



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2019

No. 168

House of Representatives

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

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

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 mas-

cot 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."

A news story published in the Atchison Daily Champion in Atchison, Kansas, on October 9, 1985, told the stories of settlers' "hunt for redskins, with a view of obtaining their scalps."

No doubt about it, this is a negative word. This is a slur. So it is remarkable that the NFL commissioners and owners continue to sanction the racist and shameful use of the term "redskin" to describe Native Americans and then profit from it.

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 Minnesotans 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 Parkland College. He gave generously to local charities, and he served on the board of 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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8391

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: Because of him, 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. One of his 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 resolute 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 to do us harm, and 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 suffered 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.

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 a concerned 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.

□ 1015

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 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 call upon my colleagues who have yet to publicly endorse this bipartisan resolution to join me, with over 110 co-sponsors, 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 mother or grandmother who has lost her children or grandchildren. By acknowledging the suffering of the victims through the official recognition of the Armenian genocide, we can at least ensure that future generations will never ever forget this atrocity to mankind.

ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the growing serious threat to our democracy and the interference in 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 reforms 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 in 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and others who have worked very hard on this important legislation to pass the SHIELD Act this week. It is the right thing to do.

TELEMEDICINE

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 flexibility for patients, it 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 dedicate their lives 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—or the VETS 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 Portability 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 Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reconsider the unilateral push forward with impeachment. We have important and timely bipartisan issues to work on, such as passing USMCA.

Canada and Mexico represent 34 percent of all U.S. exports—by far, our most important trading partners.

The North American Free Trade Agreement that we know as NAFTA

was written more than 25 years ago, and the world has changed dramatically since its enactment. President Trump has made the modernization of trade between our three countries a top priority and has allowed us the chance to make some much-needed updates. USMCA upgrades and modernizes NAFTA. It will boost our economy, and it is a win for farmers, producers, and, definitely, consumers.

We have an opportunity to take action on trade, but the work must come first. It is our constitutional duty to start this process in the House. Delaying the enactment of USMCA hurts American jobs, border security, and agriculture, as well as innovation. We cannot afford to let this opportunity pass.

Mr. Speaker, let's begin the work in the Ways and Means Committee, and let's get this done. It is time to pass USMCA.

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.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Johnson is 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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud and thank the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service for their 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 White Swan. At 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 strongly 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 earlier 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.

□ 1030

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 a special 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 Georgia Realtors Hall of Fame.

She founded scholarships for female realtors to attend the National Women's Leadership Conference and remained heavily involved in real estate well into her nineties. Her colleagues remember her as someone who blazed a trail for many women in real estate and beyond.

Yet, Ms. Konter's passion to better our community reached everyone. She served as the director of the Savannah Jewish Educational Alliance, trustee for the Armstrong Atlantic State University Foundation, owned 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.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON 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 as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

REMEMBERING ELIJAH 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 dying 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 and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SAFE DRIVERS Act introduced by my colleague, Representative SETH MOULTON.

In June of this year, seven members of Jarheads Motorcycle Club were tragically killed in my district when they were hit by a truck that crossed over into the wrong lane on Route 2 in Randolph, New Hampshire.

The Massachusetts driver responsible for this accident should not have had an active driver's license and should not have been behind the wheel that day. Despite his criminal history, the driver still had a license because of a loophole where State DMVs often do not process out-of-State infractions.

The SAFE DRIVERS Act would help States implement electronic systems to ensure that dangerous drivers are kept off our roads. By incentivizing States to modernize their databases, we can keep our roads safe and prevent further tragedies.

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 servicemembers, 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 Veterans support run 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 legacy of 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, closed-door, 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 2016 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 the 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 promote trust. Misconstruing 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 a duly elected President?

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.

□ 1215

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 high time that our struggling seniors are given 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. Supporting farmers 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 decided to give themselves millions of dollars 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 medication. 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 show 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 serving our Nation.

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(h) 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, at 9:21 a.m.:

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 XVIII, 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 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, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, 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 the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed

in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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, better known as the SHIELD Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration. The rule also executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman LOFGREN, makes in order 14 amendments, and provides one motion to recommit on the bill.

Madam Speaker, it is going to be interesting to watch my Republican friends twist pretzel-like today to convince themselves that voting against a bill that will protect the sanctity of our electoral process from foreign interference is the right thing to do for the American people.

Through today's rule, the Democrats bring to the floor a bill that states that those campaigns that are offered assistance from foreign actors should be required to report such attempts at assistance.

Sadly, I predict that my Republican friends will vote against such protections.

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 predict 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 by maligned actors 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 hopes 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 in today's 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 ought not to be spending money in our elections.

Today's bill is a direct rebuke of the Trump campaign's sharing of nonpublic polling information with Russian intelligence in the hopes that this information would make it to Moscow in order to help with their beyond well-documented campaign to interfere with the 2016 Presidential election.

Simply put, this bill treats the behavior engaged in by the Trump campaign as an illegal solicitation of support. Why? Because that is what it was.

Again, I say to the American people, watch today's vote. I once again predict that you will see Republicans vote against making such behavior illegal, and that is sad.

Finally—and this one is personal—today's bill incorporates language that will punish those who seek to intimidate, misinform, or maliciously misdirect those who simply wish to exercise that great American pastime: casting a ballot.

Attempts to dissuade voters from going to the polls, whether through violence or other means, have been part of this country's history for far too long.

We now know that in addition to homegrown efforts to keep voters away

from the polls on election day, the Russians also engaged in voter suppression tactics, including the malicious dissemination of misinformation in a brazen attempt to sow confusion in the electorate in 2016. I might add, that three Florida counties had their elections offices compromised by Russian hackers.

A vote for today's rule is a vote to bring forth a bill that will work to put an end to these dastardly deeds. Unfortunately, for reasons unfathomable, Republicans will stand brick-wall-like against such reform.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to exercise the time that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend, has extended to me.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, my very good friend, the distinguished vice-chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would be the first to admit that there are some good things in this bill. But to say also to my good friend, at the end of the day it is a very easy no. And that is sad.

Frankly, we could have had an opportunity to work together in a bipartisan fashion and actually produce a product that would be effective 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.

Earlier this year, the majority pushed through H.R. 1, which they gave the misnomer of the, "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 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 designed for TV ads to online ads, which are two very different media. And it requires the same four-second disclosures for online ads as they currently require for TV ads, even though online ads are generally significantly shorter.

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 the term "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.

This kind of overinclusive, ill-defined regulation will do nothing to protect our democracy, and will, 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. This unprecedented 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

Americans to participate in their own democracy.

And, frankly, they are putting forward a product that I think they have every confidence the Senate will not take up, and the President, I would predict, would almost certainly not sign.

We can and should do better than that. I look forward to when my friends decide they want to do better than that to actually working with them.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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 activity. Out of the \$1.4 billion spent on political advertisements in the 2016 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 rubles?"

"Was it in dollars?"

"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.

□ 1245

Much of what the Russians did was already illegal. If we want to stop this from happening in the future, then we should be strengthening existing laws and making sure law enforcement has the resources it needs to track down foreign nationals that are breaking the law by spreading propaganda.

Instead, this bill provides zero resources to help law enforcement enforce existing laws and, rather, imposes new regulations that will harm Americans' right to free speech.

The sweeping language in this bill will very likely silence the voices of honest American organizations and nonpolitical companies that wish to speak out on "issues of national importance."

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. SHIELD's burdensome regulations will make it more difficult for Americans to be heard. Isn't that the goal of the Russians, to shut down our free and open society and silence the voices of Americans?

Madam Speaker, we should support our law enforcement to do their jobs, not make up new regulations that chill free speech.

This bill is a misinformation stunt to the American people. It sends a message to America that something is being done to stop what happened in 2016 when, in reality, it fails to address the actual threat. It is a Trojan horse from the majority.

Do we actually want to stop foreign interference, or do my colleagues simply want talking points?

Madam Speaker, you have a bill before you that will not stop meddling. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I would ask my friend Mr. DAVIS if he would stand by just a minute. I have a query of him.

Last night in the Rules Committee, our colleague ED PERLMUTTER offered the gentleman an opportunity to come today to ask Mr. Zuckerberg the questions that he put here. Is the gentleman availing himself of that opportunity?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 good friend 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 went over to the Financial Services 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. HASTINGS. 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 to require hearings and markups for bills that come through the Rules Committee, and we have followed that rule.

In fact, the House Administration Committee, the primary committee of 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(i) 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 Jocelyn 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 Benjamin 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 Democracy." The following witnesses testified: Mr. Chiraag Bains, Director of Legal Strategies, Demos; Ms. Wendy Weiser, Director, Democracy Program, Brennan Center for Justice 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. Cox; Mr. Peter Earle, Wisconsin Civil Rights Trial Lawyer; Mr. Brandon A. Jessup, Data Science and Information Systems Professional; Executive Director, Michigan Forward; and David Keating, President, Institute for Free Speech.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On Wednesday, October 16, 2019, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill H.R. 4617 favorably reported with an 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) was 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 gentlewoman 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, both the chairman and 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 that 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 will begin 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 disagree-

ment 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, it is your 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 Act,” or SHIELD 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 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. 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 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.

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 effectuated 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 proliferation 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 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 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 compliance 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. 4716, the SHIELD 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, in 2016, 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 House's impeachment inquiry 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 been repeatedly denied their reasonable 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? It is 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, 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.

□ 1300

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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend.

Ms. 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 have heard publicly 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 will disagree vehemently, 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.

None of that exists now. 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. LOFGREN, 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 the things that you agree on and that can pass the other Chamber and be signed by the President. So far in this area of election security, I think my friends have been more interested in making a point than actually in making law.

So I urge opposition to the rule on H.R. 4617 because it is deeply flawed and a partisan bill that 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 such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I do agree with my good friend from Oklahoma that our exchanges are civil; and although we have respectable disagreement, the simple fact of the matter is that each of us discharges our responsibilities in a responsible way.

Madam Speaker, after exiting the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Ben-

jamin Franklin, when approached, was asked what form of government had been agreed upon; his response: "A Republic, if you can keep it."

We come here today to keep it, to not only keep it, but make more perfect that Union which we have all taken an oath to protect, not just for us and our children, but for generations unborn, so that they may know and benefit from the greatest experiment ever known to humankind, the democratic Republic we call the United States of America.

To do this, to protect our democracy from enemies foreign and domestic, we must put country over party. Indeed, there have been more than a few times in our history when it was imperative that the partisan give way to the patriotic. This is undoubtedly one of those times and one of those paramount issues.

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 24, 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 appeared to have 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 votes 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

bill (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

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

H.R. 777

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “including” and inserting “prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “including” and inserting “in particular,”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) provide assurances that the DNA section of the laboratory to be used to conduct DNA analyses has a written policy that prioritizes the analysis of, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations, samples from homicides and sexual assaults.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from 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 I helped author and enact in 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 increase the likelihood of identifying the perpetrators, making it more likely that they will be captured, punished, and prevented from doing it again. This, in turn, allows victims to obtain 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, regrettably, developed a large backlog of DNA samples that they had not tested, an intolerable situation calling out for Federal action.

In response, in 2000, I cosponsored the passage of the 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 cosponsor of the Justice for All Act, introduced by our colleague JIM SENSENBRENNER. That bill included many of the provisions of my 2002 bill.

Title II of that bill, named the Debbie Smith Act by Congresswoman MALONEY, authorized substantial funding for DNA testing and strengthened the ability of State and local law enforcement specifically to test rape kits. We subsequently reauthorized the Debbie Smith Act in 2008 and again in 2014.

In recent years, the grants we have reauthorized under the Debbie Smith Act have supported the work of crime labs to build capacity and process DNA

evidence, including evidence collected in rape kits, with greater percentages of funding allocated to testing these kits provided in subsequent amendments.

□ 1315

The act also supports audits of evidence awaiting analysis at law enforcement agencies and charges the Department of Justice with the task of maintaining national testing guidelines.

Despite these efforts, the rape kit backlog continues to be a major concern, with a large volume of kits still untested in this country, harming the survivors of sexual assault and jeopardizing public safety. Therefore, we must continue the valuable programs authorized by this important law.

That is why we included the reauthorization of this program in the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA reauthorization bill, developed by the Judiciary Committee and passed by the House earlier this year. Unfortunately, VAWA is languishing in the Senate.

While we take steps to separately pass the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith program today, I again call on the Senate to fulfill their responsibility to pass the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization without needless additional delay. Therefore, I support H.R. 777.

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 was actually on the Arizona task force to look into Arizona’s backlog on these rape kits, and so it is something that I am very passionate about doing. I am pleased that after months of inaction and after the authorization for the program had already expired, my colleagues in the majority have finally brought a Debbie Smith reauthorization bill to the House floor.

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 conspiracies 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. Finally, House Republicans had to 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 bill 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.

What would happen 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 unnecessary delay in 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 bill, a House bill instead of a Senate bill?

As Debbie Smith herself was recently quoted, "Don't punish the victims." Not acting on the Senate bill is doing just that.

Madam Speaker, I will support this bill today. I believe these programs and the survivors they serve are too critical to be the subject of partisan games. I am disappointed, however, that my colleagues do not feel the same way, otherwise they would put forward the Senate bill. I expect and hope we will be back on this floor in the very near future to pass a bill to actually authorize this vital program.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the reauthorization of this bill has been sitting in the VAWA reauthorization bill passed by this House many months ago, it has been sitting in the Senate since then.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on the Judiciary Committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, as amended. I was pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague and good friend ANN WAGNER of Missouri.

I first passed this bill in 2004. This critical State backlog grant program provides funding for forensic labs and local law enforcement to process DNA evidence, including rape kits.

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 at crime scenes sits in a backlog, because forensic labs 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 from being hurt.

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 off the street, and perhaps 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 Reauthorization Act passed by this House that 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 an 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 have supported this legislation in the past, particularly ANN WAGNER, who has championed fighting sex trafficking and protecting women in other areas.

Mrs. 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 knowing that Republicans wouldn't vote for it, and it was a political act.

And so, to me, it was a political act to also include it in the VAWA bill,

knowing the VAWA bill was so controversial and it wouldn't be heard in the Senate. So, in fact, never in the history of the Violence Against Women Act has the Debbie Smith Act been included in that bill. And, in fact, I have been told that Debbie Smith herself did not want it included in the Violence Against Women Act, because she knew it was controversial.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

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 backlogs. In my home State of Virginia, the FBI's National DNA Index contains more than 447,000 offender profiles and has aided in more than 11,000 criminal investigations.

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 and 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 completely 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 direction.

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. But let me 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.

□ 1330

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 was killed in totality, except one member, because of domestic violence.

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 forward to what we do best, 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 gentlewoman 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 PELOSI 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 in Congress under 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 30 authorization lapsed. 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, but, more 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.

Mrs. LESKO. 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 as quickly as possible.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, 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 bill, still 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 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 know they 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—they have 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.

□ 1345

Fortunately, last year, after a 7-year effort, my home State of Ohio was able to clear its backlog of nearly 14,000 of these kits, but many other States haven't been so successful. In March, the GAO estimated that the number of backlog requests for crime scene evidence nearly doubled to nearly 170,000. Unfortunately, at the end of September, the funding authorization for this program expired.

While the legislation offered by Congresswoman MALONEY is an important

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 not 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 elapse 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 includes the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

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 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 corrections.

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 of 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 is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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 will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 650; and

Adoption of House Resolution 650, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4617, STOPPING HARM- FUL INTERFERENCE IN ELEC- TIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOC- RACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 650) providing for consideration of the bill (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, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 180, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—223

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Allred	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Axne	Cicilline	Delgado
Barragán	Cisneros	Demings
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bera	Clay	Dingell
Beyer	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Cohen	F.
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Engel
Bonamici	Cooper	Escobar
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Españillat
F.	Costa	Finkenauer
Brindisi	Courtney	Fletcher
Brown (MD)	Cox (CA)	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Craig	Frankel
Bustos	Crist	Gallego
Butterfield	Crow	Garamendi
Carbajal	Cuellar	Garcia (IL)
Cárdenas	Cunningham	Garcia (TX)
Carson (IN)	Davids (KS)	Golden
Cartwright	Davis (CA)	Gomez
Case	Dean	Gonzalez (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeFazio	Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes	Scalise	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Grijalva	Malinowski	Scanlon	Schweikert	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Haaland	Maloney,	Schakowsky	Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Wenstrup
Harder (CA)	Carolyn B.	Schiff	Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Westerman
Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schneider	Shimkus	Turner	Williams
Hayes	Matsui	Schrader	Simpson	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Heck	McAdams	Schrier	Smith (MO)	Wagner	Wittman
Higgins (NY)	McBath	Scott (VA)	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Womack
Hill (CA)	McCollum	Scott, David	Smith (NJ)	Walden	Woodall
Himes	McGovern	Serrano	Spano	Walker	Wright
Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Stauber	Walorski	Yoho
Horsford	Meeks	Shalala	Stefanik	Waltz	Young
Houlihan	Meng	Sherman	Steube	Watkins	Zeldin
Hoyer	Moore	Sherrill			
Huffman	Moulton	Sires			
Jackson Lee	Mucarsel-Powell	Slotkin			
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)			
Jeffries	Nadler	Soto			
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Spanberger			
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Speier			
Kaptur	Neguse	Stanton			
Keating	Norcross	Stevens			
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Suozzi			
Kennedy	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell (CA)			
Khanna	Omar	Thompson (CA)			
Kildee	Pallone	Thompson (MS)			
Kilmer	Panetta	Titus			
Kim	Pappas	Tlaib			
Kind	Pascarell	Tonko			
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Torres (CA)			
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Torres Small			
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	(NM)			
Lamb	Phillips	Trahan			
Langevin	Pingree	Trone			
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Underwood			
Larson (CT)	Porter	Van Drew			
Lawrence	Pressley	Vargas			
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Veasey			
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Vela			
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Velázquez			
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky			
Levin (MI)	Richmond	Wasserman			
Lewis	Rose (NY)	Schultz			
Lieu, Ted	Rouda	Waters			
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman			
Loebach	Ruiz	Welch			
Lofgren	Ruppersberger	Wexton			
Lowenthal	Rush	Wild			
Lujan	Ryan	Wilson (FL)			
Luria	Sanchez	Yarmuth			

NAYS—180

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Aderholt	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Allen	Flores	Lamborn
Amash	Fortenberry	Latta
Armstrong	Fox (NC)	Lesko
Arrington	Fulcher	Long
Babin	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Bacon	Gallagher	Lucas
Baird	Gianforte	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	Gibbs	Marchant
Banks	Gohmert	Marshall
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	Massie
Biggs	Gooden	Mast
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buchanan	Green (TN)	Meadows
Buck	Griffith	Miller
Bucshon	Guest	Mitchell
Budd	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Burchett	Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Harris	Mullin
Byrne	Hartzler	Murphy (NC)
Calvert	Hern, Kevin	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Carter (TX)	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Olson
Cheney	Hill (AR)	Palazzo
Cline	Holding	Palmer
Cloud	Hollingsworth	Pence
Cole	Hudson	Perry
Comer	Huizenga	Posey
Conaway	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Riggleman
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Roby
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)
Duncan	King (IA)	Rose, John W.
Dunn	King (NY)	Rouzer
Emmer	Kinzing	Roy
Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford

Amodei	Gabbard	Reschenthaler
Bergman	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Keller	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Eshoo	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Meuser	Timmons
Evans	Morelle	
Fudge	Peters	

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Gabbard	Reschenthaler
Bergman	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Keller	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Eshoo	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Meuser	Timmons
Evans	Morelle	
Fudge	Peters	

□ 1419

Messrs. LUCAS and GUEST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HECK and Ms. WILD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 180, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—226

Adams	Cooper	Golden
Aguilar	Correa	Gomez
Allred	Costa	Gonzalez (TX)
Axne	Courtney	Gottheimer
Barragán	Cox (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Bass	Craig	Grijalva
Beatty	Crist	Haaland
Bera	Crow	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Cuellar	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Himes
F.	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DeGette	Horsford
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Houlihan
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hoyer
Bustos	Delgado	Huffman
Butterfield	Demings	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Deutch	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Johnson (TX)
Case	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	F.	Keating
Castor (FL)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Escobar	Kennedy
Chu, Judy	Españillat	Khanna
Cicilline	Evans	Kildee
Cisneros	Finkenauer	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Fletcher	Kim
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Kind
Clay	Frankel	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Gallego	Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn	Garamendi	Kuster (NH)
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Lamb
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Langevin

Larsen (WA)	O'Halleran	Shalala	Wittman	Wright	Young
Larson (CT)	Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman	Womack	Yoho	Zeldin
Lawrence	Omar	Sherrill			
Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Sires			
Lee (CA)	Panetta	Slotkin	Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Lee (NV)	Pappas	Smith (WA)	Bergman	Keller	Steil
Levin (CA)	Pascarell	Soto	Bilirakis	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Levin (MI)	Payne	Spanberger	Bishop (NC)	Lowey	Takano
Lewis	Perlmutter	Speier	Collins (GA)	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Stanton	Eshoo	Meuser	Timmons
Lipinski	Phillips	Stevens	Fudge	Peters	Woodall
Loebback	Pingree	Suozi	Gabbard	Reschenthaler	
Lofgren	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)	Grothman	Roe, David P.	
Lowenthal	Porter	Thompson (CA)			
Lujan	Pressley	Thompson (MS)			
Luria	Price (NC)	Titus			
Lynch	Quigley	Tlaib			
Malinowski	Raskin	Tonko			
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)			
Carolyn B.	Richmond	Torres Small			
Maloney, Sean	Rose (NY)	(NM)			
Matsui	Rouda	Trahan			
McAdams	Roybal-Allard	Trone			
McBath	Ruiz	Underwood			
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Van Drew			
McGovern	Rush	Vargas			
McNerney	Ryan	Veasey			
Meeks	Sánchez	Vela			
Meng	Sarbanes	Velázquez			
Moore	Scanlon	Visclosky			
Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman			
Moulton	Schiff	Schultz			
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Waters			
Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Watson Coleman			
Nadler	Schrier	Welch			
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wexton			
Neal	Scott, David	Wild			
Neguse	Serrano	Wilson (FL)			
Norcross	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth			

NAYS—180

Abraham	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)
Allen	Gooden	Mullin
Amash	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Armstrong	Granger	Newhouse
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Norman
Babin	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Olson
Baird	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Balderson	Griffith	Palmer
Banks	Guest	Pence
Barr	Guthrie	Perry
Biggs	Hagedorn	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hartzler	Reed
Brady	Hern, Kevin	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Riggleman
Brooks (IN)	Hice (GA)	Roby
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hill (AR)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hollingsworth	Rooney (FL)
Burchett	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Huizenga	Rouzer
Byrne	Hunter	Roy
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Cloud	Katko	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Comer	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	King (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Kinzinger	Spano
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Stauber
Crenshaw	LaHood	Stefanik
Curtis	LaMalfa	Steube
Davidson (OH)	Lamborn	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Taylor
DesJarlais	Lesko	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Long	Tipton
Duncan	Loudermilk	Turner
Dunn	Lucas	Upton
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Estes	Marchant	Walberg
Ferguson	Marshall	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Walker
Fleischmann	Mast	Walorski
Flores	McCarthy	Waltz
Fortenberry	McCaul	Watkins
Foxx (NC)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	McKinley	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Meadows	Westerman
Gianforte	Miller	Williams
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—25

Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bergman	Keller	Steil
Bilirakis	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Bishop (NC)	Lowey	Takano
Collins (GA)	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Eshoo	Meuser	Timmons
Fudge	Peters	Woodall
Gabbard	Reschenthaler	
Grothman	Roe, David P.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1428

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, due to a roundtable on veterans suicide at the White House, which is part of my work as Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I was unable to make the first series of votes.

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

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: "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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, The White House held a roundtable on the National Crisis of Veteran Suicide, which I was invited to be a part of. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579 and "nay" on rollcall No. 580.

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 to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 650 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4617.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1432

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (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, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4617 is comprehensive legislation to strengthen the resilience of our democracy and protect against foreign interference in our elections, including by foreign governments.

These concerns go back to the earliest days of our country. In his farewell address to the people of the United States, our first President, George Washington, warned that "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence . . . the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of the republican government."

Mr. Chair, the 2020 Federal elections are fast-approaching. Public confidence and trust in our elections is of the utmost importance. We know that foreign adversaries are working to undermine that trust today. To quote former Special Counsel Mueller in July, "They are doing it as we sit here."

Our adversaries have a variety of tools to interfere in our democracy. These tools sow disinformation to provoke discord. Their goal is to divide us and attack our values of equality and freedom. Their tactics are calculated to undermine confidence in our democratic institutions so that they will collapse under the pressure of the division and distrust. The need to act is urgent.

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 strategic competitors almost certainly will use online influence operations to try to weaken democratic institutions, undermine U.S. alliances and partnerships, and shape policy outcomes in the United States and elsewhere."

He also wrote that their tactics will include spreading disinformation, conducting hack-and-leak operations, or manipulating data in a more targeted

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 beyond 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 IRA"—that is the Russian group—"information operatives 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.

H.R. 4617 does just that. 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, as well as 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 cybersecurity 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 I of the bill enhances reporting requirements and advances transparency and accountability. It establishes a duty upon political committees to report to the FBI and the FEC illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments, foreign political parties, and their agents. This provision of the bill was informed by various proposals that were introduced in the House, including by Representative JACKSON LEE, Representative SWALWELL, Representative MALINOWSKI, and Representative SLOTKIN. The bill also includes the Honest Ads Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that takes an important step to provide more transparency to digital political advertising, including the ads that the Russians targeted to Americans to build followers and the engagement of unwitting American citizens.

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 and political 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, the committee with leading 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 security bill, again attempting to 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 chance—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.

Look, 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 close the loopholes that allow 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 issue.

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 in to your race, every State and local race if they—he or she—wants to "correct the record." 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

what Russia did? We need serious election security legislation that will protect Americans' First Amendment rights. That is why I introduced the Honest Elections Act, which, if passed, would actually address the type of foreign meddling we saw in 2016 and highlighted in the Senate intel report.

□ 1445

The Honest Elections Act would strengthen existing laws, such as the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA; the Federal Election Campaign Act; and the Help America Vote Act. And it would modernize online political ad disclosure without infringing on free speech or requiring unworkable standards for Americans.

Our bill also increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in elections and addresses domestic interference in our elections, something the SHIELD Act fails to accomplish.

We may never be able to prevent criminal activity, whether that is in our elections or in our day-to-day lives, but we can provide our law enforcement with the best tools and resources available.

The Honest Elections Act is simply a better solution to preventing foreign interference in our elections than the SHIELD Act and its unintended consequences on Americans.

Again, I will say the greatest threat to our Nation's election system is partisanship because it is the partisanship we are seeing from the majority today that is keeping the American people from having bipartisan legislation right now that will prevent any potential foreign interference in our elections.

I keep hearing my Democratic colleagues talk about urgency, but this is the third time we have been here with a partisan election bill in the House that has yet to become law or make any real change whatsoever. If Democrats are serious about this urgency in protecting our Nation's elections in the 2020 cycle, prove it. Stop with the political games. Come back to the table and work with us on something that actually stands a chance at becoming law and protecting our Nation's elections.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that it was Justice Kavanaugh, in the *Bluman v. Federal Election Commission* case, who wrote the opinion that "it is fundamental to the definition of our national political community that foreign citizens do not have a constitutional right to participate in, and thus may be excluded from, activities of democratic self-government."

The idea that we are going to infringe on foreign governments' rights to participate is simply not legally supported.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a valued member of our committee.

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 leave our 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 enemies out there every day trying to cast doubt on our elections. We have no excuse—no 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.

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 held in the basement of this building, 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 running 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 cybersecurity czar, he brought it to their attention and proposed countermeasures, 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.

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.

If these weren't enough concerns, this thing has been rushed to the floor with zero hearings. Let me repeat that: There have been no hearings, no fact-finders to get to the bottom of what would be the best solution to this problem. None.

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 internal polling 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 partisan word in this act. We hear our 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

that Congress may make or alter regulations governing the time, place, and manner of elections for the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

It was the Framers of the Constitution who put in Article IV that Congress must guarantee to the people of every State a republican form of government.

So, this is in the Constitution. We are doing our job to protect our elections, the sovereignty of our country, and the integrity of the democracy against foreign attack.

We should all be together on it, and I deplore the partisan response to this excellent legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good and new friend, our newest Member of this institution.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to serve beside Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with my adamant opposition to H.R. 4617, otherwise known as the SHIELD Act.

I think my Republican colleagues would agree that this bill is misleading at best and should be more effectively monikered as the First Amendment suppression act.

Simply put, this bill is an extension of House Democrats' efforts to federalize the election process away from the States by substantially restricting free speech through governmental overreach. Furthermore, it does not actually do anything further to secure our elections from foreign interference.

In the buildup to the 2016 election, Russian operatives broke many existing U.S. laws in their attempt to spread misinformation. Nothing in SHIELD would provide additional resources to law enforcement officials to pursue these foreign actors.

Additionally, this bill will create a chilling effect on free speech by punishing organizations that have nothing to do with politics, and it mandates Federal overreach on a substantial scale.

The SHIELD Act even gives the Federal Government the duty of determining what qualifies as a legitimate news source.

To combat this recklessness, I actually offered a commonsense amendment that Democratic leadership would not consider for debate. It, simply enough, would have struck the word "legitimate" from the section because it is vague, overbroad, and open to subjective interpretation. Do we really want the Federal Government deciding on what is or is not a legitimate news outlet?

Two minutes is not enough time to fully detail the unintended consequences of the SHIELD Act, which I intend to vote against later on today on the floor.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that the legitimate press function referred to is part of the FEC analysis that has been longstanding. It is nothing new in this bill.

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 in 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 sanctity 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 words of my good friend and our dear colleague, Congressman Cummings, are swirling around this Chamber today. He said the following: "When we are dancing with the angels, the question will be asked: In 2019, what did we do to make sure we kept our democracy intact? Did we stand on the sidelines and say nothing? Did we play games?"

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, before I yield to my good friend from California, I do want to respond.

My great friend and colleague from the great State of Maryland mentioned that Republicans said that this bill is unconstitutional. Well, it wasn't just us.

Americans for Prosperity says this bill is unconstitutional. Heritage Action says the bill is unconstitutional. Even the ACLU said this bill is unconstitutional.

It is not every day, Mr. Chair, that you get those three organizations together on the same issue, but it is here. The unconstitutionality of this bill is from them and their remarks, adding to what we are saying here and debating on the floor.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my good friend.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I fervently agree with the premise of this bill. American political campaigns should remain among Americans.

In California, it is now common for admitted noncitizens, some of them here illegally, to inject themselves into campaigns and attempt to influence voters.

Perhaps we can all agree: You are either a citizen or you are not. If you are not a citizen, you are a guest. If you

are a guest, you are not entitled to participate in our elections or in the debate that influences them.

□ 1500

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 sovereign 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 the job we are doing, and every 2 years 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, the remedy is to call him out, tell him to butt out, and denounce such conduct for the meddling that it is. The remedy is not to insert the government into the discussion over how the government is doing.

Once government seizes the power to tell the people what they can say or 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 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 18 minutes remaining.

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

I would just like to note that it was eight Justices who said, in 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 Kavanaugh himself who pointed out that foreign citizens don't have a First Amendment right to meddle in our elections.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes 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.

The measure of partisanship here is not whether the Republicans have refused to get on this and it is a Democratic bill. That is not how you measure partisanship, because that is an

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 partisan 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 here 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.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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. Chairman, 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 for a bill that mentioned the Secretary, HHS Secretary, 3,033 times; 974 times it said the "Secretary shall" and then went on to say something else.

According to Dr. BURGESS, he estimated that there were actually 262 different action items in 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 we 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 we are 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 dis-

tricts 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.

Mr. 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 election 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 would just note that the provision referred to relates only to the time, place, or manner of holding an election. So if you have a digital ad that says Democrats vote Tuesday, Republicans vote Wednesday, you can send out an ad saying everybody votes on Tuesday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman 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 U.S. elections and political processes. 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 gentlewoman from California for her leadership.

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

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.

Mr. Chair, 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 effectuated 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 proliferation 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 exist-

ence and knowingly and happily accepted the benefits of the hostile foreign interference.

While some may tolerate this as 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 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 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 to 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 through other committees and other pieces of legislation: They don'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 taken away from us.

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 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.

□ 1515

If you want bipartisanship, you have got to earn bipartisanship by allowing us to have a seat at the table.

Now, it is not too hard to have discussions. 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 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 a freaking home run. 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 with a voter verified 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 consult with us, 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, Illinois, they worked with their 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. We can come 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 cosponsor 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 strengthen 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 Chair LOFGREN 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 been able to have the bill on 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 is scary 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 signed into law.

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 designed a system 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. Let me repeat that. There is nothing 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 gentlewoman 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, foreign intelligence services and the like.

This is a problem because in 2016 across Pennsylvania users of social

media saw this image over and over again. It is the real image of a coal miner suggesting that miners were supporting the Republican nominee and getting together in huge rallies in places like Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

But the problem is, there were no rallies. And the truth is, the actual opinions of coal miners were much more mixed. They know, in fact, that they have been let down on issues like healthcare and pensions, by both Republicans and Democrats, and they have been supported and protected on those same issues by Members of both parties.

In fact, just today, the House Natural Resources Committee passed the Miners Pension Protection Act, and I was proud to stand with members of both parties in support of that.

Mr. Chair, the man in this image died in 1987 at the age of 57—too young—like most miners, of black lung. These miners have given a lot. We cannot allow the Russians or anyone else to take anything else from them and affect our elections.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN), a new Member of Congress from Michigan, who had a distinguished career in the intelligence community.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and thank her for all the work she has done on the SHIELD Act.

As a former CIA officer and Pentagon official, as the wife of a 30-year Army officer and the stepmom of a current Army officer, I know that when our country sees a threat, we have the responsibility to act and to consider ways to protect our country.

I think we have all said it many times here today, no matter who you are, what political party you are from, we can all agree that foreigners have no role in our political process.

I am incredibly proud to be supporting the SHIELD Act. Certain portions of it are modeled off legislation I have been working on since I first started in Congress in January, the PAID AD Act, in particular. It is the very basic idea that foreigners should not be able to buy an ad for or against a candidate in an American political election. That should be illegal, plain and simple.

Michigan was particularly targeted by these ads. They are divisive. They are hateful. They are meant to split us apart and stoke fears in our community. It is a classic in the playbook the Russians have used in Eastern Europe, and now they are using it here in the United States.

The SHIELD Act closes these loopholes that currently allow foreign entities to purchase campaign ads. I am thrilled to support it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS), a valued new Member of Congress.

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.

□ 1530

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—today—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 to 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 in a 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 instance of foreign 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—and that was bipartisan; 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 Kavanaugh wrote: “The United States has a compelling interest for purposes of First Amendment analysis in limiting the participation of foreign citizens in activities of American democratic self-government, and in thereby 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 subvert 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 misconduct 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 Democratic 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 you would 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 because 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 information is sent to them.

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, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the na-

ture 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.**—This 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 contacts.

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 disclaimer statements 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 LOOPHOLES 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 activities.

Sec. 203. Audit and report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 204. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connections 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.

Sec. 313. Corrective action.

Sec. 314. Reports to Congress.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Effective dates of provisions.

Sec. 402. Severability.

TITLE I—ENHANCED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

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:

“(j) 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.

“(2) 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.

“(3) 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—

“(I) a candidate, a political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee; and

“(II) an individual that the person described in subclause (I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes is a covered foreign national; and

“(ii) the person described in clause (i)(I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes involves—

“(I) an offer or other proposal for a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319; or

“(II) coordination or collaboration with, an offer or provision of information or services to or from, or persistent and repeated contact with, a covered foreign national in connection with an election.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) CONTACTS IN OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ELECTED OFFICIAL.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact’ shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by an elected official or an employee of an elected official solely in an official capacity as such an official or employee.

(ii) CONTACTS FOR PURPOSES OF ENABLING OBSERVATION OF ELECTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact’ shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by any person which is made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections in the United States by a foreign national or observation of elections outside of the United States by a candidate, political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS NOT APPLICABLE IF CONTACTS OR COMMUNICATIONS INVOLVE PROHIBITED DISBURSEMENTS.—A contact or communication by

an elected official or an employee of an elected official shall not be considered to be made solely in an official capacity for purposes of clause (i), and a contact or communication shall not be considered to be made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections for purposes of clause (ii), if the contact or communication involves a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319.

“(C) COVERED FOREIGN NATIONAL DEFINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered foreign national’ means—

“(I) a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b)) that is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

“(II) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal described in subclause (I); or

“(III) any person included in the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to authorities relating to the imposition of sanctions relating to the conduct of a foreign principal described in subclause (I).

“(ii) CLARIFICATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.—In the case of a citizen of the United States, subclause (II) of clause (i) applies only to the extent that the person involved acts within the scope of that person’s status as the agent of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) of clause (i).”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by 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.—Section 304(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (7);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) for any reportable foreign contact (as defined in subsection (j)(3))—

“(A) the date, time, and location of the contact;

“(B) the date and time of when a designated official of the committee was notified of the contact;

“(C) the identity of individuals involved; and

“(D) a description of the contact, including the nature of any contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation involved and the nature of any activity described in subsection (j)(3)(A)(ii)(II) involved.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reports filed on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FOREIGN CONTACT REPORTING COMPLIANCE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACTS COMPLIANCE POLICY.—

“(1) REPORTING.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that requires all officials, employees, and agents of such committee to notify the treasurer or other appropriate designated official of the committee of any reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) not later than 3 days after such contact was made.

“(2) RETENTION AND PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that provides for the retention and preservation of records and information related to reportable foreign contacts (as so defined) for a period of not less than 3 years.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon filing its statement of organization under section 303(a), and with each report filed under section 304(a), the treasurer of each political committee (other than an authorized committee) shall certify that—

“(i) the committee has in place policies that meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2);

“(ii) the committee has designated an official to monitor compliance with such policies; and

“(iii) not later than 1 week after the beginning of any formal or informal affiliation with the committee, all officials, employees, and agents of such committee will—

“(I) receive notice of such policies;

“(II) be informed of the prohibitions under section 319; and

“(III) sign a certification affirming their understanding of such policies and prohibitions.

“(B) AUTHORIZED COMMITTEES.—With respect to an authorized committee, the candidate shall make the certification required under subparagraph (A).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) 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 under 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 302(j) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 103. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

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 subparagraphs:

“(E) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of subsection (j) or (b)(9) of section 304 or section 302(j) shall be fined not more than \$500,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(F) Any person who knowingly and willfully conceals or destroys any materials relating to a reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.”

SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed—

(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—

(A) resides in the United States;

(B) is not a citizen of the United States or a national of the United States, as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)); and

(C) is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence, as defined by section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)).

Subtitle B—Strengthening Oversight of Online Political Advertising

SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Honest Ads Act”.

SEC. 112. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to enhance the integrity of American democracy and national security by improving disclosure requirements for online political advertisements in order to

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 (8)(B)(v), by striking “on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising” and inserting “in any public communication”; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B)—

(A) by amending clause (i) to read as follows: “(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;”; and

(B) in clause (iv), by striking “on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising” and inserting “in any public communication”.

(c) **DISCLOSURE AND DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS.**—Subsection (a) of section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended—

(1) by striking “financing any communication through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising” and inserting “financing any public communication”; and

(2) by striking “solicits any contribution through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising” and inserting “solicits any contribution through any public communication”.

SEC. 114. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ELECTORATE COMMUNICATION.

(a) **EXPANSION TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION TO QUALIFIED INTERNET AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 304(f)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “or satellite communication” each place it appears in clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting “satellite, or qualified internet or digital communication”.

(B) **QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.**—Paragraph (3) of section 304(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.**—The term ‘qualified internet or digital communication’ means any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in subsection (k)(3)).”.

(2) **NONAPPLICATION OF RELEVANT ELECTORATE TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.**—Section 304(f)(3)(A)(i)(III) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)(i)(III)) is amended by inserting “any broadcast, cable, or satellite” before “communication”.

(3) **NEWS EXEMPTION.**—Section 304(f)(3)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) a communication appearing in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any online or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;”.

(b) **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 STATEMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) **CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER REQUIREMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 318 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 (1), (2), and (3) and inserting “shall state in a clear and conspicuous manner”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following flush 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 section 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 as provided in subsection (a) if the communication meets the following requirements:

“(A) **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).

“(B) **AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS.**—In the case of an audio communication, the statement is spoken in a clearly audible and intelligible manner at the beginning or end of the communication and lasts at least 3 seconds.

“(C) **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 in—

“(I) a written format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) and appears for at least 4 seconds; and

“(II) an audible format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(D) **OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.**—In the case of any other type of communication, the statement is at least as clear and conspicuous as the statement specified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).”.

(2) **NONAPPLICATION OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.**—The exceptions provided in section 110.11(f)(1)(i) and (ii) of title 11, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor to such rules, shall have no application to qualified internet or digital communications (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by this Act).

(c) **MODIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.**—Section

318(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through radio” and inserting “which is in an audio format”; and

(B) by striking “BY RADIO” in the heading and inserting “AUDIO FORMAT”;;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through television” and inserting “which is in video format”; and

(B) by striking “BY TELEVISION” in the heading and inserting “VIDEO FORMAT”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “made in audio or video format”; and

(B) by striking “through television” in the second sentence and inserting “in video format”.

SEC. 116. POLITICAL RECORD 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 by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) **DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.**—An online platform shall maintain, and make available for online public inspection in machine readable format, a complete record of any request to purchase on such online platform a qualified political advertisement which is made by a person whose aggregate requests to purchase qualified political advertisements on such online platform during the calendar year exceeds \$500.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVERTISERS.**—Any person who requests to purchase a qualified political advertisement on 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).

“(2) **CONTENTS OF RECORD.**—A record maintained under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain—

“(A) a digital copy of the qualified political advertisement;

“(B) 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;

“(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);

“(iii) in 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

“(iv) in 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.

“(3) **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.

“(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.”.

(b) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall establish rules—

(1) requiring common data formats for the record required to be maintained under section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) so that all online platforms submit and maintain data online in a common, machine-readable and publicly accessible format;

(2) establishing search interface requirements relating to such record, including searches by candidate name, issue, purchaser, and date; and

(3) establishing the criteria for the safe harbor exception provided under paragraph (6) of section 304(k) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(c) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress on—

(1) matters relating to compliance with and the enforcement of the requirements of section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a);

(2) recommendations for any modifications to such section to assist in carrying out its purposes; and

(3) identifying ways to bring transparency and accountability to political advertisements distributed online for free.

SEC. 117. PREVENTING CONTRIBUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE FORM OF ONLINE ADVERTISING.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCAST STATIONS, PROVIDERS OF CABLE AND SATELLITE TELEVISION, AND ONLINE PLATFORMS.**—

“(1) **RESPONSIBILITIES DESCRIBED.**—Each television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform (as defined in section 304(k)(3)) shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that communications described in section 318(a) and made available by such station, provider, or platform are not

purchased by a foreign national, directly or indirectly. For purposes of the previous sentence, a station, provider, or online platform shall not be considered to have made reasonable efforts under this paragraph in the case of the availability of a communication unless the station, provider, or online platform directly inquires from the individual or entity making such purchase whether the purchase is to be made by a foreign national, directly or indirectly.

“(2) **SPECIAL RULES FOR DISBURSEMENT PAID WITH CREDIT CARD.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform shall be considered to have made reasonable efforts under such paragraph in the case of a purchase of the availability of a communication which is made with a credit card if—

“(A) the individual or entity making such purchase is required, at the time of making such purchase, to disclose the credit verification value of such credit card; and

“(B) the billing address associated with such credit card is located in the United States or, in the case of a purchase made by an individual who is a United States citizen living outside of the United States, the individual provides the television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform with the United States mailing address the individual uses for voter registration purposes.”.

TITLE II—CLOSING LOOPHOLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY 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 “or” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) a foreign national to direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decision making process of any person (including a corporation, labor organization, political committee, or political organization) with regard to such person’s Federal or non-Federal election-related activity, including any decision concerning the making of contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements in connection with an election for any Federal, State, or local office or any decision concerning the administration of a political committee.”.

(b) **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—Section 319 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 117, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE REQUIRED PRIOR TO CARRYING OUT ACTIVITY.**—Prior to the making in connection with an election for Federal office of any contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement for an electioneering communication by a corporation, labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)), limited liability corporation, or partnership during a year, the chief executive officer of the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership (or, if the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership does not have a chief executive officer, the highest ranking official of the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership), shall file a certification with the Commission, under penalty of perjury, that a foreign national did not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decision making process relating to such activity in violation of subsection (a)(3), unless the chief executive officer has previously filed such a certification during that calendar year.”.

(c) **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. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) **APPLICATION TO DISBURSEMENTS TO SUPER PACS.**—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon 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 to or on behalf of any account of 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 during a year unless the fund has certified to the Commission the following during the year:

“(A) Each individual who manages the fund, and who is responsible for exercising decision-making authority for the fund, is a citizen of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States.

“(B) No foreign national under section 319 participates in any way in the decisionmaking processes of the fund with regard to contributions or expenditures under this Act.

“(C) The fund does not solicit or accept recommendations from any foreign national under section 319 with respect to the contributions or expenditures made by the fund.

“(D) Any member of the board of directors of the corporation who is a foreign national under section 319 abstains from voting on matters concerning the fund or its activities.”.

SEC. 203. AUDIT AND REPORT ON ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(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 DISBURSEMENTS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

“(a) **AUDIT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall conduct an audit after each Federal 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.

“(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the end of each Federal election cycle, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(1) 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 which begins on the day after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and which ends on the date of the first regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held after such date.

“(2) The term ‘illicit foreign money’ means any disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 319(b)) prohibited under such section.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the

Federal election cycle that began during November 2018, and each succeeding Federal election cycle.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) 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 2020 or any 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) an expenditure;

“(D) an independent expenditure;

“(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(j)(3));

“(F) a disbursement for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a website, web application, or digital application that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;

“(G) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable or satellite communication, or for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a 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);

“(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in section 304(k)(3)), that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in a year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held, but only if the disbursement is made by a covered foreign national described in section 304(j)(3)(C); or

“(I) a disbursement by a covered foreign national described in section 304(j)(3)(C) to compensate any person for internet activity that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the activity communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy);”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 117 and section 201(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **RESTRICTIONS ON EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN CANDIDATES AND FOREIGN POWERS.**—

“(1) **TREATMENT OF OFFER TO SHARE NON-PUBLIC CAMPAIGN MATERIAL AS SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTION FROM FOREIGN NATIONAL.**—If a candidate or an individual affiliated with the campaign of a candidate, or if a political committee or an individual affiliated with a political committee, provides or offers to provide non-public campaign material to a covered foreign national or to another person whom the candidate, committee, or individual knows or has reason to know will provide the material to a covered foreign national, the candidate, committee, or individual (as the case may be) shall be considered for purposes of this section to have solicited a contribution or donation described in subsection (a)(1)(A) from a foreign national.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) The term ‘candidate’ means an individual who seeks nomination for, or election to, any Federal, State, or local public office.

“(B) The term ‘covered foreign national’ has the meaning given such term in section 304(j)(3)(C).

“(C) The term ‘individual affiliated with a campaign’ means, with respect to a candidate, an employee of any organization legally authorized under Federal, State, or local law to support the candidate’s campaign for nomination for, or election to, any Federal, State, or local public office, as well as any independent contractor of such an organization and any individual who performs services on behalf of the organization, whether paid or unpaid.

“(D) The term ‘individual affiliated with a political committee’ means, with respect to a political committee, an employee of the committee as well as any independent contractor of the committee and any individual who performs services on behalf of the committee, whether paid or unpaid.

“(E) The term ‘nonpublic campaign material’ means, with respect to a candidate or a political committee, campaign material that is produced by the candidate or the committee or produced at the candidate or committee’s expense or request which is not distributed or made available to the general public or otherwise in the public domain, including polling and focus group data and opposition research, except that such term does not include material produced for purposes of consultations relating solely to the candidate’s or committee’s position on a legislative or policy matter.”.

SEC. 302. CLARIFICATION OF STANDARD FOR DETERMINING EXISTENCE OF COORDINATION BETWEEN CAMPAIGNS AND OUTSIDE INTERESTS.

Section 315(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) 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 without regard to whether or not the cooperation, consultation, or coordination is carried out pursuant to agreement or formal collaboration.”.

Subtitle B—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

SEC. 311. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle 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 inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) **FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**—

“(A) **PROHIBITION.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, within 60 days before an election described in paragraph (5), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, communicate or cause to be communicated information described in subparagraph (B), or produce information described in subparagraph (B) with the intent that such information be communicated, if such person—

“(i) knows such information to be materially false; and

“(ii) has the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(B) **INFORMATION DESCRIBED.**—Information is described in this subparagraph if such information is regarding—

“(i) the time, place, or manner of holding any election described in paragraph (5); or

“(ii) the qualifications for or restrictions on voter eligibility for any such election, including—

“(I) any criminal penalties associated with voting in any such election; or

“(II) information regarding a voter’s registration status or eligibility.

“(3) **FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING PUBLIC ENDORSEMENTS.**—

“(A) **PROHIBITION.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, within 60 days before an election described in paragraph (5), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, communicate, or cause to be communicated, a materially false statement about an endorsement, if such person—

“(i) knows such statement to be false; and

“(ii) has the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(B) **DEFINITION OF ‘MATERIALLY FALSE’.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a statement about an endorsement is ‘materially false’ if, with respect to an upcoming election described in paragraph (5)—

“(i) the statement states that a specifically named person, political party, or organization has endorsed the election of a specific candidate for a Federal office described in such paragraph; and

“(ii) such person, political party, or organization has not endorsed the election of such candidate.

“(4) **HINDERING, INTERFERING WITH, OR PREVENTING VOTING OR REGISTERING TO VOTE.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intentionally hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(5) **ELECTION DESCRIBED.**—An election described in this paragraph is any general, primary, runoff, or special election held solely or in part for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Commissioner from a Territory or possession.”.

(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—

(A) by striking “Whenever any person” and inserting the following:

“(1) Whenever any person”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Any person aggrieved 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 a reasonable attorney's fee 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) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(1) DECEPTIVE ACTS.—Section 594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Whoever" and inserting the following:

"(a) INTIMIDATION.—Whoever";

(B) in subsection (a), as inserted by subparagraph (A), by striking "at any election" and inserting "at any general, primary, run-off, or special election"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) DECEPTIVE ACTS.—

"(1) FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—

"(A) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, within 60 days before an election described in subsection (e), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, to communicate or cause to be communicated information described in subparagraph (B), or produce information described in subparagraph (B) with the intent that such information be communicated, if such person—

"(i) knows such information to be materially false; and

"(ii) has the intent to mislead voters, or the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in subsection (e).

"(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—Information is described in this subparagraph if such information is regarding—

"(i) the time or place of holding any election described in subsection (e); or

"(ii) the qualifications for or restrictions on voter eligibility for any such election, including—

"(I) any criminal penalties associated with voting in any such election; or

"(II) information regarding a voter's registration status or eligibility.

"(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) HINDERING, INTERFERING WITH, OR PREVENTING VOTING OR REGISTERING TO VOTE.—

"(1) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, to intentionally hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in an election described in subsection (e).

"(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts to commit any offense described in subsection (a), (b)(1), or (c)(1) shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense that the person attempted to commit.

"(e) ELECTION DESCRIBED.—An election described in this subsection is any general, primary, run-off, or special election held solely or in part for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives,

or Delegate or Commissioner from a Territory or possession."

(2) MODIFICATION OF PENALTY FOR VOTER INTIMIDATION.—Section 594(a) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), 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, the United States Sentencing Commission, pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing 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 21(a) 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. 10307) is amended by striking "either for registration to vote or for voting" and inserting "for registration to vote, 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 promptly communicate 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.

(2) COMMUNICATION OF CORRECTIVE INFORMATION.—Any information communicated by the Attorney General under paragraph (1)—

(A) 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; and

(B) shall not be designed to favor or disfavor any particular candidate, organization, or political party.

(b) WRITTEN PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR 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.

(2) INCLUSION OF APPROPRIATE DEADLINES.—The procedures and standards under paragraph (1) shall include appropriate deadlines, based in part on the number of days remaining before the upcoming election.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the procedures and standards under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall consult with the Election Assistance Commission, State and local election officials, civil rights organizations, voting rights groups, voter protection groups, and other interested community organizations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 314. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after each general election for Federal office, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report compiling all allegations received by the Attorney General of deceptive practices described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 2004(b) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)), as added by section 312(a), relating to the general election for Federal office and any primary, run-off, or a special election for Federal office held in the 2 years preceding the general election.

(b) CONTENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(A) a description of each allegation of a deceptive practice described in subsection (a), including the geographic location, racial and ethnic composition, and language minority-group membership of the persons toward whom the alleged deceptive practice was directed;

(B) the status of the investigation of each allegation described in subparagraph (A);

(C) a description of each corrective action taken by the Attorney General under section 4(a) in response to an allegation described in subparagraph (A);

(D) a description of each referral of an allegation described in subparagraph (A) to other Federal, State, or local agencies;

(E) to the extent information is available, a description of any civil action instituted under section 2004(c)(2) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(c)(2)), as added by section 312(b), in connection with an allegation described in subparagraph (A); and

(F) a description of any criminal prosecution instituted under section 594 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 3(c), in connection with the receipt of an allegation described in subparagraph (A) by the Attorney General.

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall not include in a report submitted under subsection (a) any information protected from disclosure by rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or any Federal criminal statute.

(B) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN OTHER INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may determine that the following information shall not be included in a report submitted under subsection (a):

(i) Any information that is privileged.

(ii) Any information concerning an ongoing investigation.

(iii) Any information concerning a criminal or civil proceeding conducted under seal.

(iv) Any other nonpublic information that the Attorney General determines the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to infringe on the rights of any individual or adversely affect the integrity of a pending or future criminal investigation.

(c) REPORT MADE PUBLIC.—On the date that the Attorney General submits the report under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall also make the report publicly available through the Internet and other appropriate means.

Subtitle C—Inadmissibility and Deportability of Aliens Engaging in Improper Election Interference

SEC. 321. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.

(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 engaged, or at any time after admission engages 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 election processes or institutions, or influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or caucus, including—

“(i) the campaign of a candidate; or

“(ii) a ballot measure, including an amendment, a bond issue, an initiative, a recall, a referendum.”.

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 such provision or such 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 to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of the provisions to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-253. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 54, insert after line 14 the following:

Subtitle C—Notifying States of Disinformation Campaigns by Foreign Nationals

SEC. 321. NOTIFYING STATES OF DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) **REQUIRING DISCLOSURE.**—If the Federal Election Commission makes a determination that a foreign national has initiated or has attempted to initiate a disinformation campaign targeted at an election for public office held in a State, the Commission shall notify the State involved of the determination not later than 30 days after making the determination.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section the term “foreign national” has the meaning given such term in section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(b)).

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.

□ 1545

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 by my friend from Illinois 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. LOFGREN’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 Facebook by the Russians. 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 communities, and I agree 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 afforded 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 act.

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.

In one way that they are 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 them to do in the Honest Elections Act—my bill—that I would certainly hope some 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 that for this 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, so 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 disagreements on not only 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.

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 650, 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 my 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 without guardrails 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.

Despite the request from Judiciary Committee Ranking Member COLLINS, this section of the legislation was not afforded the opportunity of a markup by the Judiciary Committee, despite it having jurisdiction. In fact, this is at least the fourth piece of legislation this year that Ranking Member COLLINS requested to markup but was denied an opportunity by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Because this section is a Federal intrusion into State and local elections and came to the floor through a deficient process, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strike this section, and 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 time, place, or manner of holding an election.

Section 313 provides that the responsibility first falls on State and local of-

ficials to correct the materially false information. It is only if State and local election officials fall 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, or 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 gentleman 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.

Mr. Chairman, 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.

□ 1600

This section that is being amended today provides unprecedented power to the Attorney General to intercede 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 reason why we have hearings. 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 bill was rushed 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 institution. 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 Conference 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 to try and prevent people from voting has a racial impact. We have seen the suppression 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 confused 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 Attorney General should get involved in local elections.

On this bill and other bills, I think there is a fundamental difference between the way some of my Democratic colleagues believe and what fellow Republicans and I believe. They believe

the U.S. Government should know everything 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 Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. LYNCH. 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—Prohibiting Use of Deepfakes in Election Campaigns

SEC. 321. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY 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 203, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 325. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY 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 election for Federal office at which a candidate for elective office will appear on the ballot, distribute, with actual malice, materially deceptive audio or visual media of the candidate with the intent to injure the candidate's reputation or to deceive a voter into voting for or against the candidate.

"(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 describes 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 consists of audio only, the disclosure shall be read in a clearly spoken manner and in a pitch that can be easily heard by the average listener, at the beginning of the audio, at the end of the audio, and, if the audio is greater than two minutes in length, interspersed

within the audio at intervals of not greater than two minutes each.

"(c) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN ENTITIES.—This section does not apply to the following:

"(1) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, that broadcasts materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section as part of a bona fide newscast, news interview, news documentary, or on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events, if the broadcast clearly acknowledges through content or a disclosure, in a manner that can be easily heard or read by the average listener or viewer, that there are questions about the authenticity of the materially deceptive audio or visual media.

"(2) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, when it is paid to broadcast materially deceptive audio or visual media.

"(3) An internet website, or a regularly published newspaper, magazine, or other periodical of general circulation, including an internet or electronic publication, that routinely carries news and commentary of general interest, and that publishes materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section, if the publication clearly states that the materially deceptive audio or visual media does not accurately represent the speech or conduct of the candidate.

"(4) Materially deceptive audio or visual media that constitutes satire or parody.

"(d) CIVIL ACTION.—

"(1) INJUNCTIVE OR OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may seek injunctive or other equitable relief prohibiting the distribution of audio or visual media in violation of this section. An action under this paragraph shall be entitled to precedence in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

"(2) DAMAGES.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may bring an action for general or special damages against the person, committee, or other entity that distributed the materially deceptive audio or visual media. The court may also award a prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees and costs. This paragraph shall not be construed to limit or preclude a plaintiff from securing or recovering any other available remedy.

"(3) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any civil action alleging a violation of this section, the plaintiff shall bear the burden of establishing the violation through clear and convincing evidence.

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to alter or negate any rights, obligations, or immunities of an interactive service provider under section 230 of title 47, United States Code.

"(f) MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL 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 intentionally 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 or video 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

person would have if the person were hearing or seeing the unaltered, original version of the image or audio or video recording.”.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)), as amended by section 103, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of section 325 shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.”.

(c) EFFECT ON DEFAMATION ACTION.—For purposes of an action for defamation, a violation of section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a), shall constitute defamation per se.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I thank Ms. LOFGREN for her leadership and her courage and hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor.

My amendment to H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act, would generally prohibit the use of so-called deepfakes within 60 days of a Federal election.

These digital photo, audio, and video forgeries are generated using artificial intelligence. They appear realistic and are intended to manipulate or deceive their audience.

This amendment also establishes criminal and civil penalties for the malicious use of deepfakes in Federal elections while providing necessary exemptions for broadcasting or publication of deepfake content by news media organizations in satire or parody and other appropriate cases.

As chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of the Oversight and Reform Committee, I can attest to the escalating warnings that we have received from U.S. intelligence community officials and national security experts regarding the use of these deepfake technologies as an emerging tool of foreign election interference.

During our recent hearing to examine election security, government and private-sector panelists testified about the capacity of deepfake technologies to “weaponize” false information on a massive scale. That is because it is already widely accessible, easy to use, low cost, and rapidly evolving.

In reference to the security of the 2020 U.S. Presidential election, FBI Director Christopher Wray has stated that deepfake content is a “topic of great concern,” as Federal intelligence agencies combat the threat of election meddling by foreign adversaries that are intent on developing new ways to perpetuate malign influence operations.

According to the nonpartisan Council on Foreign Relations, deepfakes present “disinformation on steroids” and could easily be deployed to influence an election, spark violence, exacerbate societal divisions, and undermine other democratic institutions.

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, defame 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 deepfakes 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 the amendment, although I am not necessarily opposed it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this is a problem. Misinformation, false representation, digitally manipulated images, that is a problem.

What we do in this institution, and the political nature of our jobs, I think we have all been victims of videos that try to provide false information. This has to be addressed.

I believe we need to have some hearings on this issue because it is pretty complicated. And we haven’t had a single hearing with any of the platforms, where many of these videos would be published, before this bill was rushed to the floor.

I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that deepfakes present a unique challenge for Congress to address. I would hate to see a potential solution that is being offered by my good friend put on a partisan bill.

An additional problem I see is that I am not aware of any technology that

can identify which images or video are deepfakes. Perhaps the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology should hold a hearing on this issue as well.

In dealing with this issue, Congress needs to appropriately weigh the First Amendment protections afforded to public speech with the dangerous potential of deepfakes to add further damage to our already polarized climate.

This amendment, like many of these amendments, would be better served to pass through regular order and give the American public a chance to learn about these very important and, at times, recent and troubling issues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I do appreciate the gentleman from Illinois’ thoughtful support for this amendment.

I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership again in bringing the SHIELD Act to the floor and working with me on this amendment.

I again urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and 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 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 116–253.

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. PROHIBITING ESTABLISHMENT 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 owner, officer, attorney, or incorporation agent of a corporation, company, 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 subsection (a) shall be imprisoned for 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 and coauthor of this amendment, Ranking Member MCCAUL, with whom I have the great privilege of serving on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as my colleagues cosponsoring this amendment, especially Representatives ROUDA, SLOTKIN, and SPEIER.

I also thank Chairwoman LOFGREN 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, there is no law specifically preventing foreign nationals from setting up a shell corporation or company to hide illegal political activity.

Our bipartisan amendment will nail that loophole shut by prohibiting foreign nationals from funneling money through shell companies to engage in political activity in America.

We must keep our democratic process safe from all bad actors, including foreign actors, and strengthen the integrity of our elections. 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 the corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal the political activities of foreign actors.

Put simply, 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 Texas 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 both foreign and domestic adversaries and threats. That includes the cornerstone of our democracy, free and fair elections.

□ 1615

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 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 already 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 was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

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 evaluation of media literacy skills, such as the ability to evaluate sources, synthesize multiple accounts into a coherent understanding of an issue, understand the context of communications, and responsibly create and share information, among voting-age Americans.

(2) 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.

(3) Recommendations for improving voting-age Americans' ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 270 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 Rules and 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

(6) 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 online 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, Instagram, and Twitter 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 our democracy 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.

This amendment, Madam Chair, to the SHIELD Act would direct the FEC to commission a study on Americans' media literacy skills, including the ability to critically evaluate sources and responsibly share information. It would require a report on the impact of media literacy education on how Americans consume and understand online political content, with a focus on political advertisements. The study would also include recommendations to improve voters' resilience to 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.

Renee Hobbs, 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 dimension 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."

Professor Hobbs 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY 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 good a 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 worth noting 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, would we want them 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 hotdogcollars.com would allow me to get my two Yorkies some new dog collars. I don't know—except 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 is Halloween season, it is almost upon us, \$10 pizza pies. I don't know why that is categorized as political, but it is.

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 & Salad: 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.

Madam Chair, we need to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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 both understand and identify disinformation that is critical to preventing foreign influence. This means our citizens, and especially our kids, need to have the tools to spot this disinformation.

In this new age of digital warfare, 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. RODNEY 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.

□ 1630

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 B of House Report 116-253.

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 rise 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 ZOE 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 was, "part of Russia and 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 parts of the honor code that 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 and my Democratic colleagues, 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 work 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 is covered, "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, yes, 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 democracy has been tested. 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. RODNEY 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 have them ask 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, we will be judged by in this country. We will be judged by the freedoms and the freedom of speech that many in this country take for granted, that we should stand together, Republicans and Democrats, to protect, or we will be judged by bad legislation that could be turned into law that could have a chilling effect on these freedoms, on these liberties that our adversaries that meddle in our elections want to use to take them away from every single American.

Vote "no" on this amendment. Vote to protect free speech and vote to take a step back to clarify how we work to ensure that no foreign entity can interfere with our elections again.

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

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.

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):

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report relating to notifications received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 304(j)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 101(a) of this Act).

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following with respect to notifications described in subsection (a):

(1) The number of such notifications received from political committees during the year covered by the report.

(2) A description of protocols and procedures developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation relating to receipt and maintenance of records relating to such notifications.

(3) With respect to such notifications received during the year covered by the report, a description of any subsequent actions taken by the Director resulting from the receipt of such notifications.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "congressional intelligence committees" has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I want to recognize, first, the hard work of Chairwoman LOFGREN. Your hard work and your leadership on this important issue and the underlying bill. It is clear that our foreign adversaries have and will continue to interfere and influence our elections and attempt to erode confidence in our government and destroy our democratic system.

The Mueller report made clear that the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in a sweeping and systematic fashion. And Mr. Mueller testified earlier this year that many more countries have developed misinformation campaigns since 2016 targeted at the United States, our democracy, and our system of elections.

Facebook on Monday disclosed that it had taken down four new foreign interference operations originating from Iran and Russia. Soliciting or accepting foreign interference doesn't just violate our democratic norms; it clearly violates our laws.

Yet, in June, President Trump said there would be nothing wrong with accepting from a foreign government incriminating information about an opponent and saw no reason—the President saw no reason—to call the FBI if it were to happen.

He went one step further and said it was wrong for FBI Director Chris Wray to say that public officials or campaigns should contact the FBI if they

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, candidates, 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 hostile 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. 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, the provision this section seeks to amend has problems in and of itself. I object to this amendment because I object to the underlying premise of the bill. It is unreasonable to require candidates to vet every foreign national they come into contact with.

I understand that this bill requires that candidates know or have reason to know that foreign nationals are covered. My question is: Would not any government employee, such as those that work at an embassy, be covered under this bill? Wouldn't a conversation with a traffic officer or embassy clerk be subject to penalties under this section?

I absolutely believe that campaigns should have to report offers of assistance from foreign nationals. The issue with this bill and, thus, this amendment, 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 was agreed to.

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 to 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, together 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.

□ 1645

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 upholding 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 would have the data and the information to do so and to 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 going to be tacked 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 zero hearings in 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 offers 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 when we were in the majority, "So what if the Senate is not going to pass it? We ought 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 be signed into 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 midterms. 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. I look 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 note, to bring 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. 30121), 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"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) a person to knowingly provide substantial assistance to another person in carrying out an activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(f) KNOWINGLY DESCRIBED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), the term 'knowingly' means actual knowledge, constructive knowledge, 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; and

"(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 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman 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.

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 the 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, to condone 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 have to be a high-powered campaign finance attorney to understand what is at stake in terms of election security.

The issue of foreign nationals meddling in elections can be resolved more simply by passing my bill, the Honest Elections Act. My bill does not have to empower the FEC, an already—I have said, and I hope my colleagues agree—pretty dysfunctional agency.

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 success story we have 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 Democrat majority, they 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 gen-

tlewoman 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 exemption 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 of foreign government 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 lobbyists of foreign governments 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

existing law to identify loopholes in FARA, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and then recommend the right legislative fixes.

The SHIELD Act does a great deal to meet the threat of foreign influence and interference with robust legislative responses. This amendment will help us continue that work and get us closer to a solution to an outstanding vulnerability in our system.

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, although I am supportive of 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 just want to say to my colleague from the great State of Michigan, thank you.

Finally—finally—we have a study that is not too wonky, a perfect amount of wonkiness, that is going to go through an agency that is going to give us an unbiased review: the GAO.

Thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you. Pass this amendment.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I am just shocked because I have them running, jumping up and down over there.

I continue to think that the gentleman from Illinois doesn't understand that when he calls our bills wonky and our amendments wonky, we are deeply proud of that over here. I am thrilled that he is supportive.

There actually is a bipartisan agreement on the need to reform FARA, as reflected, I think, by Senator GRASSLEY's bipartisan bill, very similar language.

I am thrilled. I thank the gentleman for his support and for jumping up and down, giving us a little energy.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. SHERRILL. 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 41, line 1, strike "60" and insert "90".
Page 42, line 11, strike "60" and insert "90".

Page 45, line 20, strike "60" and insert "90".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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 in the lead-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 used social media to mislead 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 our 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 spirited debate, 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 to ensure that 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.

Expanding 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 can occur up to 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 according to this section if this bill were passed?

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 here 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 gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. 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 straightforward, commonsense amendment which would specifically examine how 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 during our recent elections. This amendment would also call for recommendations to address these concerns in future elections.

Republicans and Democrats agree that foreign adversaries should never be allowed to sow discord in our political system and interfere with our electoral process. Unfortunately, in the last two elections, we saw massive misinformation campaigns launched by hostile foreign powers, and we know—we know—those efforts disproportionately targeted African American communities.

Last May, the House Judiciary Committee released a trove of over 3,500 Facebook ads posted by Russia-linked accounts between 2014 and 2017. In 2015, for instance, Kremlin-backed accounts tweeted and retweeted dozens of messages manipulating the tragic mass shooting at the predominantly African American Mother Emanuel AME Church in downtown Charleston. Ads

like this reached over 11.4 million people.

Russia has sought to influence our democratic process by stoking racial, religious, and political differences, and this has had real consequences. African American turnout declined in 2016 for the Presidential election for the first time in 20 years, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, falling to less than 60 percent, from a record high of 66.6 percent in 2012.

Election security is not a partisan issue; it is essential to our democracy; and Americans deserve to have the confidence of knowing the information they seek hasn't been manipulated by foreign adversaries.

Our next elections are quickly approaching, so the time to show the world that we stand united on election security is now. I ask all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to support this amendment to protect against foreign interference in America's elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not necessarily opposed.

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 have had the opportunity to travel the country with my friend and colleague Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE on the subject of the Voting Rights Act.

We have heard testimony that minority turnout across the board was higher than ever: Hispanic and Asian communities jumped 13 points above the turnout levels in 2014 when compared to the 2018 election cycle; this last midterm, in 2018, African American turnout jumped 11 points.

I hope this trend continues, and I hope we see increased minority turnout in our upcoming elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, in closing, I urge both Democrats and Republicans to support this commonsense amendment to prevent malicious misinformation and propaganda campaigns from targeting African American and other minority communities.

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. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

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 influencing military and veteran 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.

□ 1715

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, today I rise 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 foreign governments from sponsoring influenced campaigns designed to affect the outcome of a Federal election.

But since we know that foreign adversaries 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 my colleague, 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 “a 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 acting as the agent of a 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 continues to grow. 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, they 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 on social media 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 corruption. It unmasks 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 require the online platform to identify the foreign principal involved. That principal could be a foreign government, a foreign political party or a nonstate actor.

Fundamentally, my amendment to the SHIELD Act would put the power back in the hands of the American people. It would help address a critical underlying question, who is in charge of deciding American elections? Is it those abroad, working to divide and influence the American people? Or is it the American people themselves?

By requiring online records of purchase requests that include public information on the foreign principal behind these advertisements, the American people will be able to see clearly who is attempting to influence their decisions.

As Congress acts today to restore the trust of those we serve in our system of government, my amendment 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 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 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 nonpartisan 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 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 gentlewoman's willingness to want to help fix a bill where the underlying bill is one that we 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 let the DOJ have the resources and the ability to do their job. The SHIELD Act is not allowing that to happen. The Honest Elections Act, my bill, will allow that to happen. I would urge everybody to take a look at that.

Madam Chair, I reserve 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 gen-

tlewoman 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 116-253 offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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—ayes 180, noes 231, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—180

Abraham	Gosar	Nunes
Aderholt	Granger	Olson
Allen	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Pence
Babin	Green (TN)	Perry
Bacon	Griffith	Posey
Baird	Guest	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Guthrie	Reed
Banks	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Barr	Harris	Riggleman
Bergman	Hartzler	Roby
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Buchanan	Hudson	Roy
Buck	Huizenga	Rutherford
Bucshon	Hunter	Scalise
Budd	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Burchett	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Calvert	Jordan	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Katko	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cheney	King (IA)	Spano
Cline	King (NY)	Stauber
Cloud	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Comer	LaHood	Stewart
Conaway	LaMalfa	Taylor
Cook	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crawford	Latta	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lesko	Turner
Curtis	Long	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Loudermilk	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Walberg
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Walker
Duncan	Marshall	Walorski
Dunn	Massie	Waltz
Emmer	Mast	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Flores	McClintock	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McHenry	Westerman
Fox (NC)	McKinley	Williams
Fulcher	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Miller	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gibbs	Mullin	Wright
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Young
Gooden	Norman	Zeldin

NOES—231

Adams	Allred	Barragán
Aguilar	Axne	Bass

Beatty	Grijalva	Pappas
Bera	Haaland	Pascarell
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hayes	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Phillips
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Hill (CA)	Plaskett
F.	Himes	Pocan
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Pressley
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Raskin
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Case	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan
Ciçilline	Khanna	Sablan
Cisneros	Kildee	San Nicolas
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Cohen	Lamb	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lawrence	Scott, David
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Craig	Lee (NV)	Shalala
Crist	Levin (CA)	Sherman
Crow	Levin (MI)	Sherrill
Cuellar	Lewis	Sires
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Slotkin
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Soto
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Spanberger
Dean	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowe y	Stanton
DeGette	Lujan	Stevens
DeLauro	Lynch	Suo zzi
DeBene	Malinowski	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Deutch	Matsui	Tlaib
Dingell	McAdams	Tonko
Doggett	McBath	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Torres Small
F.	McGovern	(NM)
Engel	McNerney	Trahan
Escobar	Meeke s	Trone
Espallat	Meng	Underwood
Evans	Moore	Van Drew
Finkenauer	Morelle	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Veasey
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Vela
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Frankel	Nadler	Visclosky
Fudge	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gallo	Neal	Schultz
Garamendi	Neguse	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Norton	Welch
Golden	O'Halleran	Wexton
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Gonzalez (TX)	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Gottheimer	Pallone	Yarmuth
Green, Al (TX)	Panetta	

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei	Grothman	Peters
Armstrong	Joyce (PA)	Radewagen
Bilirakis	Keller	Reschenthaler
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Eshoo	Kind	Steil
Estes	Luria	Stivers
Gabbard	McEachin	Takano
González-Colón	Meuser	Thompson (PA)
(PR)	Mitchell	Timmons

□ 1759

Messrs. RUSH, VAN DREW, Ms. WILD, and Mr. LOWENTHAL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 650, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, 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. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read 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. Prohibition on contributions 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 collection and 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 DEPORTABILITY 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 AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—Section 1(c)(1) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of clause (iii);

(2) by striking “and” at the end of clause (iv) and inserting “or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) engages outside the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal which are directed at persons within the United States, including activities consisting of communications disseminated within the United States through telecommunications or computer equipment or services, the Internet, broadcast, cable, satellite, print, or mail; and”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 619) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and shall be applicable outside the United States to the extent described in section 1(c)(1)(v).”.

SEC. 102. APPLICATION OF PRESS EXEMPTION TO OTHER FORMS OF MEDIA FOR PURPOSES OF ENGAGEMENT IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 1(d) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(d)” and insert “(d)(1)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) In addition to the exception described in paragraph (1), to the extent that a person engages with the United States in political activities, the term ‘agent of a foreign principal’ does not include any bona fide media outlet organized under the laws of 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 3685 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 acceptance 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 80 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. 103. TREATMENT OF ACTIVITIES TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC OPINION ON ELECTIONS AS POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

Section 1(o) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(o)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “, or with reference to public opinion about public officials, candidates, or elections of the United States.”.

SEC. 104. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to activities carried out on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS.

(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:

“(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 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 reading, 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 communication 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 this subparagraph is, with respect to a communication, any clear and conspicuous visible or audible element of the communication that gives notice to the individual reading, observing, or listening to the 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 which is 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 communications made after the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—REDUCING ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN ELECTIONS

SEC. 301. REPORT ON ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(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. REPORT ON PRESENCE OF ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY.

“(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each Federal election cycle, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(1) an analysis of the presence of illicit foreign money in such cycle; and

“(2) recommendations to address the presence of illicit foreign money in elections, as appropriate.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

“(1) The term ‘Federal election cycle’ means the period which begins on the day after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and which ends on the date of the first regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held after such date.

“(2) The term ‘illicit foreign money’ means any disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 319(b)) prohibited under such section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the Federal election cycle that began during November 2018, and each succeeding Federal election cycle.

SEC. 302. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52

U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) 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 2020 or 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.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES

“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 has in effect a law that prohibits an individual from the knowing collection and transmission of a ballot in an election for Federal office that was mailed to another person, other than an individual described as follows:

“(1) An election official while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(2) An employee of the United States Postal Service while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(3) Any other individual who is allowed by law to collect and transmit United States mail, while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(4) A family member, household member, or caregiver of the person to whom the ballot was mailed.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, with respect to a person to whom the ballot was mailed:

“(1) The term ‘caregiver’ means an individual who provides medical or health care assistance to such person in a residence, nursing care institution, hospice facility, assisted living center, assisted living facility, assisted living home, residential care institution, adult day health care facility, or adult foster care home.

“(2) The term ‘family member’ means an individual who is related to such person by blood, marriage, adoption or legal guardianship.

“(3) The term ‘household member’ means an individual who resides at the same residence as such person.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 296 the following new item:

“PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES

“Sec. 297. Eligibility for payments of States allowing collection and 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.

(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 8—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

“SEC. 298. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS OF STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS.

“A State is not eligible to receive funds under this Act if 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 8—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

“Sec. 298. Eligibility for payments of States allowing voting by non-citizens.”.

TITLE VI—INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE

SEC. 601. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.

(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 engaged, or at any time after admission engages 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 election processes or institutions, or influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or caucus, including—

“(i) the campaign of a candidate; or

“(ii) a ballot measure, including an amendment, a bond issue, an initiative, a recall, a referral, or a referendum.”.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit, a proposal that would actually assist law enforcement in pursuing those individuals who seek to disrupt our elections, as opposed to the partisan bill we have been debating here today.

I first want to address some of the accusations made here today about how my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle do not care about election security or how we are the only thing standing in the way of securing elections. This is simply not true.

In the 115th Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress appropriated over \$400 million to the States and to DHS prior to the 2018 midterms to bolster election security, allowing for unprecedented cooperation between DHS and all 50 States and 1,400 localities. Earlier this year, \$33 million was appropriated to DHS to continue these assistance efforts.

I also introduced a bill during the debate of the SAFE Act that will provide even more funding for DHS to combat nefarious activity. But last week, I introduced, along with many of my colleagues, the Honest Elections Act, which the entire basis for this motion to recommit is based upon. So don't tell me that we on this side of the aisle are standing in the way.

According to the report recently released by the Senate Intelligence Committee, out of the \$1.4 billion spent on digital political ads in the 2016 election cycle, Russia spent \$100,000 over 2 years on Facebook ads. The majority of those were not election ads, so they wouldn't necessarily be regulated by the Honest Ads Act portion of SHIELD and will not address the real threat that we saw in 2016.

My motion today strengthens and reforms the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA, to combat election interference. It modernizes online political ad disclosure. It increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in elections. It incentivizes States to prohibit the practice of ballot harvesting and encourages States to stop this recent trend of noncitizen voting.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit because I was given some advice by our colleague from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) before I came up here. He said: "The more you talk, the fewer votes this MTR will get."

So, let's make sure everyone goes back to their districts. But first, vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect our elections from interference from foreign countries like Russia, China, and all others. Vote to hunt down those who are attempting to interfere in our elections. And vote, finally, to restore the American people's trust in our institutions.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that this motion to recommit should be opposed. It is so much weaker than the bill that we have an opportunity to pass to get foreign interference out of our elections so that millions of Americans are not exposed unwittingly to ads by Russian trolls.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this blatant attempt to help foreign agents subvert our democracy.

Madam Speaker, we stand at the crossroads of history. Foreign enemies have attacked our elections in a sweeping and systematic fashion, and they are continuing to do so.

We are faced today with a very simple question: Should Iran, Russia, and China be allowed to interfere in our elections? Should they have more of a say in who gets elected than our constituents?

Let me tell you my answer. Our soldiers did not fight our enemies overseas just to watch them try to corrupt our democracy here at home. I am not sure when that became a controversial position, but it is a damn shame that it has.

Protecting America should not be a one-party issue. It should be what unites us, not a cause for petty games.

But once again, the minority party has decided it is more important to practice the kind of politics that put them in the minority in the first place. They have decided, yet again, to play another political stunt, just like they played this morning in the SCIF. It is the same exact thing.

That is your choice. My choice is to stand up to say American elections are for Americans only.

The SHIELD Act puts forward critical reforms to improve our defenses against foreign influence and interference. The bill strengthens reporting requirements, closes loopholes, and deters illegal foreign activity in our elections.

I can understand if some of my colleagues are worried that they cannot win on a fair and level election playing field, but for all those who believe in free and fair elections, who swore an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, I urge you to reject this MTR and stand with the United States of America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 4617, if ordered; and The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 777.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 225, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—182

Abraham	Gooden	Nunes
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Allen	Gottheimer	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (LA)	Perry
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Posey
Baird	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Griffith	Reed
Banks	Guest	Rice (SC)
Barr	Guthrie	Riggleman
Bergman	Hagedorn	Roby
Biggs	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brindisi	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roy
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Buck	Hudson	Scalise
Bucshon	Huizenga	Schweikert
Budd	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Katko	Spano
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Staubert
Cline	King (IA)	Stefanik
Cloud	King (NY)	Stewart
Cole	Kinzinger	Taylor
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Thornberry
Conaway	LaHood	Tipton
Cook	LaMalfa	Turner
Crawford	Lamborn	Upton
Crenshaw	Latta	Van Drew
Curtis	Lesko	Wagner
Davidson (OH)	Long	Walberg
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Walden
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walker
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Duncan	Marchant	Waltz
Dunn	Marshall	Watkins
Emmer	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Mast	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McCaul	Westerman
Flores	McClintock	Williams
Fortenberry	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Fox (NC)	McKinley	Wittman
Fulcher	Meadows	Womack
Gaetz	Miller	Woodall
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Wright
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gibbs	Mullin	Young
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	Zeldin
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	

NOES—225

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Case
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Casten (IL)
Axne	F.	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Cisneros
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)

Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree

Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suo zzi
Swailwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Amodei
Armstrong
Bilirakis
Collins (GA)
Estes
Gabbard
Grothman
Joyce (PA)

Keller
Kelly (PA)
Kind
McEachin
Meuser
Mitchell
Newhouse
Peters

Resenthaler
Smucker
Steube
Stivers
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1816

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—227

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suo zzi
Swailwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Phillips
Pingree
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)

NOES—181

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen

Amash
Arrington
Babin

Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)

Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

NOT VOTING—23

Amodei
Armstrong
Bilirakis
Collins (GA)
Estes
Gabbard
Grothman
Joyce (PA)

Keller
Kelly (PA)
Kind
McEachin
Meuser
Mitchell
Peters
Resenthaler

Smucker
Steil
Steube
Stivers
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1824

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. 584]

YEAS—402

Abraham	Curtis	Horn, Kendra S.
Adams	Davidson (OH)	Horsford
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Houlihan
Aguilar	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Allred	Dean	Huffman
Arrington	DeFazio	Huizenga
Axne	DeGette	Hunter
Babin	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Bacon	DelBene	Johnson Lee
Baird	Delgado	Jayapal
Balderson	Demings	Jeffries
Banks	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Barr	DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)
Barragán	Deutch	Johnson (OH)
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)
Bera	Dingell	Johnson (TX)
Bergman	Doggett	Jordan
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Joyce (OH)
Biggs	F.	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Duncan	Katko
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Keating
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Engel	Kelly (MS)
Blunt Rochester	Escobar	Kennedy
Bonamici	Eshoo	Khanna
Bost	Española	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	Kilmer
F.	Ferguson	Kim
Brady	Finkenauer	King (IA)
Brindisi	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Kinzing
Brooks (IN)	Fletcher	Kirkpatrick
Brown (MD)	Flores	Krishnamoorthi
Brownley (CA)	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Buchanan	Foster	Kustoff (TN)
Buck	Fox (NC)	LaHood
Bucshon	Frankel	LaMalfa
Budd	Fudge	Lamb
Burchett	Fulcher	Lamborn
Burgess	Gaetz	Langevin
Bustos	Gallagher	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Byrne	Garamendi	Latta
Calvert	Garcia (IL)	Lawrence
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Lawson (FL)
Cárdenas	Gianforte	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Gibbs	Lee (NV)
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Golden	Levin (CA)
Cartwright	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Case	Gonzalez (OH)	Lewis
Casten (IL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lieu, Ted
Castor (FL)	Gooden	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gosar	Loeb
Chabot	Gottheimer	Loeb
Cheney	Granger	Long
Chu, Judy	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Cicilline	Graves (LA)	Lowenthal
Cisneros	Graves (MO)	Lowey
Clark (MA)	Green (TN)	Lucas
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Clay	Griffith	Lujan
Cline	Grijalva	Luria
Cloud	Guest	Lynch
Clyburn	Guthrie	Malinowski
Cohen	Haaland	Maloney
Cole	Hagedorn	Carolyn B.
Comer	Harder (CA)	Maloney, Sean
Conaway	Harris	Marchant
Connolly	Hartzler	Marshall
Cook	Hastings	Massie
Cooper	Hayes	Mast
Correa	Heck	Matsui
Costa	Hern, Kevin	McAdams
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	McBath
Cox (CA)	Hice (GA)	McCarthy
Craig	Higgins (LA)	McCaul
Crawford	Higgins (NY)	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hill (AR)	McCollum
Crist	Hill (CA)	McGovern
Crow	Himes	McHenry
Cuellar	Holding	McKinley
Cunningham	Hollingsworth	McNerney

Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Meeks	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Meng	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Miller	Rose (NY)	Thornberry
Moolenaar	Rose, John W.	Tipton
Mooney (WV)	Rouda	Titus
Moore	Rouzer	Tlaib
Morelle	Roy	Tonko
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Torres (CA)
Mucarsel-Powell	Ruiz	Torres Small
Mullin	Ruppersberger	(NM)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Trahan
Murphy (NC)	Rutherford	Trone
Nadler	Ryan	Turner
Napolitano	Sánchez	Underwood
Neal	Sarbanes	Upton
Neguse	Scalise	Van Drew
Newhouse	Scanlon	Vargas
Norcross	Schakowsky	Veasey
Nunes	Schiff	Vela
O'Halleran	Schneider	Velázquez
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrader	Visclosky
Olson	Schrier	Wagner
Omar	Schweikert	Walberg
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Walden
Pallone	Scott, Austin	Walker
Palmer	Scott, David	Walorski
Panetta	Sensenbrenner	Waltz
Pappas	Serrano	Wasserman
Pascarella	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Payne	Shalala	Waters
Pence	Sherman	Watkins
Perlmutter	Sherrill	Watson Coleman
Perry	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Peterson	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Phillips	Sires	Welch
Pingree	Slotkin	Wenstrup
Pocan	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Porter	Smith (NE)	Wexton
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Wild
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Williams
Price (NC)	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Quigley	Spanberger	Wilson (SC)
Ratcliffe	Spano	Wittman
Reed	Speier	Womack
Rice (NY)	Stanton	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Staubert	Wright
Richmond	Stefanik	Yarmuth
Riggleman	Stevens	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young
Rodgers (WA)	Suozzi	Zeldin
Roe, David P.	Swalwell (CA)	

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler
Armstrong	Keller	Smucker
Bass	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Bilirakis	Kind	Steube
Cleaver	McEachin	Stivers
Collins (GA)	Meuser	Takano
Dauids (KS)	Mitchell	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Norman	Timmons
Gabbard	Peters	
Grothman	Raskin	

□ 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. 568 (H. Res. 630 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 569 (H.R. 4406 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 570 (H.R. 4407 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 577 (H.R. 2513 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 578 (H.R. 2426 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 583 (H.R. 4617 final passage); and “yea” on rollcall No. 584 (H.R. 777 final passage).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, please accept the following vote recommendations in my absence as I represent the United States at the formal ascension of the Emperor in

Japan. 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.

MOMENT 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 rise for a moment of silence.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 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. 2181, 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 public lands.

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 a 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 are 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 had been violations of law, whether the President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. And when those hearings are concluded, obviously, they will make some deter-

mination 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 fairness. And I know we talked 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, of course, when 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, where you had a divided government. You had a Democrat House and a Republican President.

And then, for the Clinton impeachment, you had a Republican House and a Democrat President. They used the same set of rules. Both sides got to call witnesses, both sides got to subpoena. The President's legal counsel actually got to be in the room and, maybe most importantly, the public got to be in the room.

Members of Congress, even if they weren't on the relevant committees, were allowed to watch these hearings. That is not going on today. These hearings are going on in secret in a secret room.

A number of my colleagues and I went down to see what was going on, to see the hearings and the proceedings. It turned out, what we found out in the SCIF, which is designed for classified briefings, it wasn't a classified briefing. The chairman, himself, acknowledged that it was not a classified briefing. In fact, it included a Department of Defense official. And members of the Committee on Armed Services asked if they would be able to participate in that hearing, and they were denied the ability.

And so when the press can't see what's going on, when the public can't see what's going on, when Members of Congress try to see what is going on, and the chairman takes the witness and runs out of the room, it begs the question, "What are they trying to hide?"

What kind of tainted document are they creating, if it is an impeachment inquiry?

And if it is not, then stop trying to use two different sets of rules. But if it is—and the Speaker, herself, is the one who said it is an impeachment inquiry—at a minimum, use the same standards that have always been used for that serious of a process. The House of Representatives has a constitutional ability to ultimately make this kind of decision.

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 person decided, 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.

And 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.

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, or that they are secret hearings, or that Republicans can't participate, no matter how many times he says that, it will not be true.

□ 1845

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. There are 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 paper because somebody on the majority staff is, against the direction of the chairman, selectively leaking information to the press.

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 because they 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 hearings, 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 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 the majority staff. It should be something every Member of Congress who is going to be asked to vote on this actually can find something out about.

We can't go and read the transcripts. Seventy-five percent of us can't. Yet, that is the process that is going on right now.

If you want to call that fair, maybe it is fair to you, but is it really the justice that we look for across the street at the Supreme Court?

Imagine if only one side—the accused couldn't present witnesses. You could accuse anybody of anything. And you have that ability, as you are doing right now, and then you tie the hands behind the back of those you are accusing because they can't even be in the room.

The other side can't even bring witnesses forward. There are witnesses that our Members would like to bring forward who were in that room, yet they are not even allowed that opportunity. That is not fair. Maybe in the Soviet Union that is fair, but not in the United States of America.

It is not how you should be running an impeachment operation to try to take out a President of the United States when we have an election next year. Let the people of this country make that decision, not one person sitting in a secret room downstairs, keeping other people out. When Members of Congress who are trying to find out what is going on walk in the room, he runs out of the room with the witness.

Is that really the fair process that this country deserves? It falls well short. We can absolutely do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the whip did not answer my question. I said, is the President above the law?

But he wants to pound on the table, Mr. Speaker, because neither the facts nor the law is on his side.

The process is consistent with the rules put in place by the current Secretary of State, 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 an ally 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. Mr. Speaker, 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 never answered why he wouldn't, 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 buying more, but they were already allowed to buy what they needed to defend themselves, and I am glad they were. It helped a friend.

But 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 newspapers, the front page of The Washington Times: Democrats writing more subpoenas than laws. Impeachment inquiries sideline 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: Pass a comprehensive background check to make their 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 whip.

So, 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 poster, but 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 ensure that there is not 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 Zelensky, 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 interference 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 he brings up 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 with Erdogan led to another headline on that same page: Russia and Turkey reach deal on Syria. America in retreat. America no longer a factor in trying to bring peace.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I asked a question. Is the President above the law?

I asked another question: Is it right to keep the \$391 million that we appropriated because we thought Ukraine was at great risk? And again, the question wasn't answered. It was answered with a question and with an assertion that the President had the authority to make sure that there wasn't corruption in Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned whether there is corruption in the United States of America. That concerns us, and that is why these hearings are proceeding, consistent with our constitutional duty.

And all the Republicans can do is—not defend the actions, because they are indefensible. All they can do is talk about process.

One thousand subpoenas issued by Dan Burton when he was the Republican chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. One hundred subpoenas, unilaterally, under the Gowdy rule, under the Pompeo rule, under the Republican rules, unilaterally.

Trey Gowdy, himself, as chairman of the Benghazi Select Committee, three dozen subpoenas, without any input, under the Gowdy-Pompeo rules.

So I ask the gentleman, do you think it is consistent with our Constitution that the President of the United States suggest to a foreign leader that they become involved in our elections?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is not a question. It is a false assertion that the gentleman is making. And so you can make claims about people, but ultimately, if it is not backed up in fact, you just continue on.

This has been the pattern of this majority, really, since before you took the

majority. It has been an assertion to impeach the President, finding something; if there is nothing there, just keep looking.

You had the Mueller investigation; 2,800 subpoenas, 22 months meandering around, looking for something, hoping; and we saw the chairman of the Intelligence Committee said publicly, time and time again, for 2 years, that he, himself, had more than circumstantial evidence of criminal acts. It turned out there were none.

The chairman never showed the evidence that he had. Maybe he went and had a meeting with Mueller and Mueller discarded it. But if he really did have more than circumstantial evidence, he would have brought it forward. He would have shown all of us, but he didn't. He made the assertion, but it was a false assertion.

And if it wasn't false, by the way, I would challenge the gentleman to bring it forward. He ought to have that duty to bring it forward.

Mr. HOYER. We are in that process.

Mr. SCALISE. No, no. We are talking about the Mueller investigation, but it didn't happen. So the collusion argument that was supposedly going 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 impeachment 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 complaint, 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, hears what they want to hear, writes a memo saying it was crazy; it was disturbing. Those were the words that the whistleblower wrote about the phone conversation.

Lo and behold, 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 the 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 congratulating the other on his election. One talking about how he got elected on a platform of rooting out corruption, which he is doing, and we are

helping them with. That was the conversation.

So now the whistleblower isn't even going to be brought forward, according to the chairman, because the chairman is the only person who gets to bring witnesses forward.

Then the gentleman talked about Trey Gowdy's committee, the Benghazi Select Committee. He tries to use that as the reference point for holding an impeachment inquiry.

Let's all be clear: Trey Gowdy's committee on Benghazi was a special select committee to find out what happened.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

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 always 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 eighth 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.

Why? As the minority leader said, on television, well, no, we got something out of it. We got some dirt on Hillary Clinton.

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 employee, do not provide for 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 our 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 we run 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 designed 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 the 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, that Biden stopped the prosecutor, and a lot of people want to find out about that. So whatever you can do with the Attorney General—he wants his lawyer. It should be the Justice Department's lawyer, but Mr. BARR to participate. And, of course, he wanted Mr. Giuliani to participate as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude, we are going down this rat hole too long. We are going to have hearings. We are going to find out the truth, and we are finding out the truth every day, and every day our Republican colleagues get more nervous.

Every day there is some Republican who says: I don't know how long I can defend President Trump. Every day that is happening now, because the facts are coming out.

When you don't have the facts, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, you attack the process. Republicans know the facts aren't on their side. They can't answer the fundamental question: Is it acceptable for a President to seek foreign interference in elections?

They will say: Oh, there is no proof of that. And the problem they have is almost every day there is proof of that, not hearsay.

Yes, the whistleblower did the right thing. The whistleblower heard something that he felt was dangerous to our national security, to our men and women in uniform, and to the democracy that we hold so dear, and so he said something. You have seen the signs: You see something, say something. He heard this.

One could say, well, he didn't hear it, but then the President admitted it. Then the Chief of Staff, Acting Chief of Staff, Mr. Mulvaney, said, yes, that is what we did. And he instructed, don't get that money to the Ukrainians.

Those are facts. We know those are facts.

So I tell my friend, we really ought to conclude this. We believe we are following the law. If you don't feel we are following the law, go to court, just as we had to go to court with the President refusing to cooperate with the Congress of the United States in its constitutional duty.

□ 1915

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 openness. 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, and Republicans criticized him.

And, Mr. Speaker, 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 to confront terrorists. 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.

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 forward 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 to 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 get one side of 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 grand jury 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, go get a jury.

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 you don't 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.

And Members of both sides, 75 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.

Is 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 thank 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 get 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 this Trey Gowdy allowed this 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 give one story and then parrot the other story that was said.

And Ambassador Sondland, of course. I don't know that he was our friend. He

was the President's friend, big contributor, special envoy to the European Union, but apparently doing part-time work in Ukraine along with Mr. Giuliani.

The facts are going to come out, Mr. Speaker. And they are going to try to say, oh, the process. You are going to have public hearings, Mr. SCHIFF has said so. He said so in his letter.

And you are going to have to answer the question: Do I believe that the conduct that has been pursued by the President of the United States, if he were a Democrat, would I believe that was right? That is the question you're going to have to answer. It is going to be a tough question for your side because the facts almost every day are mounting up.

So I want to urge my friend, let's conclude this discussion, because I am not going to agree with you, and you are not going to agree with me.

But ultimately the American people—and those 236 million people you talk about, there is not going to be any indictment, there is not going to be any impeachment, unless 218 of us in this body vote. And we are all going to vote. It is not going to be any Star Chamber. Everybody is going to have to vote.

And then they are going to have to answer to their constituents, did I vote my conscience, or did I vote my politics?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the gentleman is asserting that we will have a vote on impeachment, that might be breaking news, but if these Members, all of us, are going to vote on impeachment, shouldn't we be able to see what goes on? Shouldn't we be able to have access to the hearings? Shouldn't we be able to have access to the transcripts? Can we now?

I would ask the gentleman, would he release the transcripts now of these hearings so that Members can start preparing? So Members can know what they are going to vote on?

Are you going to keep it in secret and then drop something on the floor after it has been baked and predetermined what the outcome should be before Members really have an idea of what is going on in those rooms that are being denied entrance to those rooms right now? It has never happened before in other impeachment inquiries.

And you can say it is about process. It is about history.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't say that.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HOYER mocked that the process is tainted, that the process is being run like it might be run in the Soviet Union, not in the United States of America. It has never been done like that before.

And you talk about Trey Gowdy, as if we were looking around for something to impeach a President on. We weren't.

You had four Americans die. There are a lot of questions that still haven't

been answered about why those Americans died.

And all of us should be concerned about what happened at Benghazi. To ridicule the fact that there were eight hearings on something so alarming? Nobody was fishing around, looking—

By the way, we never tried to impeach the President over anything. All of 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 own 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. Again, 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, interestingly, 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.

□ 1930

And if that is what the document is going to ultimately yield, it will be a tainted document. But I guess if you

want to find an outcome—this isn't a grand jury. This is the United States House of Representatives, and there are 75 percent in this body who are going to be asked to vote on something that they cannot see, they cannot participate in, they have absolutely no access to. That is not what this country is all about.

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 my 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 Korean war, 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 an impeachment inquiry in a secret room based on assertions of a phantom whistleblower.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TOM C. "IKE" MORRIS

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a constituent of the 21st Congressional District of Texas. This man was a hero, veteran, and the oldest known graduate of Texas A&M University, the alma mater of my bride. His name was Colonel Tom C. "Ike" Morris.

Colonel Morris passed away Sunday in San Antonio at the age of 109 years old, leaving behind a life and legacy all of us can only aspire to someday.

Colonel Morris is the epitome of what the Greatest Generation embodied. He worked five jobs to stay in school during the Depression and graduated from Texas A&M with a bachelor's degree in agriculture.

Working his way through school didn't stop him from being an engaged member of the Aggie community. He was senior class president, chaired the committee that set the first requirements for seniors to earn the famous Aggie Ring, and was a member of the track and field team.

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, we thank you for your service and for leading a life worthy of example. May you rest in peace now. God bless you, sir.

HONORING THE 36TH 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, Leb-

anon, 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 10 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 GALLEGOS, 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), my fellow 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 incident 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 the 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 servicemembers who paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend and protect the United States of America.

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. They 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 peace-keeping mission when Lebanon was facing a violent civil war.

In a single moment, 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers lost their lives, and 128 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 what would be the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the battle of Iwo Jima, seven of the 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 grieve. And of the roughly 50 years of birthday balls that I have attended, that one was heavy with grief. We had lost our brothers through a heinous 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 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 Corpsman 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. MCCAUL. 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 that day and it reads, "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. Of 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 Mount Cabuganan, 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 the inside out. A grenade 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 Felt 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 war never left him. Nola says she would often rescue him from his frequent nightmares, and all he could say through his tears was, "It's either kill or be killed." His children only knew that he was in the thick of the war, that he had come home wounded, and that those days in the Philippines still haunted him.

In recent years, Leon's family began looking into his service record. Having read his journal, his daughter, Lydean, began searching for what he did that day that would have rated a recommendation for the Silver Star. They had ordered copies of his medals, but there was no mention of a Silver Star

in them. He had received the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, among other decorations.

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. The Archives could find 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 Cabuganan, 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, their rifle pits 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 from the left platoon, the intensity of 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.

□ 2000

"Despite his wound and the warning shouts of his comrades, he continued to push his attack, and reaching the foxhole, killed its two occupants. Unable to advance farther because of his wounds, he from his advanced position directed the attack of his platoon upon

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 "snafu" to describe the military bureaucracy. It is an acronym that, roughly translated, means, "Situation Normal—All Fouled 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 this long-overdue presentation about 3 weeks ago on October 5. This was the Saturday before his 98th birthday. They gathered from across the country. They decorated the house and made a cake.

I have never been more honored or more moved than to have been asked to fulfill that long-overdue presentation that General MacArthur had ordered so long ago.

On my way to meet this gentle giant, as his family called him, I received word that Leon Felt had passed away in the early hours of that morning, surrounded by his loving family. But they were still gathered at the house, in grief now as well as pride, and so I made the presentation posthumously to his widow, an extraordinary woman in her own right.

There is some consolation in this story. As his health began slipping in the days before he died, his family told him that he had been awarded the Nation's second-highest military honor and that he was about to receive it at 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 "remember, with advantage, what feats he did that day." He should have been feasted and feted, and thanked every day of his life, as this honor spoke of his courageous deeds.

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 unrequited 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. MCCLINTOCK. 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.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 4 AND SEPT. 8, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	9/5	9/8	France		2,418.00		(³)				2,418.00
Wyndee Parker	9/5	9/8	France		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Terri McCullough	9/5	9/8	France		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Kate Knudson	9/5	9/8	France		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Dr. Brian Monahan	9/5	9/8	France		1,526.00		(³)				2,560.50
Committee total					8,522.00		3,103.50				11,625.50

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Oct. 7, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JERROLD NADLER, Oct. 15, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Amata Radewagen	6/28	6/30	Switzerland		1,151.03			493.74			1,644.77
	6/30	7/4	Israel		2,106.00			967.46			3,073.46
	7/4	7/6	Qatar		769.05			206.65			975.70
	7/6	7/7	Cyprus		585.11			591.01			1,176.12
	7/7	7/7	Greece		257.00			39.20			296.20
Sarah Lim	8/15	8/29	Switzerland		4,332.91		2,462.13				6,795.04
Kenneth Degenfelder	7/26	7/31	Micronesia		328.00		2,750.09				3,078.09
Brian Modeste	7/26	7/31	Micronesia		328.00		2,450.09				2,778.09
Committee total					9,857.10		7,662.31		2,298.06		19,817.47

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, Oct. 11, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Oct. 8, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Oct. 8, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN APRIL 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL, Oct. 3, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL, Oct. 3, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2735. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Bylaws (RIN: 3313-AE86) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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: 3133-AE91) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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.: S7-14-18] (RIN: 3235-AM10) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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. 868); 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 Ceramics Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0290; FRL-10001-21-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT25) received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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-2019-0438; 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. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2741. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Philadelphia County Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0082; FRL-10001-46-Region 3] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 Revi-

sions to Implement the Revocation of the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Final Rule [EPA-R03-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. 868); 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, Ohio-West Virginia 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0044; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0699; 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. 868); 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 CRB 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. 868); 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.: 190925-0044] (RIN: 0694-AH68) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Hook-and-Line Catcher/Processors in the Central

Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG869) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2747. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG591) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2748. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XF292) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2749. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XY039) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2750. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico, Fort Myers Beach, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0602] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2751. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0571] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2752. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Manasquan Inlet, Manasquan, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0799] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2753. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Voluntary State Tax Withholding From Retired Pay [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0012] (RIN:0790-AK19) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Ways and Means.

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. STIVERS):

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 amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H.R. 4803. A bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, 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 trophies into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for interest on certain small business loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

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. PINGREE (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 provide for 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 Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CORREA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. Rouda, Ms. PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. POSTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ESPAILLART):

H.R. 4809. 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 the Office 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 DREW, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4810. A bill to facilitate responsible, informed dispensing of controlled substances and other prescribed medications, 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. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the modification, transfer, and termination of a registration to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances or list I chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 4813. A bill to prohibit large platform utilities from being a financial institution 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. MATSUI (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 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. AGUILAR:

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.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to modify provisions relating to whistleblower incentives and protection, and for other purposes; 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. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CROW, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MAST, Mr. CASE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAMB, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. 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 Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 4818. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and 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. BUCHANAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARCIA 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, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASE, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 4821. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of Cali-

fornia, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4822. 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 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. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BARRAGÁN, 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 address 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. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4824. A bill to reauthorize 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. KEVIN 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 judge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 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 amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, and Mrs. DINGELL):

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 pur-

poses; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the 50 percent limitation on the deduction for meal expenses 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. KATKO):

H.R. 4832. 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 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. GOTTHEIMER (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 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 Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Ms. 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 Labor.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. 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 history of wine in countries outside of 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. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 4838. 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. 4839. 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. LESKO, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 4840. 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. HAGEDORN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. OLSON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 4842. 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, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4843. A bill to authorize the Susan Harwood Training Grant Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4844. A bill to remove the authorized purpose of maintaining water supply for agricultural uses for the project for Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the National Lighthouse Center and Museum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide priority for the senior community service employment program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4847. A bill to establish a United States Global Health Commission and a United States Global Health Attaché Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Armed Services, for a period to

be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for educational assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4850. A bill to provide for certain additional requirements with respect to patent disclosures; 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. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to carry out a State workforce incentive program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make available to veterans certain additional information about post-secondary educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to eliminate the percentage cap on funding available to carry out the program to provide support services to older caregivers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to update and improve eligibility criteria for the Social Security Disability Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BANKS:

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution expressing support for freedom of conscience; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Portland Trail Blazers on the 50th anniversary of their inaugural season; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CORREA:

H. Res. 652. A resolution honoring the city of Santa Ana's 150th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MOULTON, 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. Res. 653. 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 to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4804.

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:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4806.

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. PINGREE:

H.R. 4807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 4808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 4809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4811.

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. 4812.

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. GARCÍA 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 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 4815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 4817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, 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 1, 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 VIII, 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. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. CARTWRIGHT:

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 1, 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.

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 4826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 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 1 Section 8 Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18: The 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 Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4831.

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 Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and wit the Indian Tribes.

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 powers vested by this Constitu-

tion in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 4835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 4836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 4837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 4838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for . . . the general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 4840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the 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 any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 18

"The 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. POCAN:

H.R. 4843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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

"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 any Department or Officer thereof".

By Ms. SCANLON:
H.R. 4846.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 4847.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SIREs:
H.R. 4848.
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. SMITH of Missouri:
H.R. 4849.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 4850.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 4851.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 4852.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.
Article 1: 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.
By Mrs. TRAHAN:
H.R. 4853.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. YOHO:
H.R. 4854.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. BANKS:
H.J. Res. 78.
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, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 51: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 94: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 129: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 141: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 144: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 217: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 451: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 463: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 478: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 535: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 613: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 625: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 649: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 671: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 712: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 737: Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 777: Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 847: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 865: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 884: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 895: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 921: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 934: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 935: Mr. TRONE and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 945: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 960: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 961: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 991: Mr. BACON and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1002: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. MENG, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1007: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1025: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 1078: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1108: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 1142: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 1224: Ms. PORTER, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KIM, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1230: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1243: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1309: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1315: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1341: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 1345: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1379: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1380: Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1394: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1407: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 1446: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1497: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1498: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 1528: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 1529: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1570: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1601: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1636: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 1643: Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 1646: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1652: Mr. SOTO and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1680: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1692: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1695: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1713: Mr. COX of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1717: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1765: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1766: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TURNER, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1774: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 1777: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1794: Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1865: Mrs. ROBY and Ms. FRANKEL.
H.R. 1866: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1869: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1882: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1903: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2128: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2135: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2146: Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2147: Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2179: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2191: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2201: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2207: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 2214: Mr. KIM, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 2235: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2256: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2258: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 2279: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SMUCKER, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2282: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2311: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2349: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2411: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2415: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2420: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mrs. 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. 2478: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2487: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2521: Mr. WALDEN and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2540: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2584: Mr. KILMER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2628: 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 Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 2734: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2747: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 2767: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 2772: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2802: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MAST, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2808: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2812: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2818: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2825: Ms. WILD and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.
H.R. 2831: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 2913: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2932: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 2986: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2989: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2990: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3038: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3068: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 3073: Mr. SARBANES 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: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3103: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 3127: 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. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3182: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 3219: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 3222: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3225: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3265: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3355: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3373: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3374: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3463: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3473: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3495: 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. 3502: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3513: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3524: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3529: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3559: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3588: 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. 3787: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 3794: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3815: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3820: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3822: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3870: Mr. REED.

H.R. 3896: Mrs. 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: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4096: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4098: 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. VISCLOSKEY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4237: Mr. WALKER and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4269: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4279: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4297: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4300: Mr. KEATING.

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. ROBY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 4319: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4333: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4334: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 4348: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4374: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4386: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4397: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4399: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4482: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4487: Mr. COX of California and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4560: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4584: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4588: Mr. SOTO and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4589: Mr. STAUBER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 4615: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 4623: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4639: 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. 4678: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 4686: Mr. SIRES and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 4691: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4695: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4700: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4701: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4705: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 4724: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 4736: 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. SENSENBRENNER.

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: Ms. TITUS.

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. CUELLAR, 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. DEUTCH, 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 Ms. 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. 620: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Res. 633: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 636: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 639: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

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. 1047, 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.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2019

No. 168

Senate

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 their 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

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6051

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 track and 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 what 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 for the first time in its history.

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 is 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 publicly 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. Send a message to Americans with inconvenient views that speaking up is more trouble than it is worth.

This proposal will not do anything to stop maligned foreign actors—something that every Member of this body cares 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 diplomatic, national security, and 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 have 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 bill 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.

Since tax reform, 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, our Democratic friends still want 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 were more than compensated for 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. That cap is what 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 \$200,000 a year. That is what they are advocating. 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 \$60,000 tax cuts for wealthy people and \$10 tax cuts 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 have 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 Afghanistan, 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. Under 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 "CON- TRIBUTIONS IN EXCHANGE FOR STATE OR LOCAL TAX CREDITS"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 50, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (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."

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.

Frankly, I 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 drafting 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 manner, carefully 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 passing this CRA 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 here is very clear. 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 they can run 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 American'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 religion, which culminated 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, or should be, a shocking 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 just antithetical, but it is 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 outlandish 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, it became clear 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.

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. From article 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 and publicly, 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 one 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, which we read in the Senate, 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 human 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 could not trace all their connections with 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 moderate problematic 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 it builds men 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 go away overnight 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 aid for individuals caught in the path 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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

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 half 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 controlled 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 fixing the mess he has 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, 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 derelict 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 oppose his policy in Syria. 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 protecting President Trump than protecting America? I hope not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

USMCA AGREEMENT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it has been over 1 year since the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement was signed by President Trump and the leaders of Canada and Mexico. This landmark trade agreement is expected to create 176,000 new American jobs. It is expected to grow American businesses all over our country and help give a jump-start to our hard-working

farmers and ranchers. With 95 percent of the world's population outside of the United States, Montana producers need access to these global markets.

Agriculture drives our economy in Montana. In fact, it is the No. 1 economic driver in our State. Canada and Mexico both are in high demand for our products like wheat, barley, and beef. In fact, in 2018 alone, Montana had \$731 million in total exports to Canada and Mexico.

For our producers in Montana, the USMCA would be a positive step forward in providing certainty and alleviating the challenges and obstacles they faced virtually every single day this season.

When I travel across Montana, I have heard from folks in every corner of our State: 4-H members, FFA members, farmers and ranchers at local county fairs, and producers along the highway. They all want action on USMCA. They all need relief. They are looking for something certain coming out of Washington, DC, in these uncertain times.

I cannot stand by any longer as my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives fail to act. Listen, we have enough votes in the Senate to pass it. There are enough votes in the House to pass it. President Trump can't wait to sign it. Mexico is ready; Canada is ready; the United States is ready; and I can state that in my home State of Montana, we are very ready. I, along with the majority in the U.S. Senate, am ready to get this deal done and get it across the finish line for some of the hardest working folks in our Nation, our farmers and ranchers.

Hard-working small business owners and folks on farms and ranches all over Montana are sitting and waiting for Speaker PELOSI to stop slow-walking the USMCA. The House Democrats cannot continue to hold our farmers and ranchers hostage for any future political gain that we are seeing right now in the House. It has been a political game over there. This is negatively impacting the Montana way of life.

There are countless numbers of Montana families out there who are surviving paycheck to paycheck. They are living on a prayer. They are sick and tired of politics and the partisan games being played in Washington, DC, and, you know what, I am too.

We were elected to come here and get something done, not spin the wheels on cable TV at night just talking about other issues that aren't moving the ball forward on behalf of the American people. What Montanans care about is how they are going to put food on the table and how they are going to make ends meet this winter coming up. The USMCA is more than just a trade deal, it is an opportunity for more jobs and, importantly, higher wages.

That is why I am here today. I am here to encourage our Democratic colleagues in the House to stop playing politics with our communities, our jobs, and our very lives. I am calling on the U.S. House to act, bring this impor-

tant trade deal up for a vote. Let's have an up-or-down vote. Let the House Chamber speak. Let them vote.

The USMCA has the potential to boost our Nation's GDP by \$68 billion, plain and simple. That means more money in the pockets of Montanans. It is a better opportunity for our folks in agriculture. There is more revenue for Main Street businesses in Montana. The USMCA will deliver much needed trade certainty, secure intellectual property rights, and modernize digital trade.

I am not alone in wanting swift action. I am honored to have support from the Montana Chamber of Commerce, the Montana Farm Bureau Federation, from the Montana Grain Growers Association, from the Montana Stockgrowers Association, and from the Montana Pork Producers Association. They are all with us to get the USMCA done. The longer we stall this deal, the further we stall economic opportunity in Montana and across this Nation.

To Speaker PELOSI and to my colleagues in the House, the time to act is now. Our neighbors depend on it, my Montana farmers and ranchers depend on it, and the entire country depends on it.

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 in the wheat business. 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 House to act as quickly as possible because those wheat farmers in Eastern Colorado need the certainty of new markets. The cattlemen in Colorado need the certainty of new markets and existing markets. That is exactly what the USMCA will do. I commend my colleague for his words on the USMCA.

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 gets to 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, being joined by 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 several months. 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 discussing 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 our State—a State that has been transformed by energy jobs and high-tech aerospace jobs. Agriculture remains one of the highest job sectors in the State.

Even though it 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 the heartland 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 generations of 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 Reassurance 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, to install wind turbines, which provides 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 on their ranch. If you think about it, 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 of 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 a small town. Employees will have 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 Baca 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 is 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 new technologies. One of the things we talked about is how we can make it more effective to produce dryland crops and how we can make oilseed opportunities available for additional value-added opportunities in the area.

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 assistance and prevention training 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.

Alarming, 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 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 labor 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 the Denvers 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 shortage needs.

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 and still 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 Interior and Environment; 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. We have 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 bill, there was 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 process.

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 can bring us together 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 now sees before it.

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 arrive here as part of the first package without having done a great deal of work. You don't do that and receive unanimous support coming out of the committee for the second year in a row now if you do not demonstrate this strong 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 all of the 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 Institution, our 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 I will speak to the 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 \$13.7 billion. These funds go to support energy development that is critical to our Nation's economy, to recreation activities that power our rural communities, and to conservation efforts to protect our public lands and the wildlife that relies on them. Funding is provided to support an all-of-the-above energy approach, both onshore and offshore, that will continue to help our country achieve energy independence.

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 certain of 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. We also 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. In my State of Alaska, the support for the Earthquake Hazards Program helps us. As a State that is very seismically prone, it helps us with warnings, and it helps to enhance the earthquake monitoring capability. The bill also maintains funding for mapping initiatives that will help to gather data to improve our maps, which enhances the safety of activities such as aviation. In certain parts of the country, believe it or not, we do not have current and accurate mapping. Certainly, in my home State—and I know in other parts of the country—the updates to the maps have simply not been made.

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 this bill an 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—to have had 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 measure to do that. The two primary 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 \$288 million over the 2019 levels. We maintain all critical program 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 education scores 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 Indian Country 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 HOEVEN, Senator DAINES, and 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 statewide leaders, Native leaders, and law enforcement. He then had an opportunity to get out of the rural areas and into the villages. After he left, he declared a public safety emergency in the State of Alaska because of where we sit. So we have been 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 recruitment and quality improvement as well as providing a \$24 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 many 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 assistance. We provide increases for hazardous fuels reductions.

As far as the EPA budget goes, we prioritize funding for the programs that result in concrete actions to improve the quality of the environment across our country. 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 funded for the first time in this measure. Funding is also provided for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds and for the WIFIA Program to build and support critical water infrastructure in communities in every State. The bill also equips the EPA with a powerful set of tools to further the Agency's core missions of clean air, clean water, and clean land.

One of the issues I hear a lot about from the folks back home, as well as from 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 what 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 reiterate the work Senator UDALL and I put in to produce 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 this package. 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 transportation 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 now before the Senate. I want to begin 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 landscape 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 delivers 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 funding, 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 of 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 Indian Health Service and 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.

This 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 very proud that we were 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, including the efforts to dismantle the Bureau of Land Management. This bill sends a strong message that the administration needs to push "pause" and work with Members on both sides of the aisle. It is vitally 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 also oppose a 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 as the clerk 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 SHELBY.

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 handle any request that came to us from wherever in the Senate and deal with it in a bipartisan way. So I very much appreciate working hard with Senator MURKOWSKI to get this bill done and to move it on to conference with the House and to get it into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

S.J. RES. 50

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to address the Congressional Review Act measure we will be voting on later today.

Let's be very clear. This is a vote 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 they choose to pay. The fact 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 or anywhere else in Pennsylvania—constituents with modest incomes who choose local governments that keep a modest level of service and therefore a modest level of taxes—why should those constituents have to pay higher tax rates to subsidize the folks who have multimillion-dollar condos on 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 one-third of all the benefits 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 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 our 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 some savings. That was objectionable 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 that 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 subsidize 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. The States came along and developed a scam to circumvent it. The IRS, quite rightly, saw through the scam and said: We are not going to allow that scam to continue. Now my Democratic colleagues want to tear up the IRS rule to perpetuate the scam. That is a very bad idea, and I hope we will all vote against the Congressional Review Act effort that is scheduled for a vote later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2242

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am here today because, unfortunately, our elections still remain vulnerable to foreign election interference.

Earlier this month, the Senate Intelligence Committee, which I am proud to serve on, released its report on Russia's use of social media to undermine our democracy.

The committee's bipartisan conclusion was clear. Russia attacked our democracy in 2016; their efforts on social media are ongoing; and they will be back in 2020. Frankly, they never left.

This echoes all of the evidence we have seen from the intelligence community and from companies 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, 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 earned applause 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 campaigns going forward: 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 this legislation more necessary 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 complaints.

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 deals—about the President's deals 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 this body. 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 colleague raised concerns 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 very, very 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 cosponsor as well. Let me simply say that I support their efforts to make sure 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, this person seems to be winning, as well, in Syria and seems to be winning, as well, 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 dis-

charged 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 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 disclosure, we are shirking 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.

This is the second time I have come to the floor this week to urge the Senate to take action on election security legislation. 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.

In the last election, an ad was discovered that was paid for in rubles. It had been paid for in rubles before the election. It happened, but we did not know

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 to 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 and 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. 2669, 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?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. That is very unfortunate, given how soon the elections are and what a difference we could make, especially with the disinformation campaigns. I hope my colleagues change their minds.

The Honest Ads Act is a bipartisan bill with Senator GRAHAM, the Republican chair of the Judiciary Committee. We must act.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2238

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be making a unanimous consent request to move the 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 continues 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 changed. Nobody knows that because 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 of 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. I sure wish some of my 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 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 hacked 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 small potatoes.

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, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

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, TN, where I live and 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 not too much 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 my colleague has made.

The first argument was that, on this side of the aisle, people really aren't interested in election security. The fact is, what Senator KLOBUCHAR and I and those on our side of the aisle have been interested in are the three priorities that independent cyber security experts agree are essential to protecting our elections: paper ballots, audits, and cyber security standards. So that ought to dispose of this issue that somehow on this side of the aisle, people really aren't interested in election security.

Second, I want it understood that over here, we have been interested in working in a bipartisan way. But our ranking member, Senator KLOBUCHAR, on the Rules Committee said that at one point there was a markup scheduled on these issues, and, essentially, the leadership on the other side of the aisle intervened, and it was canceled.

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 KLOBUCHAR, 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 advanced 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 in this quiet Chamber, we must remember that there is a city half a world away that is struggling to survive—a city that is fighting for human rights and human liberty and a city that is a solitary pinpoint of light on a continent of authoritarianism, a city called Hong Kong.

The need there is urgent, and the hour there is late, and it is time for America to act. I know this because I have been there. I have been there myself. I have seen it. I have been to Hong Kong. I have been to the streets of Hong Kong. I have seen the protesters marching in support of and in defense of their basic human rights. I have seen them demonstrating for their basic human liberties. I have seen them confronting the police with their tactics of brutality and oppression.

It makes me think that sometimes, in the course of history, the fate of one city defines the challenge of an entire generation. Fifty years ago, that city was Berlin. Today, that city is Hong Kong. The situation there is critical. Hong Kong is sliding toward becoming a police state. Have no doubt and make no mistake that Beijing wants to impose its will on Hong Kong. It wants to silence dissent in Hong Kong. It wants to steamroll Hong Kong, just as it wants to steamroll all of its neighbors in the region, just as it wants to control the region, and just as it wants ultimately to control the entire international system.

We know what is at stake in this country because we have gotten all too familiar with Beijing's tactics. We have seen what Beijing has tried to do to this country for decades now. They have stolen our jobs. They have stolen our technologies. They have tried to build and are building their military on the backs of our middle class. Their aims are expansionist, and their aims are domination, and their aims are not compatible with the security or the prosperity of this country. That is why what is happening in Hong Kong today is so important and the fight there is so significant.

Will a totalitarian China and totalitarian Beijing be allowed to dominate

the city of Hong Kong, to silence it, and then to turn to the region as a whole?

You know, let's review what is actually happening there in the streets of Hong Kong. This didn't start with the people of Hong Kong; this started with Beijing. This started with Beijing and its puppet government and its puppet chief executive in Hong Kong attempting to revoke the rights of Hongkongers—the rights, by the way, that Beijing promised to the people of that city in 1984 and again in 1997. They are trying to revoke those rights by bringing in a bill for extradition of Hong Kong citizens and Hong Kong residents to mainland China to be tried in China's courts, where there is no due process, where there are no basic guaranteed liberties, and where there is no recourse. That was Beijing's plan, and that would have affected not just the citizens of Hong Kong but the residents there, including over 80,000 Americans who are currently residents in the city. And the people of Hong Kong said no.

On the 12th of July, just a few days after Beijing put forward this extradition bill, 2 million Hong Kong residents—2 million took to the streets in peaceful protest. This is a city of 7½ million. There were 2 million on the streets on the 12th of July. When the Hong Kong Government—the Beijing-controlled government refused to back down, the people of Hong Kong refused to be silenced. For months now, months on end, 20 weeks and more, the people of Hong Kong have been taking to the streets protesting, seeking to vindicate their rights, and they have been doing it in the face of escalating opposition.

The Hong Kong Government—on orders, no doubt, from Beijing—has sought to deny the protesters permits to gather peacefully. They have sought to deny them the right to cover their faces because, let's not forget, China is a surveillance state, and the persecution and retribution against protesters is real, and it is constant.

Now they are talking about a potential curfew. They are shutting down subway stations early so protesters can't get from one place to another. They have used violent tactics to put down the protests—tear gas and beatings and dye blasted at protesters.

China continues to escalate—Beijing continues to escalate the situation, turning the screws on Hong Kong and taking away the rights and liberties of the people there.

Hong Kong's demands are not outlandish; they are asking for what they were promised. They were promised in 1984, by the Government of Beijing—in a duly ratified international treaty, they were promised the right to assemble and the right to peacefully gather and protest. They were promised the right to vote and to be able to choose their own government. They were promised the right to speak openly. They were promised the right to worship. Those are the rights the people of

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 water.” Some have actually referred to this as a water movement. They mean “Be fluid. Be reactive. Adjust to the situation.”

I just have to say, having been there myself, having been to the streets, having seen the protesters, having met 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. These are his words:

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 potentials 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 time for this body 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 and to send a 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 arm. 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 allies to do the same—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 voice.

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 this week 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 working to achieve statehood. 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 assuage 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 majority leader 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 secured. 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. Chief 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 Alaskan 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 \$460 billion at the pump.

Here is how it got done. I couldn't get it 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 one of 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.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, thank you and a huge thanks to my colleague for not just deferring to 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 that feeds 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, particularly among girls.

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 detailee from the Department of Agriculture to our subcommittee. That is because he is fabulous, and we just couldn't let him go here in the U.S. Senate. 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 leave such a mark 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 regular order. 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 bipartisanship 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, as I said, in 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—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 supplementals 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 if 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 appropriations 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 ag research, housing and business loan programs for rural America, domestic and international nutrition programs, and food safety and drug safety because we also fund the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, as part of this bill.

Again, these are very important priorities for this body that we need to take up and pass. The subcommittee has made difficult decisions in drafting the bill, and I am proud of the work that has been done to this point.

It is written to our allocation of \$23.1 billion, which is \$58 million above the current enacted level. We worked hard to invest taxpayer dollars responsibly, funding programs to provide assistance to our farmers in rural communities and supporting 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 jobs nationwide 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 simplifying the Tax Code, which is something I think we can all agree needs to be done. For the millions of Texans who were filled with dread sim-

ply 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 claimed this legislation 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 my State gave to 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 this no-limit deduction. That is why the cap was included in tax reform—in order 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 with incomes of over \$1 million. 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 in their seeking to repeal this regulation that basically prevents a tax dodge. There are 24 percent of taxpayers with incomes between \$200,000 and \$1 million who will be affected and 6 percent of taxpayers who will be affected who earn under \$200,000. You can see that the majority of the benefit that our Democratic colleagues seek to confer is on the wealthiest people in the country.

I don't have any ax to grind with people who have been successful and 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, Texas, and Wyoming don't 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 fact is, since tax reform passed, a number of States have crafted a workaround—I 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 estimates that doing away with the subsidy cap would cost about \$700 billion over the next 7 years, or \$100 billion a year, and almost 95 percent of the benefit would go to the people who make more than \$200,000. Even according to the liberal Tax Policy Center, one-third of the uncapped SALT deduction went to the top 1 percent.

If I have heard BERNIE SANDERS or ELIZABETH WARREN or any of the Democrats who are running for President rail on and on about the top 1 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 low-tax States to subsidize those who are in high-tax States and localities. And 52 percent of them make over \$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 my State.

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, but 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 the most modest of cuts in the highest marginal rate. The benefit flowed to everybody in every tax bracket, but most of it went to the middle class. Yet, after hammering this side of the aisle for its somehow benefiting the wealthy to the detriment of the middle class, the Democrats are now working to help their richest constituents get back to the days of unlimited deductions.

This is unfair. It is regressive. It benefits the people who need the help the least, and it hurts the people who need our attention and help the most. Asking Texans and all Americans to somehow foot the bill for \$700 billion so that

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 Democratic 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. What we wanted to do was to make 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 could see the benefits of tax reform.

Let's be clear about who will be benefiting 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 aren't 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 double the standard deduction, and that 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 also 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, give 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 going on. 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 thousands of dollars in tax relief and \$4,000 raises 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-exploding 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 dipped 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 their property and State income taxes from their Federal returns. That average was about \$18,000 per deduction. More than 80 percent of those who deducted earned less than \$200,000. So to say that the Trump tax law was a giant hit job on New Jersey's middle class is no exaggeration, for already New Jersey families are paying the price.

Earlier this month, new data from ProPublica revealed 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 are 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 30-some 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. In Florida, there are 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 whatsoever.

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 these 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, it 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.

Since 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—and for the first time ever—we owe 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 in fact were 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—listen to this—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 solu-

tion 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 get. It is the exact 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 hard-working 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 purposes they made, whether it be education, conservation, or whatever else, that now are nullified by the IRS rule.

Join us, and let's exercise our power with the Congressional Review Act to do what is right—to protect middle-class families throughout the Nation from higher property tax burdens, to protect States and their right to determine how their taxpayers will ultimately receive the benefits for making investments in education, for making investments in conservation, and for making investments in a whole host of issues, that these States, in their rightful judgment, decided were perfectly fine and that were always upheld by the IRS and are now nullified by the Internal Revenue Service's decision.

That is what we have an opportunity to turn around, and I hope we will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I address the issues before the Senate right now, I would like to express some concern I have about whether the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will be able to get done this year.

I come to the floor today to express growing worry. The Democratic-controlled House of Representatives looks increasingly less likely to act this year on the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. That threatens passage of the trilateral trade deal this Congress, as next year is a Presidential election year.

It has been about a year since the updated trade agreement with Canada and Mexico was signed by the leaders of the three nations. It is a whole year, and Democrats have still failed to act.

Every day that passes, Americans are losing out on economic benefits of the USMCA. House Democrats seem to have no sense of urgency. For months now, House Democrats have said they are working on it, that they are mak-

ing progress and that they are optimistic that they can get to yes.

But conspicuously absent from their pronouncements are any mention of a date or timeline. With every passing month, these seem less like good-faith assurances and more like stalling tactics.

The new Congress has been seated for more than 10 months now. How long is it going to take before this can come up?

Ambassador Lighthizer, more than any other Trade Representative I can recall, has gone above and beyond to accommodate the other party's policy demands. For nearly a year now, Lighthizer has worked with House Democrats to find solutions on issues of concern to them, like labor, environment, intellectual property, and enforcement.

I am beginning to wonder if Democrats are interested in reaching a compromise at all. It is looking more like 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 it. Today, it is looking more like the former than the latter.

If 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 congressional Democrats can agree is better 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 under this loophole. At 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 the 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 tax shelters for the wealthy.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have correctly determined that these workarounds are contrary to the Federal tax law and have issued sensible regulations to clarify this tax treatment. In doing so, they applied longstanding tax principles that deny a charity deduction to the extent the taxpayer receives something of value in return for their charitable donation. It is simply common sense.

Charity is by definition something done out of the goodness of your heart without expecting or getting something in return. That is certainly not the case with these workarounds. There is no charity involved. In fact, once taking into account both the State tax credit and the charitable deduction at the Federal level, a taxpayer could actually receive a tax benefit that exceeds the dollar value of their so-called donation. That is not charity; that is a tax scam.

Some have attempted to justify this tax scam by pointing to State tax credit programs that existed prior to the existence of the SALT cap, but unlike

the recently enacted programs, these older programs were not specifically designed to circumvent Federal tax law when they were enacted. These pre-existing tax credit programs were targeted at giving taxpayers the option of funding certain nontraditional governmental activities, such as providing underprivileged children scholarships or to set aside land for conservation.

My Democratic colleagues have painstakingly tried to defend these scams by claiming they are efforts to alleviate State tax burdens on the middle class; however, this argument doesn't even pass the laugh test. It is undeniable that these workarounds will overwhelmingly benefit the super-wealthy, while the middle class will receive little or no benefit.

I was pleased to see that at least one Senate Democrat was willing to be honest about this last night here on the Senate floor. Senator BENNET of Colorado put it this way:

The vast majority of the benefits of repealing the SALT cap 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—52 percent—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 on State tax deductions, as the Democrats are proposing. Only a handful of taxpayers with incomes under \$200,000—or about 3 percent—would ac-

tually 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 as supposedly 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, the SALT provisions we are talking about. We then used that revenue to increase benefits that better target low- to middle-income taxpayers. For example, we doubled the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and increased the refundability of that tax credit. We also nearly doubled the standard deduction, to the benefit of many lower and middle-income taxpayers. 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 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 incredible 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 that these 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 saw a tax cut under the 2017 tax cut bill. This isn't just coming from this Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, but an analysis by the liberal Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy. In addition, recent filing season data released by H&R Block shows that, on average, residents of even high-tax States received a tax cut.

We have also heard fears that the cap will negatively affect blue State revenues, as higher income taxpayers flee to lower tax jurisdictions. But concerns about such an exodus aren't new and didn't start because of the cap; they started because of sky-high taxes in those very same States.

In November of 2017, prior to the enactment of this tax cut and reform bill, the Wall Street Journal wrote about "The Great Progressive Tax Escape." This article focused on IRS tax return data between 2012 and 2015 that showed billions of dollars in taxable income leaving high-tax States for low-tax States due to taxpayer migration. Last time I checked, there was no SALT cap between 2012 and 2015. While there is some anecdotal evidence that taxpayer migration might be starting to increase due to the cap, it is not entirely clear at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Bloomberg article from May of this year titled "Blue States Warned of a SALT Apocalypse. It Hasn't Happened" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[May 21, 2019]

BLUE STATES WARNED OF A SALT APOCALYPSE. IT HASN'T HAPPENED

(By Martin Z Braun)

To listen to New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, the 2017 Republican tax overhaul that limited state and local deductions to \$10,000 was a devastating blow. The rich would flee, the middle class would suffer and blue state budgets would bleed.

Perhaps this will come to pass over time, but so far, there are almost no signs of it.

New York, in fact, saw revenue rise \$3.7 billion in April from a year earlier, thanks to a shift in timing of taxpayer payments, a stock market that rallied through much of 2018 and a decade-long economic expansion that's pushed national unemployment to a 50-year low. Similar windfalls arrived in New Jersey, California and Illinois—states that, like New York, had warned of dire consequences from the law.

And it turns out that tax refunds across the U.S. in 2019—those once-a-year checks from Uncle Sam that people use to pay credit card debt from Christmas or buy a washing machine—were roughly the same size as a year earlier. In all, about 64% of American households paid less in individual income tax for 2018 than they would have had the Tax Cut and Jobs Act not become law, according to the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center.

"Any comment that says this is an economic civil war that would gut the middle

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 limit 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 their borrowing 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 nerves of Democratic governors and their budget officers frayed in December when income tax collections plunged by more than 30 percent from the prior December. 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 Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli. 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 \$16.3 billion, or 36.2% year-over-year to \$61.4 billion, Bank of America Corp. said.

"SALT caps do not appear to be a broad system risk to state credit quality at this point," S&P Global Ratings said recently.

A big reason for the sharp bounce-back after December's deep revenue declines in New York and other high-tax states: The SALT limits caused some people to change when they paid their taxes. Wealthy taxpayers in December 2017 accelerated big tax payments to take advantage of the unlimited state and local tax deduction before it expired. Then, with the SALT deduction capped, that incentive evaporated and taxpayers waited until this April to pay their 2018 taxes.

Also, some individuals failed to adjust their W-4s after the passage of the tax law. So people who underwithheld received more in their paychecks since then but had to pay more tax in April or received lower refunds.

TRENDING INLINE

Still, there are some indications that residents in high-tax states are fretting about the law. Thirteen percent of house-hunters in both New York and California said they have started looking for homes in states with lower taxes, according to a recent survey by brokerage Redfin Corp.

In Westchester County, where a typical property tax bill for a single family home is more than \$17,000, the average sales price declined 7.6% between the first quarter of 2018

and the same quarter this year. Sales prices for luxury homes (average price \$2 million) plummeted 22% during the same period, according to appraiser Miller Samuel Inc. and brokerage Douglas Elliman Real Estate.

Almost half of income taxes paid to California, New York and New Jersey are from the wealthiest 1% of earners. If they were to move in large enough numbers, those states could be in trouble. New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Maryland sued the Trump administration last year to invalidate the \$10,000 cap, saying that it unfairly targets them. States have sought to pass loopholes around the limit and there's a push in Congress to reverse it.

But migration rates in high tax states most affected by SALT are below pre-recession levels, and generally in-line with U.S. trends, Moody's Investors Service said in April. Jobs, housing and the weather influence migration more than taxes, according to Moody's analyst Marcia Van Wagner.

"Armageddon hasn't resulted from the changes to SALT, but it still may be too early to measure its impact," said Matt Dalton, chief executive officer of Rye Brook, New York-based Belle Haven Investments, which manages \$9 billion of municipal bonds. "You see more mansions listed in New York. Manhattan real estate sales just had their worst quarter in a decade."

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 that 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 SALT 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. The fact is, after tax reform, the wealthy now shoulder a larger share of Federal tax burden than they did under the prior law.

This was made possible by reforms to regressive tax expenditures, such as our capping the SALT deduction. What is more, these reforms allow us to target more tax relief to lower and middle-income taxpayers.

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 put the 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 SALT rule hurts their State charities. Yet they have been unwilling—at least based on what I am told—to be part of an effort to fix this and to support those charities. That is what we would be doing in our effort today to overturn the Treasury Department's flawed—deeply flawed—SALT regulations.

My view is that these regulations illustrate essentially what was wrong with the Republicans' 2017 tax law. This was a law that was half-baked and rushed to shovel hundreds of billions of dollars to those at the top of the economic pyramid in our country. Then \$1.5 trillion was borrowed so that Donald Trump and his Republican allies could find a way to cover this tax cut for cronies and donors.

Then, because they still needed revenue, Republicans deliberately targeted middle-class homeowners in States like New Jersey, New York, Maryland, and Oregon for tax increases.

For some communities in Oregon, it is not uncommon for property tax bills alone for middle-class folks to exceed \$10,000. But when our Republican colleagues took this flawed approach on the SALT issue, they didn't want to listen to experts. So the Trump Treasury Department stepped in, and without any clear authority to do so, the Treasury Department reversed a long-standing IRS provision that had allowed taxpayers a full deduction for charitable contributions to State tax credit programs.

In essence, the Treasury Department created a new rule that extended the \$10,000 cap on State and local tax deductions to also include charitable contributions to State tax credit programs.

To make matters worse, because Republican Senators began to see what an absurd approach this was, Secretary Mnuchin put together another carve-out for Republican interests, trying to figure out how to manage this flawed regulation. In effect, businesses using these same workarounds to fund private school voucher programs would be exempt from the regulation. Middle-class families pay more; businesses pay less. That is the Republican way.

My view is that the Treasury Department shouldn't be putting its thumb on

the scale on behalf of Republicans, and it certainly shouldn't be using what amounts to a phony regulatory justification to fix this extraordinarily poorly drafted law.

While Donald Trump certainly intended for these regulations to hurt middle-class families in some parts of the country in Democratic States and protect Republican interests, the bad news for my Republican colleagues—and this is why so many Republican Senators are writing the Treasury Department, talking about why their State charities are getting hammered. The regulations produced by the Treasury Department are overly broad, and they 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 Trump tax law was already estimated to slash overall charitable giving by as much as \$20 million a year.

Now on top of that, the regulations that I oppose and feel so strongly about coming from the Treasury Department threaten more than 100 charitable 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 Colorado and Missouri; foster care organizations in Arizona; historic preservation groups in Kansas; charities in Iowa, Kentucky, and Mississippi; conservation groups in Arkansas, Iowa, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee; rural hospitals in Georgia, the home State of the Presiding Officer; universities in Indiana, Idaho, Montana, and North Dakota; and volunteer responders in Nebraska.

As today's debate proceeds, you are going to hear about these comments against these regulations that were submitted to the Trump administration. There is a rural hospital in Georgia that was able to upgrade its heart monitors, a childcare center in Colorado that helps parents remain in the workforce, and a conservation group that has preserved more than 10,000 acres of land in Florida's gulf coast.

In wrapping up, I just hope my Republican colleagues will put their constituents first by shielding them from these unintended consequences of losing their charitable tax credits and supporting this resolution offered by the leader, Senator SCHUMER, myself, and other colleagues.

Senate Republicans have a choice. They can keep writing letters to the Treasury Department, complaining about the regulations that hammer their State charities, or they can join us in voting to reverse this policy. I just hope that Senators move to this vote, and they take the option that I think is the only one you can explain to the folks at home in a townhall meeting. I have had more than 950 of

them. I am going to have some more very shortly. There, folks have a chance to really see what your priorities are.

The question here is, Are your priorities with folks at home, with these State charities that I have emphasized—everything from conservation to healthcare, to children? Are you going to support the State charities doing that important work or are you going to continue to support the Department of the Treasury with their incredibly flawed regulations to hammer these State charities?

I hope Senators from all sides—from those 33 States that I have just ticked off—will vote to protect those charities 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.

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.

It is not because the House hasn'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 without a pay raise for our troops, 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 everywhere 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. Mexico has already ratified the deal, and Canada is well on their way. Our trade partners are ready. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is about modernizing a trade deal with two of our closest allies that would grow more than 175,000 jobs across this country.

NAFTA was ratified in 1994. That was 3 years before Wi-Fi became available to the public, 5 years before USB drives were invented, 12 years before the launch of Facebook and Twitter, and 16 years before computer tablets were on sale. None of us are living with 1994 technology, so why should we be living with a 1994 trade policy?

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. It 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 Iowan 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 Northwest Iowa a couple of weeks ago visiting with one Iowa corn farmer, and he said 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 visiting 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, wondering when the House is 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 of Representatives 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 computer 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 almost \$600 million 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 communities, farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and business owners stand to gain from Congress finalizing the USMCA.

A few weeks ago, I was honored to host Vice President PENCE in the Grand Canyon State. One of our stops took us to Caterpillar's proving grounds in Green Valley, AZ, where the company tests their impressive machinery and trains operators on new equipment.

With roughly 660 full-time employees in our State, Caterpillar knows what a critical role cross-border commerce—and the passage of USMCA—is for Arizona. Caterpillar recycles 150 million tons of scraps a year to create new products. This kind of innovation should be promoted, not penalized. USMCA encourages this kind of innovation by specifically prohibiting restrictions on remanufactured goods. In turn, companies like Caterpillar are not penalized but encouraged to be thoughtful in their environmental footprint.

I made many other visits to local businesses this year and heard straight from Arizonans about why we need to get this deal passed and now. The USMCA opens doors for Arizona to continue leading in the aerospace, financial services, film and digital media, and bioscience sectors. It enhances intellectual property protections and will benefit Arizona's emerging automotive sector by requiring at least 75 percent of a car to be built with North American parts in order for it to be sold duty-free. Arizona's farmers and ranchers will 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 in the House 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. It is good for America, and it is good for Arizona.

USMCA is a clear win for my constituents in Arizona. Arizonans 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 really is 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 have heard that you have people in logistics, people who are in farming, and people who are in every single part of the economy who are saying: Why can't you get this done?

We all know there is support that we hear about—bipartisan support—wide bipartisan support in the other Chamber and, indeed, wide bipartisan support here in the Senate, but for some reason, they just can't seem to find the time to schedule the bill and call the vote.

America is waiting on them to take this vote. There are 120,000 small and midsize American businesses that will be able to continue exporting their goods to customers in Canada and Mexico. Do you know what is significant? These businesses, small and midsize businesses, are located in every single one of our States.

The updated customs and trade rules are certainly going to make sure that even startups are able to participate in this cross-border economy. I have talked to so many new-start businesses that are coming through our universities and our entrepreneur centers, and they say: We want to make certain that we have access to markets around the globe.

Isn't this great? They are not just 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? There was 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 dedicated and 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 will tell 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 and Mexico 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 see the House take action and 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 markets 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 Com-

mittee 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 we are about 5 percent of the world's population in America, and yet we have 25 percent of the economy. The way we do well is to sell more of our stuff to the 95 percent of the people who are outside of our borders.

It should be fair. We should have a level playing field. That is the kind of context in which I look at the USMCA. Does it meet these criteria, where we can sell more of our stuff and we have a more level playing field? Yes, it does. That is exactly what this agreement does. It is a good agreement, and it deserves to have a vote. If it has a vote, it will pass because logic, I think, will prevail.

As crazy as this town is these days and as partisan as things are, the logic of this is inescapable, which is that you have the USMCA, a good agreement, and then you have the status quo, which is NAFTA, which is not as good in any respect. If you vote no on USMCA, you 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 markets for 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 this year 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 trade 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 a solid foundation. The NAFTA agreement which it is built on is now 25 years old. It is outdated. It has not kept up with the times, and it has to be improved upon. That is what USMCA does. It basically says that we are in the 21st century, and we have to make changes to this agreement.

NAFTA doesn't have things in it that one 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 protects 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 has to do with economic impact. 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.

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 unchanged in NAFTA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce over 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 easing of their customs burdens for small-value products. They will have data localization protections. They will have a prohibition on Mexico and Canada requiring that there be localization of the data in those countries. Finally, this prohibits tariffs on data, which we don't have now. These are all important key elements in the agreement to keep our internet economy moving. So under the rules for the internet economy, there is a green check for the USMCA, and NAFTA doesn't have it.

Let's talk about the next subject, which is enforceable labor and environmental standards. In the agreement we have now, the NAFTA agreement, there are no labor or environmental standards that are enforceable—none. Whereas, in the new USMCA, standards are actually enforceable. There are consequences if they don't abide by them. This is part of the leveling of the playing field. Think about it. In Mexico, one of their great advantages has been lower labor costs and labor conditions—the inability to organize and so on. This changes that now that we have labor standards. By the way, Mexico has already made changes to their labor laws because of the agreement we have with them under the USMCA, which, by the way, was negotiated with these two countries and submitted back on September 30 of last year. It has been over a year. So it is about time to move it. Again, the USMCA has enforceable environmental and labor standards, and NAFTA does not.

There are some other provisions that are interesting that lead to why this is

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 an agreement 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. In NAFTA, there is nothing with regard to how much steel has to be coming from North America.

It also states that, with regard to the wages in Canada, Mexico, and the United States, there would be a minimum wage of \$16 per hour for about 40 to 45 percent of this manufacturing we are talking about. So any vehicle made in Mexico or anywhere else in America has to be produced by workers making 16 bucks an hour or more. This is again about leveling the playing field, and, frankly, this is the kind of provision that we would see in a provision negotiated by a Democratic administration, not a Republican administration. My Democrat friends have been calling for this for years. It is in the USMCA agreement, and it is good for us because it will result in more jobs coming to the United States of America, where we have not just higher labor standards but higher wages. So 40 to 45 percent of the vehicles must be made by workers earning \$16 an hour. Check the box for yes in USMCA and no in NAFTA.

It is another example of how this agreement is one that addresses a lot of the concerns the Democrats have raised over the years. When I was U.S. Trade Representative, we talked a lot about these issues. We talked a lot about them in the Finance Committee. They are in this agreement.

My hope would be that Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats in the House would take this into account and at least allow this agreement to be voted on by the full House. If that happens, I can't believe that logic wouldn't prevail, that NAFTA versus USMCA wouldn't result in our passing USMCA. All of these things are going to help.

The one element that I think has gotten the most attention in farm country is the fact that the dairy protections in Canada have been changed so we have a chance to send our dairy products to Canada from Ohio and other dairy States. It is more than that. It also affects commodities—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: ROB, 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 this agreement is going to catch us up to 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 for workers and farmers. It 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 floor, 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.

There is a lot of politics 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 my remarks.

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 an 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 small business. The tech industry benefits from the USMCA. As the Senator of Tennessee pointed out, 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 this 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 increased 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 the world's marketplace, 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 why it has taken more than a year 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 for 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 or labor rights. 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's GDP. 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 trade 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 benefiting 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, which improves 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 as well. It is just a matter 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 innovation throughout 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 outcompete 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 need these types of trade agreements in 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 making it 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 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. 2 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 has been said but not everybody 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, in that order. It has been pointed out that there is lots of focus on agriculture. Every State is an agriculture State. Every State has that as a significant part of their economy. Nobody in the world does that part of the economy more efficiently or more effectively than we do. 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 HOEVEN said his State is in the top 10. Ours is too. 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 we are 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 the 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 was a person who always did his best to try to figure out the Senate and then be sure that the Senate worked for America and the Senate worked for Alaska. When it came to both of those

things, it was hard to beat Ted Stevens' best. He knew how to make this place work.

He would be disappointed in the dysfunction we see right now, but he would be optimistic that in the greatest country in the world, we will figure this out. All of us who had a chance to serve with him—I had a great relationship with him when I was a House Member. I learned a lot. I think of him often. I miss the way he represented his State and our country so uniquely and so dynamically and so effectively.

I look forward to not only the recognition here on the floor that he will receive today but the permanent recognition he will receive as we today hang his portrait in the U.S. Capitol.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as the Senator from Missouri has stated, this is a significant day. This is a very special day in the Congress, as later this afternoon we are going to gather to pay tribute to a truly great Senator, the late Senator Ted Stevens from Alaska. His official portrait will be unveiled shortly by the U.S. Senate Commission on Art. It will be part of the U.S. Senate Leadership Portrait Collection, which honors past Presidents pro tempore and past leaders. Like all of the family, the friends, the colleagues, and the former staff who have gathered for this occasion, I am so very pleased that he will be memorialized forever here in the U.S. Capitol and will be watching over all of us.

There are only 38 Members who are currently in the Senate who served with Ted, but I think it is important that all of us—and really every American—know who he was and why he so clearly deserves this honor.

Ted was a public servant. He was the ultimate public servant. He dedicated his life to public 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 basically Secretary Seaton's 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 some 40 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 40 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, as well as the 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, the senior member of the Senate's 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 of land to First Alaskans 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 our 800-mile-long Trans-Alaska 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 their names.

It 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 helped to facilitate bypass mail and Essential Air Service for our rural communities—programs and benefits that continue to this day.

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 not very complicated.

He said:

To hell with politics. Just do what is right for Alaska.

He lived by that every day that he served here. He would work with anyone who was willing to do right by the State of Alaska no matter who one was, where one came from, or which side of the aisle one was on. I mentioned Senator Inouye and the relationship that Ted had with him on the Subcommittee on Department of De-

fense and on the Committee on Appropriations. They formed a very close relationship. They had a lot in common. Obviously, they were both veterans, and they were both from young, off-shore States. Yet they looked out for one another. They had one another's backs. On committees, as I mentioned, 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 tempore's balcony in the early evenings, 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 Alaska's interests were at stake, 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 those who are 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 communities and see a road or 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 his 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 his 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 appropriations bills on the floor.

With that, I yield to the fine Senator from Mississippi.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The 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 rank, and I know that because I 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 figuratively, 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 me.

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.

Seniority 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 served his country brilliantly, as has been mentioned, as 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 he so deeply loved. He belongs in the place of honor where his portrait 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 know what a giant he was. 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 coastguardsmen 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 evidence 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, we are taking about somebody today who was actually a mentor for me right here in the U.S. Senate—Ted Stevens.

I believe it was 33 years ago when I first met him—33 years ago—and I was in the House, and I was coming to the Senate. He was a power in the Senate then. He was a worker. He was involved. He was involved not only in what happened in Alaska, where he was

a champion of his own State—and should have been—but also in the world. He wanted to make sure that America had a defense second to nobody; that we were powerful, but we were peaceful.

I had the occasion to serve for years and years on the Appropriations Committee and on the Subcommittee on Defense with him. I hadn't been on the committee long, and Senator Byrd was chairman of the committee, and Senator Hatfield from Oregon had been, and he tasked me with a lot of things that probably as a freshman—you know, second-year, third-year guy here—I probably was appalled but pleased—maybe not appalled, but pleased—what he would do. He told me one day: Senator SHELBY, you are going to be chairman of this committee. I looked around, and I said: Oh, it will be years. I will never be that.

But Ted Stevens was a Senator's Senator. He was involved, as I said, in just about everything in the Senate—the Rules Committee, the Commerce Committee, Appropriations, and Defense.

I will never forget his experience, his wise suggestions to me that probably helped me on my way. I traveled with him around the world because we had serious meetings on the Defense appropriations bill.

All I can say is that we are going to unveil a portrait of Ted Stevens here in the Senate later today, and it is a fitting tribute to a great Senator representing the State of Alaska but a U.S. Senator representing us all, Ted Stevens.

Ted, I will never forget you. We miss you. You left an indelible imprint on the U.S. Senate. I am glad I got to meet you and work with you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to add my voice in recognizing what an important day it is 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 already 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 an Alaskan who has 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 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 you hear and I hear 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, and after 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 end.

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 Chennault'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 where our 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 Congress of 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 of the U.S. Senate, 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 service.

As I mentioned, Members of this body, like Senator SHELBY, still approach me on a regular basis, saying what an impact Senator Stevens had.

His friendships were of course legendary: Scoop Jackson; Henry Magnuson; PAT ROBERTS; John Warner; Senator SHELBY; Senator LEAHY; Senator Biden, 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 who had so much to do with that. The late great Senator Stevens. He was also in many ways the Senator who cared more about the Olympics and focused on them more than any other Senator.

One other thing about Senator Stevens. No matter how far he rose—and we are hearing about the high levels he attained in the Senate—he never forgot what was most important: serving the people of Alaska. When our constituents traveled thousands of miles to come to DC, he always made time for them. Thousands of Alaskans have notes from him—congratulatory letters, condolence letters, and letters of appreciation.

At his standing-room-only funeral in Anchorage, where I had the honor of serving as an honorary pallbearer, someone asked for a show of hands from the audience—hundreds and hundreds of people—how many had received a letter from Senator Ted Stevens. Nearly every person at that service raised their hand.

Of course, he treated his staff like family. If you worked for Senator Ste-

vens—as my wife, Julie, did—you were always part of that family and you could always expect loyalty from him the rest of your life.

These principles—relentless focus on Alaska, fighting the Feds if you must, working across the aisle 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.

I am deeply 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 and 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 just have 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. It is life-size. He is sitting on a bench with an inviting smile, cowboy boots on, and his briefcase nearby. It is right in the middle of the airport in Anchorage. I often walk by it, touch it, and quietly say: How are we doing? It gives me inspiration and strength and peace to do that.

With the unveiling of the official portrait of Ted Stevens today and its placement permanently in the halls of the U.S. Senate, I will have another image of this great Alaskan and this great American from which to draw inspiration, but I think so many other Senators will as well.

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 are 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.

S.J. RES. 50

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 for their donation from 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.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 50

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. 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. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 331 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Paul	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Ernst	Portman
Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Bennet	Gardner	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoehen	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	McSally	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	Young
Daines	Murkowski	
Enzi	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—5

Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse
Isakson	Warren	

The joint resolution was rejected.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Resumed

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.

UNANIMOUS 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 free election 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 2015, 17 months before Election Day, when the St. Petersburg-based Internet Research Agency opened an account it called @BaltimoreOnline and began tweeting 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, devoted enormous attention and preparation to its Maryland operation, all in a likely effort, experts say, to widen racial divisions and demoralize 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 FEINSTEIN, 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. That 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 election system. Time is running out. 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 for voting registration officials 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 would create criminal penalties for political speech that misstates endorsements a candidate has received. Nobody approves 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 referees free speech.

I believe there is an appetite on both sides of the aisle for making good policy that honors the principle behind my colleague's bill, but this version has enormous problems, is nowhere near ready to pass by unanimous consent, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I regret that my colleague has raised 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 billboards in 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 to say it should 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 PRESIDING 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 PRESIDING 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 person's job than creating 176,000 new ones here in the United States. It is time for Speaker PELOSI to act on something that is nearly unanimously agreed to.

While not every person agrees to it, I don't think there is any question that if she would bring up the USMCA for a vote in the House, it would pass. We know that when it comes over to the Senate, it will pass here for many good reasons—for the reasons I already stated, for economic reasons and job creation reasons.

But I also want to add that passage of the USMCA is important to negotiations with other countries. Having Mexico, Canada, and the United States

in one accord adds leverage to the President's negotiations with China, especially now that we have a bilateral trade deal with Japan that President Trump has negotiated so effectively, and when working with other neighbors and allies on other bilateral trade agreements. 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, and our northern 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 28,000 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 standards—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 estimated to double 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 American content to be imported without 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 market 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 ap-

prove 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 petty 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 (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 old 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. Additionally, one of the bigger challenges that has to 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 passed in 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 impulses. More 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. Based on that, I do have some real 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. When I am asked at a town meeting what my views are on trade, I always say: Let's grow it in Oregon. Let's make it in Oregon. Let's add value to it in Oregon and then ship it around the world. I don't take a back seat to anybody in talking about the importance of trade, particularly in my State.

I sat and listened to a number of my colleagues who talked about their views and that we ought to just have an immediate vote, that we just should vote now. I don't know what they thought with respect to hearings and markups and the kinds of things that are required. They just said that we have to move now. As the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Finance, I just want to make it clear that you go when a trade deal is a good deal. There are issues still to be resolved on that matter, and I am interested in working with both sides in good faith in order to get a good deal.

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. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I am here today because protections for Americans with preexisting medical conditions are under attack from this administration. For the last 3 years, this President has used every tool at his disposal to try to undermine the ACA. He tried to repeal it twice through Congress. When that failed, the administration joined a lawsuit that would strike down the ACA with no plan to replace it.

The truth is, this administration is, unfortunately, actively working to destabilize the insurance market. One way the administration is attempting to undermine the ACA is with the so-called "short-term plans," which I would refer to—and, frankly, I think most Americans if they saw the criteria in these plans would not call them short-term plans—and I would call them junk plans. Thanks to this administration, these junk plans allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions.

Make no mistake, these plans are a threat to the stability of the insurance market and to every American with a preexisting condition. That is why I have introduced a resolution that will force an up-or-down vote on the administration's rule that pushes more of these junk plans on unsuspecting consumers and, consequently, significantly increases costs for other Americans.

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 writes:

Even though my cancer is in partial remission, I remain on treatment for fear of the cancer returning again. As I prepare for retirement, it scares me to think that this cancer would be considered a pre-existing condition and I could be denied healthcare or would be required to pay through the nose for insurance.

Sharon in Norfolk told me about her struggle with behavioral health issues. 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 Loudoun County is worried that she could lose coverage for her diabetes care. Here is her message for the Members of this body:

What if you or a loved one was diagnosed with a "pre-existing condition?" How would you feel about being denied health coverage?

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 and because 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 stay alive and manage her health if there are limitations on coverage for people with pre-existing 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 of 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.

Well, next 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 made 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 for folks 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 has been to attack the care 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 partisan lawsuit 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 caps 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 lawsuit.

Now, Democrats in the House have also passed legislation to restore funding that President Trump cut, to help 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 each and every 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 where they really stand on 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 premiums, 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 take benefits away from the sickest 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. These patients across the country and in my State deserve to know that we have their backs, that we are fighting against President Trump's efforts to undermine their healthcare, not cheering him on and blocking efforts to stop them.

Democrats are going to be out here a lot to talk about this because we know families in the country care about this a lot. We are going to be putting pressure on Republicans to do the right thing—the thing patients and families sent them here to do. If they don't, if they continue their relentless attacks on family healthcare, if Republicans continue to side with President Trump and his efforts to take protections away from patients and give that power back to the insurance companies, we are not going to give up. Democrats are not going to let up. We will double down. We are going to make sure that families know which party is offering solutions to protect their care and which one is blocking them, which party is trying to repair the damage President Trump has caused and which party is trying to cause even more harm, which party is fighting for their healthcare and which one is fighting against it. We are going to be out here day after day to keep pushing Republicans to do the right thing, to stand up for patients and families even if it means standing against President Trump.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

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. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 the big insurance companies 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. We tried as hard as we could to push back. This was all before I was in public life.

At the time, I said: If I ever have the opportunity in the Congress, I am going to make this priority business to make sure that everybody in America could go 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.

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 very real threat to that 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 was 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 in the trash can. I am 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 States and the President tried to 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 class 101 on the Constitution. But thanks to a cadre 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 Members of this body are not just some kind of innocent bystander when it comes to this court case. They could, if they wanted to, join Democrats to take steps that would prevent this lawsuit from going forward, and, again, we can have protections for people with preexisting conditions. Instead, all the arguments are about why the Republicans just can't be involved and a lot of excuses and deflection.

Third, the so-called "fix-it" bills that my Republican colleagues have offered to—what they claim—"protect" preexisting conditions are just so full of disclaimers that they look as if they might have been written by one of those insurance company lawyers from the old days who was only interested in finding ways in which the insurance company could win and the consumer would lose. Any healthcare legislation that doesn't provide an ironclad guarantee of health coverage, no matter your health status, age, or gender, amounts to a huge loophole that leaves hard-working, middle-class people empty-handed when they need health coverage the most. If insurance companies can make coverage for your preexisting conditions so expensive that it is unaffordable, it is no different than being denied coverage in the first place.

Next, the Trump administration has given the States the green light to use taxpayer dollars to push junk plans that aren't worth the paper they are written on. I will have more to say about that in the days ahead, but not only does this approach amount to fed-

erally funded fraud, this is a gross misreading of current law that is going to disproportionately hurt vulnerable Americans with preexisting conditions who need comprehensive healthcare.

Under these rules, unscrupulous insurance companies can charge people more if they have a preexisting condition, deny benefits for specific types of treatment, or even deny coverage altogether. This rule change is—and we are going to talk some more about it—a grotesque perversion of the provision I authored in the Affordable Care Act that would let States build on the strong protections in the law but not go out and, basically, completely undermine them.

Despite this parade of grim tidings, next Friday, November 1, is the beginning of open enrollment for individual, private health insurance coverage on healthcare.gov, so there is a little bit of encouraging news. Even as the Trump administration has done everything they can to fuel the fires of uncertainty for people about where healthcare is going to be and what is going to be available, millions of families are going to be able to shop for plans that provide them with health coverage. That is because, yesterday, Americans got the news that the average premium for the so-called "benchmark plan" for the individual market—part of the Affordable Care Act—is going down by 4 percent. Make no mistake, this reduction is in spite of all of the things the President has done to make it harder to get affordable coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Attributing this reduction to the President is about as believable as saying that Trump University is going to make a comeback any day now.

In fact, one insurer who posted a premium decrease last year crunched the numbers and said that they could have reduced premiums by over 22 percent if it weren't for congressional Republicans and sabotage by the Trump administration.

Americans should still sign up for health coverage if they need it before the deadline on December 15, even if the President hasn't done you or your family any favors on healthcare.

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 on the prowl outside of the official website. These hucksters 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 bill 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 sell older people 10, 15, sometimes even 20 private policies that were supposed to supplement their Medicare, and a lot of them weren't worth the paper they were written on. If you had one, often, the others wouldn't offer you coverage because they would say that you already had coverage.

Finally, we outlawed that. We wrote a law that streamlined the Medigap market, and it basically is still the law today.

With respect to the law on pre-existing conditions, I hope we can protect that. We shouldn't be creating new problems for patients and consumers. And, particularly, when we make progress, such as we did with the Affordable Care Act so that we now have in it airtight, loophole-free protections for those with preexisting conditions, we certainly shouldn't turn back the clock to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy.

I am going to have more to say about these junk plans and how they have really unsavory, historical roots, particularly when the equivalent was sold to the elderly. These junk plans are now just a backdoor to denying care to Americans with preexisting conditions, and people ought to know about the dangers. People deserve to know whether their elected officials are going to fight to protect their rights or whether they are going to let a bunch of con artists weaken the core protections for preexisting conditions that Senators WARNER and MURRAY talked about today that are so important to keeping families healthy.

I urge my Republican colleagues to change course and stand with Democrats in defense of the law and real protection for vulnerable patients, against discrimination if they have a pre-existing condition.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER).

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I think you have heard me say before on the floor that healthcare is personal—not political. I think it is for all of us and our families.

Healthcare affects everybody, whether they are Republican or Democrat, urban or rural, cheer for the Washington Nationals—go Nats—or the Houston Astros or my Detroit Tigers 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 to know that if they or their loved ones 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 the ability for 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 52. 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 confront. I doubt it.

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 overturning healthcare reform. Prescription drug costs could skyrocket. 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 11.8 million Medicare beneficiaries 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, just in 2017 alone, rose four times 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 their 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 lower 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 \$14.4 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 about that right now—today. 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 isn't 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 concerned about my life and the life of millions of others with cancer."

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motion on Executive Calendar No. 457 ripen at 12 noon on Thursday, October 24; further, that if cloture is invoked, at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I further ask that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN WALKER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we have seen too many Trump judicial nominees in recent years who don't 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 Justin 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 I supported in the Judiciary Committee. 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 mak-

ing 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 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,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

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.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-61

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bahrain.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$0 million.

Other \$150 million.

Total \$150 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Refurbishment of the Oliver Hazard Perry Class ship, ex ROBERT G. BRADLEY (FFG 49), spares, support, training, publications, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (BA-P-SAT).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: BA-P-GAL and BA-P-GAV.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 22, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Bahrain—Refurbishment of the Oliver Hazard Perry Class Ship, Ex ROBERT G. BRADLEY (FFG 49)

The Government of Bahrain has requested refurbishment of the Oliver Hazard Perry Class ship, ex ROBERT G. BRADLEY (FFG 49), spares, support, training, publications, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$150 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of an important ally which is a force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East. This sale is consistent with U.S. initiatives to provide key allies in the region with systems that will enhance interoperability with U.S. forces and increase security.

The proposed sale will refurbish and support the grant transfer of the Oliver Hazard Perry Class ship, ROBERT G. BRADLEY (FFG 49), which was authorized for transfer under Public Law 115-232, Section 1020. Bahrain already operates another Oliver Hazard Perry Class ship. Bahrain will have no difficulty absorbing these defense articles and services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor supporting the refurbishment has not yet been selected for this potential sale. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Bahrain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

REMEMBERING TED STEVENS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to my dear friend and colleague, the former senator from Alaska, Ted Stevens. He was an incomparable and one of kind senator.

With Ted, they broke the mold.

To me, he was my friend, mentor, and a person that comes along your pathway of life who changes everything.

In all my years in the House, I seldom sheathed my sword with appropriators who were always rustling our mandatory and authorized money. Our cause was just, but seldom successful.

It did not take Ted and Danny Inouye long to convince me not only to sheath my sword but give it to them. I had been in the Senate for just a few months when Ted cornered me on the Senate floor, jabbed me in my shoulder and said, "You're coming with me to North Korea. Don't argue with me, Dole says you are Mr. Agriculture. You don't have to say anything, just nod your head."

He was trying to arrange a third-party grain sale to alleviate constant famines in North Korea. He and Danny almost pulled it off.

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 the two join hands they make 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 who have the public trust know we are only as good as our staff, and Ted had the best, many of whom are in the audience.

As the Senator toting the bucket for our beloved 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 maybe we got retread tires and bailing wire.

Sid said, "Take in three requests. Make the first so big, he'll say, 'You know we can't afford that.' Then with number two, make that difficult to understand and fill it with acronyms, and he'll shut you down. Finally for your third request: take your number one ask and plead your case, 'What am I going to tell the Commandant? At least give me this.'"

And it would work. 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 lunch often 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 serve 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. However, he still lives within all of our hearts, and we thank the Lord for enabling us to live in his space and time.

I yield the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF EUGENE SCALIA

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to express my disapproval of the confirmation of Eugene Scalia as Secretary of Labor. America's workers are the backbone of our economy, and the Secretary of Labor should be entrusted to strengthen worker protections, support unions, and play a crucial role in ensuring a just economy. Instead, Eugene Scalia has repeatedly demonstrated that he prioritizes the well-being of corporate interests over those of workers. Throughout his career as a corporate lawyer, he fought against unions, worker safety regulations, and consumer protections 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 common-sense step towards protecting the retirement security of countless working families. Employers trying to design a quality plan for their workers, workers starting to save, and retirees 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 New York, 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. The Trump 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. MONAHAN

• 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 outreach, 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 came in 1999, 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. Over 3 years, 65 researchers at 30 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 Aquaculture Initiative. This initiative 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, a nonprofit that 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 2005.

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 Automobile Trades, eventually renamed the Flint Institute of Technology, under the direction of Mr. Albert Sobey, 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 highly successful, and in 1945, 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 added 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 cooperative education. Kettering University continued to grow and develop as technologies and advancements changed throughout the late 1980s and 1990s.

Today, Kettering University offers a variety of programs in addition to engineering related programs which include pre-med, bioinformatics, engineering, physics, and the expansion of their business program, including a master of business administration degree. Kettering University continues 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 into 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 such as Henry Juskiewicz, who is the former chairman and CEO of Gibson Guitar, James McCaslin, former President and COO of Harley-Davidson

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 milestone in 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 nonprofit, 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, OH. 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 the county's future.

APC has supported and collaborated with many organizations, including: Little Miami Conservatory (1967); Warren County Park District (1970); United Way of Warren County (1970); County Planner (1972); Warren County Career Center (1976); Ralph J. Stolle Country-side YMCA (1976); Warren County Big Brothers Big Sisters (1978); Well-head and Aquifer Protection (1992-1994); Widening (1994-1999); Warren County College Task Force (2001-2003); establishment of Sinclair Mason Campus (2007); and Rachel A. Hutzler 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.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 693. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property.

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

H.R. 598. An act to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Georgia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 724. An act to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

H.R. 835. An act to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1123. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the eastern judicial district of Arkansas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2426. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999.

The message also announced that pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 1903(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

At 12:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2513. An act to ensure that persons who form corporations or limited liability companies in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations or limited liability companies, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations and limited liability companies for criminal gain, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations and limited liability companies, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 598. An act to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 724. An act to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 835. An act to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1123. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the eastern judicial district of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2513. An act to ensure that persons who form corporations or limited liability companies in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations or limited liability companies, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations and limited liability companies for criminal gain, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations and limited liability companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the precipitous withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Syria and Afghanistan, and Turkey's unprovoked incursion into Syria.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2426. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2992. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2993. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule Part One: One National Program” ((RIN2127-AL76) (FRL No. 10000-45-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2994. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Eastern Connecticut Highlands Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2995. 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 Cod by Pot Catcher/Processors in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XY029) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2996. 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 “Release of Groundfish Reserves in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands” (RIN0648-XF292) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2997. 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; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XG591) 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 Cod by Hook-and-line Catcher/Processors in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (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-2999. 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 Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XY038) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3000. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2019 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Red Grouper” (RIN0648-XS012) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3001. 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 “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2019 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Other Jacks Complex” (RIN0648-XS013) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3002. 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 of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Closure for Spanish Mackerel” (RIN0648-XG588) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3003. 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 of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfers from NC to VA and ME to CT” (RIN0648-XX012) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3004. 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 “International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery in the ELAPS in 2019” (RIN0648-PIR-A001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3005. A communication from the 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 Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XY039) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3006. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provision; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2019 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting, and Requirement to Consider Chinook Salmon Bycatch Before Reapportioning Tribal Whiting” (RIN0648-BI67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3007. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, 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; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2019 and 2020 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish” (RIN0648-XG471) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3008. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Fishing Year 2019 Recreational Management Measures” (RIN0648-BI69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3009. 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 “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Hammerhead Shark Management Group in the Atlantic Region; Retention Limit Adjustment” (RIN0648-XT024) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3010. 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; Airbus SAS Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0441)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3011. 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; Airbus SAS Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0497)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3012. 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; Airbus SAS Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0194)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3013. 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; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0495)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3014. 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; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0715)) received during adjournment of

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; Rolls Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0693)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 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" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0444)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 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 0.25, Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (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" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0818)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3019. 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; Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (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; Manasquan Inlet, Manasquan, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0799)) 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 "Special Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico, Fort Myers Beach, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0602)) 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 Commis-

sion, 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, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3235-AM10) 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 reevaluation of an application for permanent resident status by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 an amendment:

S. 1751. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs (Rept. No. 116-140).

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, without amendment:

S. 1931. 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. 2137. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings 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. 1420. 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, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.

BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 2669. A bill 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, 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 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 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. BLUMENTHAL, 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. HAWLEY (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 provide an opportunity to build needed infrastructure in certain areas and to share the benefits of Federal employment with economically distressed regions; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mrs. CAPITO):

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 Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2674. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to establish a grant program for improving infrastructure asset management 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 a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH:

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. BROWN):

S. 2678. A bill to promote economic security and workplace accountability for the workers of air carriers, and their subcontractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2679. A bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, 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 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. BRAUN):

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 establish a task force to assist States in implementing hiring requirements for child care staff members to improve child safety; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2684. 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 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 analytics in certain federally assisted rental dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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.

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, Ms. 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. MERKLEY):

S. Con. Res. 28. A concurrent resolution congratulating the Portland Trail Blazers on the 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 Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) 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 names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as co-

sponsors 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 Department 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. 1253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1253, 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. 1300

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. BARRASSO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors

of S. 1300, 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 Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor 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. 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. 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. MARKEY, 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 Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend the FAST Act to repeal a rescission of funds.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2132

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2132, a bill to promote security and provide justice for United States victims of international terrorism.

S. 2158

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2158, a bill to improve certain programs of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to heritable disorders.

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 carbon monoxide alarms in certain federally assisted housing, and for other purposes.

S. 2216

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) 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. 2240

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2240, a bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy.

S. 2467

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2467, a bill to establish a program to award grants to entities that provide transportation connectors from critically underserved urban communities and rural communities to green spaces.

S. 2485

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2485, 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 bill 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 Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) 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 unprovoked incursion into Syria.

S. RES. 292

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, 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 Cameroonian 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 949

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. 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.

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 false new credit 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 account 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 the consumer's 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 appropriate 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 we were 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, and the President 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 learned some disturbing 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 run 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 make sure 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—to fill the gaps in our background check system and ensure that government agencies 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 dishonorably 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 the 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 breaking the existing law. Shortly after the Midland-Odessa shooting, we learned that the shooter failed a background check when he attempted to

buy a gun from a licensed dealer. He then managed to circumvent the process by purchasing his weapon from somebody who appears to have been in the business of manufacturing and selling guns but who is not a registered firearms dealer. By not registering as a dealer, the seller was able to skirt the legal requirement and sell a weapon to the shooter without conducting the necessary background check.

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 factor. I think we have to admit there 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 outpatient 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.

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.

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 cosponsors as other Senators have the opportunity to review this legislation—again, using the Fix NICS bill as a model of how we can build consensus and get something done that will save lives.

There is no quick fix, as I said, but there are commonsense measures we can take to reduce mass violence and protect the American people. As Texans continue to grieve in the aftermath of these attacks, I am committed to upholding my promise that I made to their families and friends to do something—to do what we can to prevent more communities from facing this sort of heartbreak.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 374—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

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 374

Whereas, in 1982, the United States deployed members of the Armed Forces to Lebanon as part of a multinational peacekeeping force;

Whereas, early on the morning of October 23, 1983, a truck packed with explosives detonated outside of a building at Beirut International Airport that served as quarters for several hundred members of the Armed Forces deployed as part of the peacekeeping force;

Whereas 241 members of the Armed Forces were killed in the blast;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces killed included 220 Marines, members of the Battalion Landing Team, 1st Battalion, 8th Marines Regiment, which made October 23, 1983, the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima in February and March 1945 during World War II;

Whereas, in addition to the Marine Corps casualties, 18 Navy sailors and 3 Army soldiers were killed, and more than 100 other members of the Armed Forces were injured;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces from 39 States and Puerto Rico died while serving in Beirut, Lebanon, from 1982 to 1984;

Whereas, on the same day as the bombing of the Marine Corps barracks, another suicide bomber killed 58 French paratroopers housed at another building in Beirut; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper to recognize the events of October 23, 1983, and the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in Beirut on that day through the establishment of a national day of remembrance on October 23, 2019: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of a national day of remembrance on October 23, 2019, for members of the Armed Forces of the United States who were killed or injured by the terrorist attack on the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23, 1983; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support and participate in appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities in observance of such a national day of remembrance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 375—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 375

Whereas October 2, 2019, marks the 75th anniversary of the tragic conclusion to the

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 and 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 in April 1943, 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 approximately 200,000 citizens of Poland killed, wounded, or missing;

Whereas Adolf Hitler ordered the annihilation of the city of Warsaw and the extermination of its citizens as punishment for the uprising, decimating 80 percent of Warsaw with no regard for the lives of the citizens of Warsaw or for 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 people fled 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 industry led to the incorporation of new towns and the subsequent growth of those towns;

Whereas the heroic actions of the Polish underground resistance 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, That 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 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 the 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 sold-out NBA games, at 814 games;

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 lifted 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 embarking upon their 50th season;

(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. 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.

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, 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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, 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY 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. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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, 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. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) 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 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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, 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. 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 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. JONES) 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 HOLLEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. TOOMEY (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. 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 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 by her 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.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 967. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and 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 IV of division C, insert the following:

PROHIBITION OF USE OF FUNDS TO DIVERT FUNDS FROM THE SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ACT SPECIAL ACCOUNT

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 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 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 "NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION" 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 Office of Administration under the heading "ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES" under the heading "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION" under this title shall be decreased by \$2,000,000.

SA 969. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and 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 230, line 17, strike "\$1,357,182,000" and insert "\$1,358,182,000 (of which \$4,088,000 shall be for activities under section 5(d)(2) of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2353; 130 Stat. 1786))".

On page 263, line 9, strike "\$136,244,000" and insert "\$135,244,000".

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 124, line 14, strike “\$331,114,000” and insert “\$330,114,000”.

On page 168, line 17, strike “\$34,000,000” and insert “\$35,000,000”.

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 310, lines 12 and 13, strike “and conducting an international program as authorized, \$317,964,000” and insert “\$314,964,000”.

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 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. Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) PORTABILITY OF VOUCHERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘covered public housing agency’ means a public housing agency that, in a given fiscal year, utilizes less than 95 of the budget authority available to the public housing agency;

“(ii) the term ‘initial public housing agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘initial PHA’ in section 982.4 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(iii) the term ‘portable family’ means a family holding a voucher under this subsection that seeks to rent a dwelling unit outside of the jurisdiction of the initial public housing agency.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—A covered public housing agency that has jurisdiction over the area in which a portable family is seeking to use the voucher received from an initial public housing agency—

“(i) 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;

“(ii) shall make assistance payments to the portable family under an annual contributions contract entered into between the covered public housing agency and the Secretary; and

“(iii) may not bill the initial public housing agency for those assistance payments.”.

SA 973. 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. ____ (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated under this Act or any other Act may be used for—

(1) purchase, acquire, or distribute extraneous promotional items, including blankets, buttons, clothing, coloring books, cups, fidget spinners, hats, holiday ornaments, jar grip openers, keychains, koozies, magnets, neckties, novelties, snuggles, stickers, stress balls, stuffed animals, tchotchkes, thermoses, tote bags, trading cards, or writing utensils; or

(2) manufacture or use a mascot or costumed 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;

(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. ____ (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 subgrantee 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;

(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 governments 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 project or program; 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. ____ Notwithstanding section 2, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any division of the 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. 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 231, line 15, strike “\$58,770,000” and insert “\$67,270,000”.

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 108-421; 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. 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 231, line 15, strike “\$58,770,000” and insert “\$67,270,000”.

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 108-421; 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. WARNER) 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. ____ . FINANCING OF SALES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO CUBA.

(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 any loan or extension of credit.

(c) 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”;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “PROHIBITION” and all that follows through “(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding” and inserting “IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by moving those subsections, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left; and

(4) by striking “paragraph (1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”.

SA 982. 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:

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 I—CONTINENTAL 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 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) made by section 142(a).

(2) HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.—The term “Historic Landscape” means the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape designated by section 147(a).

(3) RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Recreation Management Area” means the Tenmile Recreation Management Area designated by section 144(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.—The term “Wildlife Conservation Area” means, as applicable—

(A) the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 145(a); and

(B) the Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 146(a).

SEC. 142. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), 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) HOLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 3,866 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Megan Dickie Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Holy Cross Wilderness Addition Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and

managed as part of, the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by section 102(a)(5) of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3266).

“(24) HOOSIER RIDGE 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 ‘Tenmile 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 Addition’ and ‘Proposed Spraddle Creek Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Eagles Nest Wilderness Additions Proposal’ 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 such terms and 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 are considered to be necessary by 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 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405).

(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 1993 (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. 143. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, comprising approximately 8,036 acres and generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains 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 (d), the potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) this section.

(C) LIVESTOCK USE OF VACANT ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall publish a determination regarding whether to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the “Big Hole Allotment”; and

(B) the “Blue Ridge Allotment”.

(2) MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify or combine the vacant allotments referred to in that paragraph.

(3) PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a determination 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).

(D) RANGE IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary permits livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the potential wilderness area under subsection (c), the Secretary, or a third party authorized by the Secretary, may use any motorized or mechanized transport or equipment for purposes of constructing or rehabilitating such range improvements as are necessary to obtain appropriate livestock management objectives (including habitat and watershed restoration).

(2) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this subsection terminates on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary publishes a positive determination under subsection (c)(3).

(E) DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be designated as wilderness, to be known as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness”.

(A) effective not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) on the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that the construction or rehabilitation of range improvements under subsection (d) is complete;

(ii) the date described in subsection (d)(2); and

(iii) the effective date of a determination of the Secretary not to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock under subsection (c)(1).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77); and

(B) this part.

SEC. 144. 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 Tenmile Recreation Management Area” on the map entitled “Tenmile Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Tenmile Recreation Management Area”.

(b) PURPOSES.—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.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area—

(A) 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; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Recreation Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) VEHICLES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized for motorized vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Recreation Management Area.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes or roadside camping;

(III) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(IV) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out any activity described in subsection (d), (e)(1), or (f); or

(V) responding to an emergency.

(C) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Recreation Management Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Recreation Management Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) WATER.—

(1) EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area of—

(A) water management infrastructure in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any future infrastructure necessary for the development or exercise of water rights decreed before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Recreation Management Area.

(f) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(g) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(h) PERMITS.—Nothing in this section alters or limits—

(1) any permit held by a ski area or other entity; or

(2) the acceptance, review, or implementation of associated activities or facilities proposed or authorized by law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.

SEC. 145. PORCUPINE GULCH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,287 acres of Federal land located in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as “Proposed 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) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor over Interstate 70; and

(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) RECREATION.—The Secretary may permit such recreational activities in the Wildlife Conservation Area that the Secretary determines are consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(C) MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT; NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—

(i) MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles and mechanized transport in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be prohibited.

(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.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(II) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(III) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(IV) responding to an emergency.

(D) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 150(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(g) WATER.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 146. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 3,528 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, recreational, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or

(III) responding to an emergency.

(C) BICYCLES.—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(D) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(E) GRAZING.—The laws (including regulations) and policies followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall continue to apply with regard to the land in the Wildlife Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(d) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 150(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) WATER.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 147. CAMP HALE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 28,676 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Camp Hale National Historic Landscape” on the map entitled “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape Proposal” and

dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape”.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—

(1) to provide for—

(A) the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(B) the historic preservation of the Historic Landscape, consistent with—

(i) the designation of the Historic Landscape as a national historic site; and

(ii) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape;

(C) recreational 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

(D) the continued environmental remediation and removal of unexploded ordnance at the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site and the Camp Hale historic cantonment area; and

(2) 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) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) 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).

(2) 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 role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(ii) conducting historic preservation activities;

(iii) managing recreational opportunities, including the use and stewardship of—

(I) the road and trail systems; and

(II) dispersed recreation resources;

(iv) 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

(v) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(3) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(d) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape—

(A) to improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(B) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities and facilities; and

(C) to conserve historic values in the Camp Hale area.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the project described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall coordinate with—

- (A) the Corps of Engineers;
- (B) the Camp Hale-Eagle River Headwaters Collaborative Group;
- (C) the National Forest Foundation;
- (D) the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment;
- (E) the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office;
- (F) units of local government; and
- (G) other interested organizations and members of the public.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall continue to carry out the projects and activities of the Department of the Army in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to cleanup of—

- (A) the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site; or
- (B) the Camp Hale historic cantonment area.

(2) REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may remove unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) from the Historic Landscape, as the Secretary of the Army determines to be appropriate in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

(B) ACTION ON RECEIPT OF NOTICE.—On receipt from the Secretary of a notification of unexploded ordnance under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary of the Army may remove the unexploded ordnance in accordance with—

- (i) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;
- (ii) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and
- (iii) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(3) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to environmental remediation or removal of any unexploded ordnance located in or around the Camp Hale historic cantonment area, the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site, or the Historic Landscape, including such an obligation under—

- (A) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;
- (B) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or
- (C) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement—

- (1) to specify—
 - (A) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscape; and
 - (B) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to environmental remediation and the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) to require the Secretary to provide to the Secretary of the Army, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, a management plan for the Historic Landscape for purposes of the removal activities described in subsection (e).

(g) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the jurisdiction of the State over any water law, water right, or adjudication or administration relating to any water resource;

(2) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or

the exercise of such a water right, including—

(A) a water right under an interstate water compact (including full development of any apportionment made in accordance with such a compact);

(B) a water right decreed within, above, below, or through the Historic Landscape;

(C) a water right held by the United States;

(D) the management or operation of any reservoir, including the storage, management, release, or transportation of water; and

(E) the construction or operation of such infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations);

(3) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any reserved or appropriative water right;

(4) alters or limits—

(A) a permit held by a ski area;

(B) the implementation of activities governed by a ski area permit; or

(C) the authority of the Secretary to modify or expand an existing ski area permit;

(5) prevents the Secretary from closing portions of the Historic Landscape for public safety, environmental remediation, or other use in accordance with applicable laws; or

(6) affects—

(A) any special use permit in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the renewal of a permit described in subparagraph (A).

(h) FUNDING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a special account, to be known as the “Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund \$10,000,000, to be available to the Secretary until expended, for activities relating to historic interpretation, preservation, and restoration carried out in and around the Historic Landscape.

SEC. 148. WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the White River National Forest is modified to include the approximately 120 acres comprised of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$, the SE $\frac{1}{4}$, and the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 1, T. 2 S., R. 80 W., 6th Principal Meridian, in Summit County in the State.

(b) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, the boundaries of the White River National Forest, as modified under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 149. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL WILDERNESS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for the ongoing maintenance and use of portions of the Trail River Ranch and the associated property located within Rocky Mountain National Park in Grand County in the State.

(b) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1952(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1070) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Potential Wilderness is modified to exclude the area comprising approximately 15.5 acres of land identified as ‘Poten-

tial Wilderness to Non-wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Rocky Mountain National Park Proposed Wilderness Area Amendment’ and dated January 16, 2018.”.

SEC. 150. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this part 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 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) the 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 maps 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) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdrawn from—

- (1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) 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 Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152); and

(B) a Special Management Area.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Special Management Area” means each of—

(A) the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area designated by section 153(a)(1); and

(B) the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area designated by section 153(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 by adding at the end the following:

“(27) LIZARD HEAD WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 3,141 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Wilson, Sunshine, Black Face and San Bernardo Additions to the Lizard Head Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Lizard Head Wilderness.

“(28) MOUNT SNEFFELS WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—

“(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(B) WHITEHOUSE ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Whitehouse Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(29) MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land in the State of Colorado comprising approximately 8,884 acres of Bureau of Land Management land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed McKenna Peak Wilderness Area’ and dated September 18, 2018, to be known as the ‘McKenna Peak Wilderness’.”

SEC. 153. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison and San Juan National Forests in the State comprising approximately 21,663 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018, is designated as the “Sheep Mountain Special Management Area”.

(2) LIBERTY BELL EAST SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 792 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the “Liberty Bell East Special Management Area”.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and pro-

tect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the geological, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, 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. 1600 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 Federal land, 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 have been authorized by permit or license as of the date of enactment of this Act to continue within the Special Management Areas, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) PERMITTING.—The designation of the Special Management Areas by subsection (a) shall not affect the issuance of permits relating to the activities covered under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) BICYCLES.—The Secretary may permit the use of bicycles in—

(i) the portion of the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area identified as “Ophir Valley Area” on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018; and

(ii) the portion of the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area identified as “Liberty Bell Corridor” on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—Water and water rights in the Special Management Areas shall be administered in accordance with section 8 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this subtitle—

(1) any reference contained in that section to “the lands designated as wilderness by this Act”, “the Piedra, Roubideau, and Tabeguache areas identified in section 9 of this Act, or the Bowen Gulch Protection Area or the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area identified in sections 5 and 6 of this Act”, or “the areas described in sections 2, 5, 6, and 9 of this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Special Management Areas”; and

(2) any reference contained in that section to “this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

SEC. 154. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111–11 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 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.”

(b) MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

(1) 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 McKenna Peak Wilderness Study Area in San Miguel County in the State not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in paragraph (1) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152)—

(A) 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

(B) shall be managed in accordance with applicable laws.

SEC. 155. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this part 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 or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, 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. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) and the Special Management Areas 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 or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, 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 Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

(d) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a Special Management Area or the wilderness designated under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) 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 or Special Management Area in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the applicable 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 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101–405) or H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96–617).

(f) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary with jurisdiction over a wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) may carry out any activity in the wilderness area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(g) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the covered land and the approximately 6,590 acres generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Naturita Canyon Mineral Withdrawal Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

PART III—THOMPSON DIVIDE

SEC. 161. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this part are—

(1) subject to valid existing rights, to withdraw certain Federal land in the Thompson Divide area from mineral and other disposal laws; and

(2) to promote the capture of fugitive methane emissions that would otherwise be emitted into the atmosphere—

(A) to reduce methane gas emissions; and

(B) to provide—

(i) new renewable electricity supplies and other beneficial uses of fugitive methane emissions; and

(ii) increased royalties for taxpayers.

SEC. 162. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS.**—The term “fugitive methane emissions” means methane gas from those Federal lands in Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County

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, inactive, 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—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or

(ii) 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) **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”.

(8) **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 007496, COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 051645, and COC 051646, and generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as “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) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) **SURVEYS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area shall be determined by surveys approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 164. THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In exchange for the relinquishment by a leaseholder of all Thompson Divide leases of the leaseholder, the Secretary may issue to the leaseholder credits for any bid, royalty, or rental payment due under any Federal oil or gas lease on Federal land in the State, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNT OF CREDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of the credits issued to a lease-

holder of a Thompson Divide lease relinquished under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount of the bonus bids paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases;

(ii) the amount of any rental paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of the date on which the leaseholder submits to the Secretary a notice of the decision to relinquish the applicable Thompson Divide leases; and

(iii) the amount of any expenses incurred by the leaseholder of the applicable Thompson Divide leases in the preparation of any drilling permit, sundry notice, or other related submission in support of the development of the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of January 28, 2019, including any expenses relating to the preparation of any analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) require the approval of the Secretary.

(2) **EXCLUSION.**—The amount of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall not include any expenses paid by the leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease for legal fees or related expenses for legal work with respect to a Thompson Divide lease.

(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) accepted 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

(B) section 20 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019).

(e) **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)—

(A) shall be held in perpetuity; and

(B) shall not be—

(i) transferred;

(ii) reissued; or

(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 165. GREATER THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **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) **PLAN.**—

(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 State;
- (ii) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State;
- (iii) lessees of Federal coal within the counties referred to in clause (ii);
- (iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and
- (v) interested members of the public.

(b) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.**—

(1) **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.

(2) **CONDUCT.**—The Secretary may conduct the inventory under paragraph (1) through, or in collaboration with—

- (A) the Bureau of Land Management;
- (B) the United States Geological Survey;
- (C) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (D) the United States Forest Service;
- (E) State departments or agencies;
- (F) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State;
- (G) the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District;
- (H) institutions of higher education in the State;
- (I) lessees of Federal coal within a county referred to in subparagraph (F);
- (J) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;
- (K) the National Center for Atmospheric Research; or
- (L) other interested entities, including members of the public.

(3) **CONTENTS.**—The inventory under paragraph (1) shall include—

- (A) the general location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions;
- (B) 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 emissions estimate;
- (C) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year;
- (D) relevant data and other information available from—
 - (i) the Environmental Protection Agency;
 - (ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration;
 - (iii) the Colorado Department of Natural Resources;
 - (iv) the Colorado Public Utility Commission;
 - (v) the Colorado Department of Health and Environment; and

(vi) the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; and

(E) such other information as may be useful in advancing the purposes of the pilot program.

(4) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION; DISCLOSURE.**—

(A) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—The Secretary shall provide opportunities for public participation in the inventory under this subsection.

(B) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the inventory under this subsection publicly available.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary to publicly release information that—

- (i) poses a threat to public safety;
- (ii) is confidential business information; or
- (iii) is otherwise protected from public disclosure.

(5) **USE.**—The Secretary shall use the inventory in carrying out—

- (A) the leasing program under subsection (c); and
- (B) the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions under subsection (d).

(c) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION LEASING PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and in accordance with this section, not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the inventory required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall carry out a program to encourage the use and destruction of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINES SUBJECT TO LEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall authorize the holder of a valid existing Federal coal lease for a mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions to capture for use, or destroy by flaring, the fugitive methane emissions.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be—

- (i) subject to valid existing rights; and
- (ii) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—The program carried out under paragraph (1) shall only include fugitive methane emissions that can be captured for use, or destroyed by flaring, in a manner that does not—

- (i) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker; or
- (ii) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.

(D) **COOPERATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the holders of valid existing Federal coal leases for mines that produce fugitive methane emissions to encourage—

(I) the capture of 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; or

(II) if the beneficial use of the fugitive methane emissions is not feasible, the destruction of the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(ii) **GUIDANCE.**—In furtherance of the purposes of this paragraph, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of Federal authorities and programs to encourage the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions while minimizing impacts on natural resources or other public interest values.

(E) **ROYALTIES.**—The Secretary shall determine whether any fugitive methane emissions used or destroyed pursuant to this paragraph are subject to the payment of a royalty under applicable law.

(3) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, notwithstanding section 163, subject to valid existing rights, and in accordance with section 21 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 241) and any other applicable law, the Secretary shall—

(i) authorize the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land; and

(ii) make available for leasing such fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land as the Secretary considers to be in the public interest.

(B) **SOURCE.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall offer for lease each significant vent, seep, or other source of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines.

(C) **BID QUALIFICATIONS.**—A bid to lease fugitive methane emissions under this paragraph shall specify whether the prospective lessee intends—

(i) to capture the 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;

(ii) to destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring; or

(iii) to employ a specific combination of—

(I) capturing the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use; and

(II) destroying the fugitive methane emission by flaring.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If there is more than 1 qualified bid for a lease under this paragraph, the Secretary shall select the bid that the Secretary determines is likely to most significantly advance the public interest.

(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining the public interest under clause (i), 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.

(E) **LEASE FORM.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and provide to prospective bidders a lease form for leases issued under this paragraph.

(ii) **DUE DILIGENCE.**—The lease form developed under clause (i) shall include terms and conditions requiring the leased fugitive methane emissions to be put to beneficial use or flared by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the lease.

(F) **ROYALTY RATE.**—The Secretary shall develop a minimum bid and royalty rate for leases under this paragraph to advance the purposes of this section, to the maximum extent practicable.

(d) **SEQUESTRATION.**—If, by not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any significant fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land are not leased under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—

(1) to cap those fugitive methane emissions at the source in any case in which the cap will result in the long-term sequestration of all or a significant portion of the fugitive methane emissions; or

(2) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(e) **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 Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) any recommendations by the Secretary on whether the pilot program could be expanded geographically to include other significant sources of fugitive methane emissions from coal mines.

SEC. 166. EFFECT.

Except as expressly provided in this part, nothing in this part—

(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing mineral leases, mineral interest, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in accordance 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 applicable 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:

(1) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary”, numbered 616/100.485C, and dated August 11, 2016.

(2) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.**—The term “National Recreation Area” means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 172(a).

(3) **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 Secretary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(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 the Curecanti National Recreation Area, in accordance with this subtitle, consisting 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 administer the National Recreation Area in accordance with—

(A) this part; and

(B) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) **DAM, POWERPLANT, AND RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this part affects or interferes with the authority of the Secretary—

(i) to operate the Uncompahgre Valley Reclamation Project under the reclamation laws;

(ii) to operate the Wayne N. Aspinall Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); or

(iii) under the Federal Water Project Reclamation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–12 et seq.).

(B) **RECLAMATION LAND.**—

(i) **SUBMISSION OF REQUEST TO RETAIN ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.**—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Secretary a request for the Commissioner of Reclamation to retain administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land within the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects” that the Commissioner of Reclamation identifies as necessary for the effective operation of Bureau of Reclamation water facilities, the Secretary may—

(I) approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the request; and

(II) if the request is approved under subclause (I), make any modifications to the map that are necessary to reflect that the Commissioner of Reclamation retains management authority over the minimum quantity of land required to fulfill the reclamation mission.

(ii) **TRANSFER OF LAND.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects”, as modified pursuant to clause (i)(II), if applicable, shall be transferred from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Director of the National Park Service by not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(II) **ACCESS TO TRANSFERRED LAND.**—

(aa) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to item (bb), the Commissioner of Reclamation shall retain access to the land transferred to the Director of the National Park Service under subclause (I) for reclamation purposes, including for the operation, maintenance, and expansion or replacement of facilities.

(bb) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be determined by a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the National Park Service not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into management agreements, or modify management agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, relating to the authority of the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service to manage Federal land within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(B) **STATE LAND.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements for any land administered by the State that is within or adjacent to the National Recreation Area, in accordance with the cooperative management authority under section 101703 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) **RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allow boating, boating-related activities, hunting, and fishing in the National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws.

(B) **CLOSURES; DESIGNATED ZONES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, acting through the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area, may designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no boating, hunting, or fishing shall be permitted in the National Recreation Area under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws.

(ii) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—Except in the case of an emergency, any closure proposed by the Secretary under clause (i) shall not take effect until after the date on which the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area consults with—

(I) the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities; and

(II) the Board of County Commissioners in each county in which the zone is proposed to be designated.

(5) **LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.**—On the written request of an individual that owns private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may work in partnership with the individual to enhance the long-term conservation of natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resources in and around the National Recreation Area—

(A) by acquiring all or a portion of the private 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 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) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(7) **GRAZING.**—

(A) **STATE LAND SUBJECT TO A STATE GRazing 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 allow the grazing to continue for the remainder of the term of the lease, subject to the related terms and conditions of user agreements, including permitted stocking rates, grazing fee levels, access rights, and ownership and use of range improvements.

(ii) **ACCESS.**—A lessee of State land may continue its use of established routes within the National Recreation Area to access State land for purposes of administering the lease if the use was permitted before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—The Secretary may, in accordance with applicable laws, authorize grazing on land acquired from the State or private landowners under section 173, if grazing was established before the date of acquisition.

(C) **PRIVATE LAND.**—On private land acquired under section 173 for the National Recreation Area on which authorized 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 between 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 continuation 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, unless the Secretary determines that grazing on the Federal land would present unacceptable 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.

(8) **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;

(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 appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(9) **FISHING EASEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this part diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinall Unit developed under section 8 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. 620g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (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 EASEMENTS.**—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 for fishing within 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 under 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.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(2) **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;

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) exchange.

(B) **STATE LAND.**—Land or interests in land owned by the State or a political subdivision 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 2,560 acres of land identified on the map as "U.S. Forest 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 the revocation 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 as 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 172(c)(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; and

(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 made 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.

SA 983. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and 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:

On page 63, line 12, strike "\$335,000,000" and insert "\$338,000,000".

On page 65, line 5, strike "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

SA 984. 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, insert the following:

SEC. . . STUDY ON THE IMPACTS OF THE IMPORTATION OF ORCHIDS.

(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.

(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 from the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service 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 985. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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 15, strike "\$2,623,582,000" and insert "\$2,632,582,000".

On page 289, strike lines 21 and 22 and insert "\$480,741,000 shall be for Geographic Programs specified in the report accompanying this Act, except that \$85,000,000 shall be for the Chesapeake Bay Program (as defined in section 117(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267(a)), of which \$9,000,000 shall be for nutrient and sediment removal grants, \$9,000,000 shall be for small watershed grants to control polluted runoff from urban, suburban, and agricultural lands, and \$6,000,000 shall be for State-based implementation in the most effective basins."

SA 986. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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. ____ . FAIR TREATMENT UNDER THE ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Transportation shall re-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. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, 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:

On page 263, line 9, strike “\$136,244,000” and insert “\$96,244,000”.

On page 310, line 25, strike “\$40,000,000” and insert “\$80,000,000”.

SA 988. 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 division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . (a) In this section—

(1) the term “Federal employee” has the meaning given the term “employee” in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to whether the employee is exempted from the application of some or all of such title 5;

(2) the term “sexual assault offense” means a criminal offense under Federal law or the law of a State that includes as an element of the offense that the defendant engaged in a nonconsensual sexual act upon another person; and

(3) the term “sustained complaint involving sexual assault” means an administrative or judicial determination that an employer engaged in an unlawful employment practice under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) that included, as part of the course of conduct constituting the unlawful employment practice, that an employee of the employer engaged in a non-consensual sexual act upon another person.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the basic pay, or to increase the basic pay, of a Federal employee who—

(1) has been convicted of a sexual assault offense; or

(2) is the individual who engaged in a non-consensual sexual act upon another person that was part of the course of conduct constituting the applicable unlawful employment practice in a sustained complaint involving sexual assault that has become final.

SA 989. 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:

On page 28, line 12, strike “\$15,000,000 shall be available” and insert “\$25,000,000 shall be transferred from the Asset Forfeiture Fund”.

SA 990. 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:

Beginning on page 58, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 59, line 1, and insert the following:

(18) \$10,000,000 for a competitive grant pilot program for qualified nonprofit organizations to provide legal representation to immigrants arriving at the southwest border seeking asylum and other forms of legal protection in the United States; and

(19) \$67,000,000 for grants to be administered

SA 991. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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. ____ . 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 a secondary charge unrelated to marijuana possession, cultivation, or distribution, including—

(A) the rates of such arrests at the Federal level, including the number of Federal prisoners so arrested, disaggregated by sex, age, race, and ethnicity of the prisoners; 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.

(2) The rates of arrests and citations at the Federal and State levels related to teenage use of marijuana.

(3) The rates of arrests at the Federal and State levels for unlawful driving under the influence of a substance, and the rates of such arrests involving marijuana.

(4) The rates of marijuana-related prosecutions, court filings, and imprisonments.

(5) The total monetary amounts expended for marijuana-related enforcement, arrests, court filings and proceedings, and imprisonment before and after legalization, including Federal expenditures disaggregated according to whether the laws being enforced were Federal or State laws.

(6) The total number and rate of defendants in Federal criminal prosecutions asserting as a defense that their conduct was in compliance with applicable State law legalizing marijuana usage, and the effects of such assertions.

(c) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) address both State programs that have legalized marijuana for medicinal use and those that have legalized marijuana for adult non-medicinal use and to the extent practicable distinguish between such programs and their effects;

(2) include a national assessment of average trends across States with such programs in relation to the effects on economy, public health, criminal justice, and employment in the respective States, including with respect to the items listed in subsection (b); and

(3) describe—

(A) any barriers that impeded the ability to complete or update aspects of the study required by subsection (a)(1) and how such barriers can be overcome for purposes of future studies; and

(B) any gaps in the data sought for the study required by subsection (a)(1) and how these gaps can be eliminated or otherwise addressed for purposes of future studies.

(d) BEST PRACTICES FOR DATA COLLECTION BY STATES.—Best practices developed pursuant to this section shall consist of best practices for the collection by States of the information described in the items listed in subsection (b), including best practices for improving—

(1) data collection;

(2) analytical capacity;

(3) research integrity; and

(4) the comparability of data across States.

SA 992. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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. ____ . 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:

In the appropriate place in title II of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The matter under the heading “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses” in title I of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 609-610) is amended by striking the 6th proviso.

(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 111-8; 123 Stat. 3128-3129) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2010 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2010”.

(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 Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 111-8; 123 Stat. 574-576) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2009 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2009”.

(d) 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 110-161; 121 Stat. 1903-1904) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2008 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2008”.

(e) The 6th proviso under the heading “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses” in title I of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 109-108; 119 Stat. 2295-2296) 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 Appropriations Act, 2005 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 108-447; 118 Stat. 2859-2860) is amended by striking “with respect to any fiscal year”.

(g) The matter under the heading “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses” in title I of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 609-610) is amended by striking the 7th proviso.

(h) Section 511 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)”;

(2) by striking the semicolon and all that follows and inserting a period.

SA 994. Mr. MERKLEY 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:

SEC. 1 _____. There is appropriated \$2,000,000 to the Director of the United States Geological Survey to coordinate 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. 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 A, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. None of the funds made available by this 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. MERKLEY, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN) 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:

Strike section 113 of division C and insert the following:

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES, SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

SEC. 113. (a) Section 6906 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 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) \$282,000,000 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. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING) 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 365, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE BIOMASS UNDER RENEWABLE FUEL PROGRAM

SEC. _____. Section 211(o)(1)(I) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(I)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) through (vii) as clauses (v) through (ix), respectively; and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) Trees and tree 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 products manufacturing, including, but not limited to, sawdust, wood chips, shavings, bark, sanderdust, 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;

“(II) are slash, precommercial thinnings, or derived from ecological restoration activities;

“(III) are harvested in a manner consistent with applicable Federal laws (including regulations) and land management plans; and

“(IV) 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. 6511)) from acreage included within a community wildfire 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;

“(BB) an authorized hazardous fuels reduction project under section 102 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6512); or

“(CC) a project carried out under section 602(d) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6591a(d)); or

“(cc) an area identified as a priority area for wildfire threat in a State-wide assessment and State-wide strategy developed in accordance with section 2A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101a).”.

SA 998. 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 title II of division E, insert the following:

SEC. 2 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used 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. MERKLEY) 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:

SEC. 1. EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.

(a) DEFINITION OF FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—Section 3(11) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(11)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (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 2018, the amount that is equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2017; and

“(F) for fiscal year 2019 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. 7111) is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “and 2018” 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. 7112(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(D)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018” and inserting “FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2020”; and

(II) by striking “for fiscal years 2017 or 2018” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020”; and

(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”.

(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. 7112(d)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(F)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018” and inserting “FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2020”; and

(II) by striking “for fiscal years 2017 and 2018” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(D)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018” and inserting “FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2020”; and

(II) by striking “for fiscal years 2017 and 2018” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020”.

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) 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”.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2020” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “2021” and inserting “2023”.

(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—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2020” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “2021” and inserting “2023”.

SA 1000. 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. 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:

Strike section 113 of division C and insert the following:

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILT)

SEC. 113. Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal year 2019” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2019 through 2029”.

SA 1001. 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 title II of division E, 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 under section 210, the Secretary shall transfer the assistance to 1 or more other multifamily housing projects in accordance with the conditions under section 210(c), effective—

(1) as of the date of termination of the contract; or

(2) 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. Ms. 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 “\$2,761,00,000” 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATING TO ROADLESS MANAGEMENT IN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the draft environmental impact statement described in the notice of the Forest Service entitled “Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; National Forest System Lands in Alaska” (84 Fed. Reg. 55522 (October 17, 2019)).

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. _____. 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 5000A 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. _____. 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 opioid epidemic 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:

SEC. 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) owners of manufactured homes have 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 ¾ of the new affordable housing produced in the United States and remains a significant source of unsubsidized affordable housing in the United States;

(6) in 2015, the average cost 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 the home owners vulnerable to rent 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-owned developments in more than a dozen States;

(16) members of manufactured home communities continue to own such homes individually, own 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 make major decisions within the 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 nonprofit owned communities have 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 tax 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:

SEC. 2 _____. (a) An additional \$1,000,000 shall be available for rental assistance and associated administrative fees for Tribal HUD-VASH under the heading “TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE” under the heading “PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING” under this title, 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 \$1,000,000.

SA 1008. 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 85, line 22, insert “: *Provided*, That of such amount, not to exceed \$95,000,000 shall remain available until expended for Discovery Research PreK-12” after “2021”.

SA 1009. 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 84, line 20, strike “\$6,769,670,000” and insert “\$6,770,670,000”.

On page 86, line 8, strike “\$336,900,000” and insert “\$335,900,000”.

SA 1010. Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WARNER)

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 383, line 10, insert the following after “Budget” : “*Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for Enterprise, Concept Development, Human Factors, and Demonstration, not less than \$9,500,000 shall be available for the remote tower pilot program as authorized by section 161 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 47104 note)”.

SA 1011. 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 120, line 17, strike “\$46,782,000” and insert “\$41,782,000”.

On page 223, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 7 _____. There is appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out section 310I of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1936c).

SA 1012. Mr. Kaine 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 238, line 5, strike the period and insert “: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 9 of the 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 115-102), of the amounts made available under this heading, \$500,000 shall be made available to carry out that Act.”.

On page 288, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

400 YEARS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY COMMISSION

SEC. 117. (a) Section 7(b) of the 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 115-102) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “July 1, 2020” and inserting “July 1, 2021”.

(b) Section 8(a) of the 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 115-102) is amended by striking “July 1, 2020” and inserting “July 1, 2021”.

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. 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:

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, 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)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(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 disasters, \$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 declared by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) 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:

SEC. 192. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to terminate a grant or cooperative agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority;

(2) to deobligate funding associated with a grant or cooperative agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority; or

(3) to require the State of California or the California High-Speed Rail Authority to

repay funding previously obligated and expended.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply to Cooperative Agreement FR-HSR-0009-10-01-06 and any other grant or cooperative agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority in effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-117), deobligated funds associated with Cooperative Agreement FR-HSR-0118-12-01-01 may not be made available for any purpose until the final determination of any litigation concerning such funds.

(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the final determination of any litigation referred to in subsection (c), deobligated funds referred to in subsection (c) shall be made available only for high-speed rail projects under section 26106 of title 49, United States Code, in accordance with such section.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(A) issue a notice of funding opportunity for grants for projects referred to in paragraph (1) not later than 30 days after the final determination of litigation referred to in subsection (c);

(B) ensure that such notice of funding opportunity requires applications to be submitted not later than 30 days after the issuance of such notice;

(C) require such applications to include completed documentation with respect to any required environmental impact statements; and

(D) award grants not later than 60 days after the issuance of notice under subparagraph (A).

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 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 UNDER 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 "5,000" and inserting "1,000"; and

(B) by striking the table and inserting the following:

"If population equals— ... the limitation is equal to the population times—"

1,000	\$254.40
2,000	\$230.66
3,000	\$212.00
4,000	\$198.43
5,000	\$186.56
6,000	\$174.71
7,000	\$164.50
8,000	\$152.67
9,000	\$142.45
10,000	\$130.55
11,000	\$127.22
12,000	\$123.83
13,000	\$118.73
14,000	\$115.34
15,000	\$111.92
16,000	\$110.24
17,000	\$108.51
18,000	\$106.85
19,000	\$105.16
20,000	\$103.51
21,000	\$101.76
22,000	\$100.07
23,000	\$100.07
24,000	\$98.37
25,000	\$96.69
26,000	\$94.98
27,000	\$94.98
28,000	\$94.98
29,000	\$93.31
30,000	\$93.31
31,000	\$91.59
32,000	\$91.59
33,000	\$89.88
34,000	\$89.88
35,000	\$88.17
36,000	\$88.17
37,000	\$86.48
38,000	\$86.48
39,000	\$84.82
40,000	\$84.82
41,000	\$83.09
42,000	\$81.42
43,000	\$81.42
44,000	\$79.69
45,000	\$79.69
46,000	\$78.03
47,000	\$78.03
48,000	\$76.33
49,000	\$76.33
50,000	\$74.63."

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. . . REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Each amount made available under division A, B, C, or D of this Act (in this section referred to as a "fiscal year 2020 amount") shall be reduced by the 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: “in—

“(A) fish farming; and

“(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) fish farming; and

“(B) in 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 D, 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 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.”; and

(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, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”; and

(B) in subsection (o), by adding at the end the following:

“(21) CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS.—Each dwelling unit receiving tenant-based assistance or project-based assistance under this subsection 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.”.

(b) Section 202(j) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS.—Each owner of a dwelling unit assisted under this section shall ensure that carbon monoxide alarms or detectors are 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.”.

(c) Section 811(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:

“(i) 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, 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 with loans under this section 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 Inter-

national 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 Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”; and

(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 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) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide guidance to public housing agencies (as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)) on how to educate tenants on health hazards in the home, including to carbon monoxide poisoning, lead poisoning, asthma induced by housing-related allergens, and other housing-related preventable outcomes, to help advance primary prevention and prevent future deaths and other harms.

(g) Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to preempt or limit the applicability of any State or local law relating to the installation and maintenance of carbon monoxide alarms or detectors in housing that requires standards that are more stringent than the standards described in the amendments made by this section.

(h) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Consumer Product Safety Commission, shall conduct a study and issue a publicly available report on requiring carbon monoxide alarms or detectors in federally assisted housing that is not covered in the amendments made by this section.

SA 1022. 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 division A, insert the following:

TITLE —ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN OF 2019

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Assault Weapons Ban of 2019”.

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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 and chamber the next round; and

“(B) requires a separate pull of the trigger to fire each cartridge.

“(31) 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:

“(36) The term ‘semiautomatic assault weapon’ means any of the following, regardless of country of manufacture or caliber of ammunition accepted:

“(A) A semiautomatic rifle that has the capacity to accept a detachable magazine and any 1 of the following:

“(i) A pistol grip.

“(ii) A forward grip.

“(iii) 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.

“(iv) A grenade launcher.

“(v) A barrel shroud.

“(vi) A threaded barrel.

“(B) A semiautomatic rifle 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 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) A semiautomatic pistol 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 barrel shroud.

“(iv) The capacity to accept a detachable magazine at some location outside of the pistol grip.

“(v) A semiautomatic version of an automatic firearm.

“(vi) A manufactured weight of 50 ounces or more when unloaded.

“(vii) A stabilizing brace or similar component.

“(E) A semiautomatic pistol with a fixed magazine that has the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds.

“(F) A semiautomatic shotgun that has any 1 of the following:

“(i) A folding, telescoping, or detachable stock.

“(ii) A pistol grip.

“(iii) A fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 5 rounds.

“(iv) The ability to accept a detachable magazine.

“(v) A forward grip.

“(vi) A grenade launcher.

“(G) Any shotgun with a revolving cylinder.

“(H) All of the following rifles, copies, duplicates, variants, or altered facsimiles with the capability of any such weapon thereof:

“(i) All AK types, including the following:

“(I) AK, AK47, AK47S, AK-74, AKM, AKS, ARM, MAK90, MISR, NHM90, NHM91, Rock River Arms LAR-47, SA85, SA93, Vector Arms AK-47, VEPR, WASR-10, and WUM.

“(II) IZHMAH Saiga AK.

“(III) MAADI AK47 and ARM.

“(IV) Norinco 56S, 56S2, 84S, and 86S.

“(V) Poly Technologies AK47 and AKS.

“(ii) All AR types, including the following:

“(I) AR-10.

“(II) AR-15.

“(III) Alexander Arms Overmatch Plus 16.

“(IV) ArmaLite M15 22LR Carbine.

“(V) ArmaLite M15-T.

“(VI) Barrett REC7.

“(VII) Beretta AR-70.

“(VIII) Black Rain Ordnance Recon Scout.

“(IX) Bushmaster ACR.

“(X) Bushmaster Carbon 15.

“(XI) Bushmaster MOE series.

“(XII) Bushmaster XM15.

“(XIII) Chiappa Firearms MFour rifles.

“(XIV) Colt Match Target rifles.

“(XV) CORE Rifle Systems CORE15 rifles.

“(XVI) Daniel Defense M4A1 rifles.

“(XVII) Devil Dog Arms 15 Series rifles.

“(XVIII) Diamondback DB15 rifles.

“(XIX) DoubleStar AR rifles.

“(XX) DPMS Tactical rifles.

“(XXI) DSA Inc. ZM-4 Carbine.

“(XXII) Heckler & Koch MR556.

“(XXIII) High Standard HSA-15 rifles.

“(XXIV) Jesse James Nomad AR-15 rifle.

“(XXV) Knight's Armament SR-15.

“(XXVI) Lancer L15 rifles.

“(XXVII) MGI Hydra Series rifles.

“(XXVIII) Mossberg MMR Tactical rifles.

“(XXIX) Noreen Firearms BN 36 rifle.

“(XXX) Olympic Arms.

“(XXXI) POF USA P415.

“(XXXII) Precision Firearms AR rifles.

“(XXXIII) Remington R-15 rifles.

“(XXXIV) Rhino Arms AR rifles.

“(XXXV) Rock River Arms LAR-15.

“(XXXVI) Sig Sauer SIG516 rifles and MCX rifles.

“(XXXVII) SKS with a detachable magazine.

“(XXXVIII) Smith & Wesson M&P15 rifles.

“(XXXIX) Stag Arms AR rifles.

“(XL) Sturm, Ruger & Co. SR556 and AR-556 rifles.

“(XLI) Uselton Arms Air-Lite M-4 rifles.

“(XLII) Windham Weaponry AR rifles.

“(XLIII) WMD Guns Big Beast.

“(XLIV) Yankee Hill Machine Company, Inc. YHM-15 rifles.

“(ii) Barrett M107A1.

“(iv) Barrett M82A1.

“(v) Beretta CX4 Storm.

“(vi) Calico Liberty Series.

“(vii) CETME Sporter.

“(viii) Daewoo K-1, K-2, Max 1, Max 2, AR 100, and AR 110C.

“(ix) Fabrique Nationale/FN Herstal FAL, LAR, 22 FNC, 308 Match, L1A1 Sporter, PS90, SCAR, and FS2000.

“(x) Feather Industries AT-9.

“(xi) Galil Model AR and Model ARM.

“(xii) Hi-Point Carbine.

“(xiii) HK-91, HK-93, HK-94, HK-PSG-1, and HK USC.

“(xiv) IWI TAVOR, Galil ACE rifle.

“(xv) Kel-Tec Sub-2000, SU-16, and RFB.

“(xvi) SIG AMT, SIG PE-57, Sig Sauer SG 550, Sig Sauer SG 551, and SIG MCX.

“(xvii) Springfield Armory SAR-48.

“(xviii) Steyr AUG.

“(xix) Sturm, Ruger & Co. Mini-14 Tactical Rifle M-14/20CF.

“(xx) All Thompson rifles, including the following:

“(I) Thompson M1SB.

“(II) Thompson T1100D.

“(III) Thompson T150D.

“(IV) Thompson T1B.

“(V) Thompson T1B100D.

“(VI) Thompson T1B50D.

“(VII) Thompson T1BSB.

“(VIII) Thompson T1-C.

“(IX) Thompson T1D.

“(X) Thompson T1SB.

“(XI) Thompson T5.

“(XII) Thompson T5100D.

“(XIII) Thompson TM1.

“(XIV) Thompson TM1C.

“(xvi) UMAREX UZI rifle.

“(xxii) UZI Mini Carbine, UZI Model A Carbine, and UZI Model B Carbine.

“(xxiii) Valmet M62S, M71S, and M78.

“(xxiv) Vector Arms UZI Type.

“(xxv) Weaver Arms Nighthawk.

“(xxvi) Wilkinson Arms Linda Carbine.

“(I) All of the following pistols, copies, duplicates, variants, or altered facsimiles with the capability of any such weapon thereof:

“(i) All AK-47 types, including the following:

“(I) Centurion 39 AK pistol.

“(II) CZ Scorpion pistol.

“(III) Draco AK-47 pistol.

“(IV) HCR AK-47 pistol.

“(V) IO Inc. Hellpup AK-47 pistol.

“(VI) Krinkov pistol.

“(VII) Mini Draco AK-47 pistol.

“(VIII) PAP M92 pistol.

“(IX) Yugo Krebs Krink pistol.

“(ii) All AR-15 types, including the following:

“(I) American Spirit AR-15 pistol.

“(II) Bushmaster Carbon 15 pistol.

“(III) Chiappa Firearms M4 Pistol GEN II.

“(IV) CORE Rifle Systems CORE15 Roscoe pistol.

“(V) Daniel Defense MK18 pistol.

“(VI) DoubleStar Corporation AR pistol.

“(VII) DPMS AR-15 pistol.

“(VIII) Jesse James Nomad AR-15 pistol.

“(IX) Olympic Arms AR-15 pistol.

“(X) Osprey Armament MK-18 pistol.

“(XI) POF USA AR pistols.

“(XII) Rock River Arms LAR 15 pistol.

“(XIII) Uselton Arms Air-Lite M-4 pistol.

“(iii) Calico Liberty pistols.

“(iv) DSA SA58 PKP FAL pistol.

“(v) Encom MP-9 and MP-45.

“(vi) Heckler & Koch model SP-89 pistol.

“(vii) Intratec AB-10, TEC-22 Scorpion, TEC-9, and TEC-DC9.

“(viii) IWI Galil Ace pistol, UZI PRO pistol.

“(ix) Kel-Tec PLR 16 pistol.

“(x) The following MAC types:

“(I) MAC-10.

“(II) MAC-11.

“(III) Masterpiece Arms MPA A930 Mini Pistol, MPA460 Pistol, MPA Tactical Pistol, and MPA Mini Tactical Pistol.

“(IV) Military Armament Corp. Ingram M-11.

“(V) Velocity Arms VMAC.

“(xi) Sig Sauer P556 pistol.

“(xii) Sites Spectre.

“(xiii) All Thompson types, including the following:

“(I) Thompson TA510D.

“(II) Thompson TA5.

“(xiv) All UZI types, including Micro-UZI.

“(J) All of the following shotguns, copies, duplicates, variants, or altered facsimiles with the capability of any such weapon thereof:

“(i) DERYA Anakon MC-1980, Anakon SD12.

“(ii) Doruk Lethal shotguns.

“(iii) Franchi LAW-12 and SPAS 12.

“(iv) All IZHMAH Saiga 12 types, including the following:

“(I) IZHMAH Saiga 12.

“(II) IZHMAH Saiga 12S.

“(III) IZHMAH Saiga 12S EXP-01.

“(IV) IZHMAH Saiga 12K.

“(V) IZHMAH Saiga 12K-030.

“(VI) IZHMAH Saiga 12K-040 Taktika.

“(v) Streetsweeper.

“(vi) Striker 12.

“(K) All belt-fed semiautomatic firearms, including TNW M2HB and FN M249S.

“(L) Any combination of parts from which a firearm described in subparagraphs (A) through (K) can be assembled.

“(M) The frame or receiver of a rifle or shotgun described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (F), (G), (H), (J), or (K).

“(37) 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

converted to accept, more than 10 rounds of ammunition; and

“(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 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(38) The term ‘barrel shroud’—

“(A) 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; and

“(B) 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.

“(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 ‘forward grip’ means a grip located forward of the trigger that functions as a pistol grip.

“(43) The term ‘grenade launcher’ means an attachment for use on a firearm that is designed to propel a grenade or other similar destructive device.

“(44) The term ‘permanently inoperable’ means a firearm which is incapable of discharging a shot by means of an explosive and incapable of being readily restored to a firing condition.

“(45) The term ‘pistol grip’ means a grip, a thumbhole stock or Thordsen-type grip or stock, or any other characteristic that can function as a grip.

“(46) The term ‘threaded barrel’ means a feature or characteristic that is designed in such a manner to allow for the attachment of a device such as a firearm silencer or a flash suppressor.

“(47) The term ‘qualified law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given the term in section 926B.

“(48) The term ‘grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon’ means any semiautomatic assault weapon the importation, possession, sale, or transfer of which would be unlawful under section 922(v) but for the exception under paragraph (2) of such section.

“(49) The term ‘belt-fed semiautomatic firearm’ means any repeating firearm that—

“(A) utilizes a portion of the energy of a firing cartridge to extract the fired cartridge case and chamber the next round;

“(B) requires a separate pull of the trigger to fire each cartridge; and

“(C) has the capacity to accept a belt ammunition feeding device.”.

SEC. 03. RESTRICTIONS ON ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after subsection (u) the following:

“(v)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a semiautomatic assault weapon.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession, sale, or transfer of any semiauto-

matic assault weapon otherwise lawfully possessed under Federal law on the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019.

“(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any firearm that—

“(A) is manually operated by bolt, pump, lever, or slide action;

“(B) has been rendered permanently inoperable; or

“(C) is an antique firearm, as defined in section 921 of this title.

“(4) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

“(A) the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, 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 qualified law enforcement officer employed 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, for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty), or a sale or transfer to or possession by a campus law enforcement officer for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty);

“(B) the importation for, or sale or transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee on-site for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee-authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

“(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired in good standing from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving a firearm, of a semiautomatic assault weapon—

“(i) sold or transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement; or

“(ii) that the individual purchased, or otherwise obtained, for official use before such retirement;

“(D) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of a semiautomatic assault weapon by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purposes of testing or experimentation authorized by the Attorney General; or

“(E) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of a firearm specified in Appendix A to this section, as such firearm was manufactured on the date of introduction of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019.

“(5) For purposes of paragraph (4)(A), the term ‘campus law enforcement officer’ means an individual who is—

“(A) employed by a private institution of higher education that is eligible for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(B) responsible for the prevention or investigation of crime involving injury to persons or property, including apprehension or detention of persons for such crimes;

“(C) authorized by Federal, State, or local law to carry a firearm, execute search warrants, and make arrests; and

“(D) recognized, commissioned, or certified by a government entity as a law enforcement officer.

“(6) The Attorney General shall establish and maintain, in a timely manner, a record of the make, model, and, if available, date of manufacture of any semiautomatic assault weapon which the Attorney General is made aware has been used in relation to a crime under Federal or State law, and the nature and circumstances of the crime involved, including the outcome of relevant criminal investigations and proceedings. The Attorney General shall annually submit a copy of the record established under this paragraph to

the Congress and make the record available to the general public.

“(w)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device otherwise lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019.

“(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

“(A) the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, 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 qualified law enforcement officer employed 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 for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty), or a sale or transfer to or possession by a campus law enforcement officer for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty);

“(B) the importation for, or sale or transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee on-site for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee-authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

“(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired in good standing from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving ammunition, of a large capacity ammunition feeding device—

“(i) sold or transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement; or

“(ii) that the individual purchased, or otherwise obtained, for official use before such retirement; or

“(D) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purposes of testing or experimentation authorized by the Attorney General.

“(4) For purposes of paragraph (3)(A), the term ‘campus law enforcement officer’ means an individual who is—

“(A) employed by a private institution of higher education that is eligible for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(B) responsible for the prevention or investigation of crime involving injury to persons or property, including apprehension or detention of persons for such crimes;

“(C) authorized by Federal, State, or local law to carry a firearm, execute search warrants, and make arrests; and

“(D) recognized, commissioned, or certified by a government entity as a law enforcement officer.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) SECURE STORAGE OR SAFETY DEVICE REQUIREMENT FOR GRANDFATHERED SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.—It shall be unlawful for any person, other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, to store or keep under the dominion or control of that person any grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon that the person knows, or has reasonable cause to believe, will be accessible to an individual prohibited from receiving or possessing a firearm under subsection (g), (n), or (x), or any provision of State law, unless the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon is—

“(1) carried on the person, or within such close proximity that the person can readily

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 923(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 923(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 be identified by a 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 924 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), (r), (v), or (w)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding devices” after “firearms or quantities of ammunition”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “922(r), 922(v), 922(w),” after “922(n).”.

(e) APPENDIX A.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended 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 HK630

“Heckler & Koch HK770

“Heckler & Koch HK940

“Heckler & Koch Model 300 Rifle

“Heckler & Koch SL7 Rifle

“Iver Johnson 50th Anniversary M–1 Carbine (w/o folding stock)

“Iver Johnson M–1 Carbine (w/o folding stock)

“M–1 Carbines with standard fixed stock

“M–1 Garand with fixed 8 round capacity and standard stock

“Marlin Model 9 Camp Carbine

“Marlin Model 45 Carbine

“Remington Model 74

“Remington Model 81

“Remington Model 740

“Remington Model 742

“Remington Model 750 Synthetic

“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 Mini-14 (w/o folding or telescoping stock or pistol grip)

“Ruger PC4

“Ruger PC9

“SKS type rifles with fixed 10 round magazine and standard fixed stock

“Winchester Model SXR

“CENTERFIRE RIFLES—LEVER & SLIDE

“Action Arms Timber Wolf Pump Action

“Beretta 1873 Renegade Lever Action

“Beretta Gold Rush Slide Action

“Big Horn Armory 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 1886 High Grade Carbine

“Browning Model 1886 Lever-Action Carbine

“Browning Model B–92 Carbine

“Charles Daly Model 1892 Lever Action, All Models

“Chiappa 1886 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 30AS Lever-Action Carbine

“Marlin Model 62 Lever Action

“Marlin Model 93 Lever Action

“Marlin Model 308MX

“Marlin Model 308MXLR

“Marlin Model 336 Deluxe

“Marlin Model 336C

“Marlin Model 336CS Lever-Action Carbine

“Marlin Model 336DL Lever Action

“Marlin Model 336SS

“Marlin Model 336W

“Marlin Model 336XLR

“Marlin Model 338MX

“Marlin Model 338MXLR

“Marlin Model 444

“Marlin Model 444 Lever-Action

“Marlin Model 444XLR

“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 Cowboy

“Marlin Model 1895 Lever Action, All Models

“Marlin Model 1895G

“Marlin Model 1895GS

“Marlin Model 1895M

“Marlin Model 1895MXLR

“Marlin Model 1895SBL

“Marlin Model 1895SS Lever-Action Rifle

“Marlin Model 1895XLR

“Marlin XLR Lever Action Rifles

“Mitchell 1858 Henry Replica

“Mitchell 1866 Winchester Replica

“Mitchell 1873 Winchester Replica

“Mossberg 464 Lever Action Rifle

“Mossberg Model 472 Lever Action

“Mossberg Model 479 Lever Action

“Navy Arms 1866 Yellowboy Rifle

“Navy Arms 1873 Sporting Rifle

“Navy Arms 1873 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, 14½ Pump Actions

“Remington Model 141 Pump Action

“Remington Model 760 Slide Actions

“Remington Model 7600 Special Purpose Slide Action

“Remington Model 7600 Synthetic

“Remington Model 7615 Camo Hunter

“Remington Model 7615 Ranch Carbine

“Remington Model 7615 SPS

“Rossi M92 SRC Saddle-Ring Carbine

“Rossi M92 SRS Short Carbine

“Rossi R92 Lever Action Carbines

“Ruger Model 96/44 Lever Action

“Savage 99C Lever-Action Rifle

“Savage Model 170 Pump Action

“Taurus Thunderbolt Pump Action

“Taylor’s & 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

“Winchester Lever Actions, All Other Center Fire Models

“Winchester Model 94 Big Bore Side Eject

“Winchester Model 94 Ranger Side Eject Lever-Action Rifle

“Winchester Model 94 Side Eject Lever-Action Rifle

“Winchester Model 94 Trapper Side Eject

“Winchester Model 94 Wrangler 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 Custom Rifles

“Anschutz 1733D 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

“Auguste Francotte Bolt-Action Rifles

“Bansners 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 R8 Professional
 “Blaser R84 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Blaser R93 Bolt Action Rifle
 “BRNO 537 Sporter Bolt-Action Rifle
 “BRNO ZKB 527 Fox Bolt-Action Rifle
 “BRNO ZKK 600, 601, 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 A-Bolt Stainless Stalker
 “Browning Euro-Bolt Rifle
 “Browning High-Power Bolt Action Rifle
 “Browning X-Bolt Bolt Action Rifle
 “Carbon One Bolt Action Rifle
 “Carl Gustaf 2000 Bolt-Action Rifle Cen-
 tury
 “Centurion 14 Sporter
 “Century Enfield Sporter #4
 “Century M70 Sporter
 “Century Mauser 98 Sporter
 “Century Swedish Sporter #38
 “Cheytac M-200
 “Cheytac M70 Sporter
 “Cooper Model 21 Bolt Action Rifle
 “Cooper Model 22 Bolt Action Rifle
 “Cooper Model 38 Centerfire Sporter
 “Cooper Model 56 Bolt Action Rifle
 “CZ 527 Bolt Action Rifles
 “CZ 550 Bolt Action Rifles
 “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-93 Black Arrow Rifle
 “Ed Brown Hunting and Model 704 Bolt Ac-
 tion Rifles
 “Heym Bolt Action Rifles
 “Heym Magnum Express Series Rifle
 “Howa Bolt Action Rifles
 “Howa Lightning Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Howa Realtree Camo Rifle
 “H-S Precision Bolt Action Rifles
 “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 5100A1 Long-Range
 Rifle
 “KDF K15 American Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Kenny Jarrett 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 XS7
 “Marlin Model XS7C
 “Marlin Model XS7Y
 “Marlin XL-7/XS7 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Mauser Model 66 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Mauser 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 KRI Bolt Action Rifle
 “Midland 1500S Survivor Rifle
 “Mossberg Model 100 ATR (All-Terrain
 Rifle)
 “Navy Arms TU-33/40 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 Mag-
 num
 “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 2700 Lightweight Rifle
 “Parker-Hale Model 2800 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 Camo Synthetic Rifle
 “Remington 700 Classic Rifle
 “Remington 700 Custom KS Mountain Rifle
 “Remington 700 Mountain Rifle
 “Remington 700 MTRSS Rifle
 “Remington 700 Safari
 “Remington 700 Stainless Synthetic Rifle
 “Remington 700 Varmint Synthetic Rifle
 “Remington Model 40-X Bolt Action Rifles
 “Remington Model 700 Alaskan Ti
 “Remington Model 700 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Remington Model 700 CDL
 “Remington Model 700 CDL ‘Boone and
 Crockett’
 “Remington Model 700 CDL Left-Hand
 “Remington Model 700 CDL SF Limited
 Edition
 “Remington Model 700 LSS
 “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 Syn-
 thetic Left-Hand
 “Remington Model 700 VL SS Thumbhole
 “Remington Model 700 VLS
 “Remington Model 700 VS SF II
 “Remington Model 700 VTR
 “Remington Model 700 XCR
 “Remington Model 700 XCR Camo
 “Remington Model 700 XCR Compact Tac-
 tical 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 Ri-
 fles
 “Remington Model Seven CDL
 “Remington Model Seven Custom KS
 “Remington Model Seven Custom MS Rifle
 “Remington Model Seven Predator
 “Remington Model Seven Youth Rifle
 “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-Hand-
 ed
 “Ruger M77 Hawkeye Predator
 “Ruger M77 Hawkeye Sporter
 “Ruger M77 Hawkeye Standard
 “Ruger M77 Hawkeye Standard Left-Hand-
 ed
 “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 M77RL Ultra Light
 “Ruger M77VT Target Rifle
 “Ruger Model 77 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Sako Bolt Action Rifles
 “Sako Classic Bolt Action
 “Sako Deluxe Lightweight
 “Sako FiberClass Sporter
 “Sako Hunter Left-Hand Rifle
 “Sako Hunter LS Rifle Sako Hunter Rifle
 “Sako Mannlicher-Style Carbine
 “Sako Safari Grade Bolt Action
 “Sako Super Deluxe Sporter
 “Sako TRG-S Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Sako Varmint Heavy Barrel
 “Sauer 90 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Savage 16/116 Rifles
 “Savage 110 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Savage 110CY Youth/Ladies Rifle
 “Savage 110F Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Savage 110FP Police Rifle
 “Savage 110FXP3 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Savage 110G Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Savage 110GV Varmint Rifle
 “Savage 110GXP3 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 Rifles
 “Savage 116FSS Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Savage Axis Series Bolt Action Rifles
 “Savage Model 10 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Savage Model 10GXP Package Guns
 “Savage Model 11/111 Series Bolt Action
 Rifles
 “Savage Model 12 Series Rifles
 “Savage Model 14/114 Rifles
 “Savage Model 25 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Savage Model 110GXP3 Package Guns
 “Savage Model 112BV Heavy Barrel
 Varmint Rifle
 “Savage Model 112FVS Varmint Rifle
 “Savage Model 116FSK Kodiak Rifle
 “Shilen Rifles Inc. DGA Bolt Action Rifles
 “Smith & Wesson i-Bolt Rifle
 “Steyr Scout Bolt Action Rifle
 “Steyr SSG 69 PII Bolt Action Rifle
 “Steyr SSG08 Bolt Action Rifle
 “Steyr-Mannlicher Luxus Model L, M, S
 “Steyr-Mannlicher Model M Professional
 Rifle
 “Steyr-Mannlicher Sporter Models SL, L,
 M, S, S/T
 “Thompson/Center ICON Bolt Action Rifles
 “Thompson/Center Icon Classic Long Ac-
 tion 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

- “Thompson/Center Venture
- “Tikka Bolt-Action Rifle
- “Tikka Premium Grade Rifles
- “Tikka T3 Bolt Action Rifles
- “Tikka Varmint/Continental Rifle
- “Tikka Whitetail/Battue Rifle
- “Ultra Light Arms Model 20 Rifle
- “Ultra Light Arms Model 24
- “Ultra Light Arms Model 28, Model 40 Rifles
- “Voere Model 2155, 2150 Bolt-Action Rifles
- “Voere Model 2165 Bolt-Action Rifle
- “Voere VEC 91 Lightning Bolt-Action Rifle
- “Weatherby Classicmark No. 1 Rifle
- “Weatherby Lasermark V Rifle
- “Weatherby Mark V Crown Custom Rifles
- “Weatherby Mark V Deluxe Bolt-Action Rifle
- “Weatherby Mark V Rifles
- “Weatherby Mark V Safari Grade Custom Rifles
- “Weatherby Mark V Sporter Rifle
- “Weatherby Vanguard Bolt Action Rifles
- “Weatherby Vanguard Classic No. 1 Rifle
- “Weatherby Vanguard Classic Rifle
- “Weatherby Vanguard VGX Deluxe Rifle
- “Weatherby Vanguard Weatherguard Rifle
- “Weatherby Weatherguard Alaskan Rifle
- “Weatherby Weathermark Alaskan Rifle
- “Weatherby Weathermark Rifle
- “Weatherby Weathermark Rifles
- “Wichita Classic Rifle
- “Wichita Varmint Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 Bolt Action Rifles
- “Winchester Model 70 Custom Sharpshooter
- “Winchester Model 70 Custom Sporting Sharpshooter Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 DBM Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 DBM-S Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 Featherweight
- “Winchester Model 70 Featherweight Classic
- “Winchester Model 70 Featherweight WinTuff
- “Winchester Model 70 Lightweight Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 SM Sporter
- “Winchester Model 70 Sporter
- “Winchester Model 70 Sporter WinTuff
- “Winchester Model 70 Stainless Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 Super Express Magnum
- “Winchester Model 70 Super Grade
- “Winchester Model 70 Synthetic Heavy Varmint Rifle
- “Winchester Model 70 Varmint
- “Winchester Ranger Rifle
- “CENTERFIRE RIFLES—SINGLE SHOT
- “Armsport 1866 Sharps Rifle, Carbine
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1875 #3 Gallery Single Shot Rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1875 #4 Perfection Rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1875 #7 Long Range Rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1875 #8 Union Hill rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1875 1½ Hunter Rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1885 High Wall Sporting Rifle
- “Ballard Arms Inc. 1885 Low Wall Single Shot
- “Brown Model 97D Single Shot Rifle
- “Brown Model One Single Shot Rifle
- “Browning Model 1885 Single Shot Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms 1875 Target & Sporting Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms Custom New Model 1877 Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms New Model 1885 High Wall Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms 1874 Bridgeport Sporting Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms 1875 Classic Sharps
- “C. Sharps Arms New Model 1874 Old Reliable
- “C. Sharps Arms New Model 1875 Rifle
- “C. Sharps Arms New Model 1875 Target & Long Range
- “Cabela’s 1874 Sharps Sporting
- “Cimarron Billy Dixon 1874 Sharps
- “Cimarron Model 1885 High Wall
- “Cimarron Quigley Model 1874 Sharps
- “Cimarron Silhouette Model 1874 Sharps
- “Dakota Model 10 Single Shot Rifle
- “Dakota Single Shot Rifle
- “Desert Industries G-90 Single Shot Rifle
- “Dixie Gun Works 1873 Trapdoor Rifle/Carbine
- “Dixie Gun Works 1874 Sharps Rifles
- “Dixie Gun Works Remington Rolling Block Rifles
- “EMF Premier 1874 Sharps
- “Harrington & Richardson Buffalo Classic Rifle (CR-1871)
- “Harrington & Richardson CR 45-LC
- “Harrington & Richardson Handi-Mag Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Handi-Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Handi-Rifle Compact
- “Harrington & Richardson New England Hand-Rifle/Slug Gun Combos
- “Harrington & Richardson Stainless Handi-Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Stainless Ultra Hunter Thumbhole Stock
- “Harrington & Richardson Superlight Handi-Rifle Compact
- “Harrington & Richardson Survivor Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Synthetic Handi-Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Ultra Hunter Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Ultra Varmint Fluted
- “Harrington & Richardson Ultra Varmint Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Ultra Varmint Thumbhole Stock
- “Krieghoff Hubertus Single Shot
- “Meacham High Wall
- “Merkel K1 Lightweight Stalking Rifle
- “Merkel K2 Custom Stalking Rifle
- “Model 1885 High Wall Rifle
- “Navy Arms #2 Creedmoor Rifle
- “Navy Arms 1873 John Bodine Rolling Black Rifle
- “Navy Arms 1873 Springfield Cavalry Carbine
- “Navy Arms 1874 Sharps Rifles
- “Navy Arms 1874 1885 High Wall Rifles
- “Navy Arms Rolling Block Buffalo Rifle
- “Navy Arms Sharps “Quigley” Rifle
- “Navy Arms Sharps Cavalry Carbine
- “Navy Arms Sharps Plains Rifle
- “New England Firearms Handi-Rifle
- “New England Firearms Sportster/Versa Pack Rifle
- “New England Firearms Survivor Rifle
- “Red Willow Armory Ballard No. 1.5 Hunting Rifle
- “Red Willow Armory Ballard No. 4.5 Target Rifle
- “Red Willow Armory Ballard No. 5 Pacific
- “Red Willow Armory Ballard No. 8 Union Hill Rifle
- “Red Willow Armory Ballard Rifles
- “Remington Model Rolling Block Rifles
- “Remington Model SPR18 Blued
- “Remington Model SPR18 Nickel
- “Remington Model SPR18 Single Shot Rifle
- “Remington-Style Rolling Block Carbine
- “Rossi Match Pairs Rifles
- “Rossi Single Shot Rifles
- “Rossi Wizard
- “Ruger No. 1 RSI International
- “Ruger No. 1 Stainless Sporter
- “Ruger No. 1 Stainless Standard
- “Ruger No. 1A Light Sporter
- “Ruger No. 1B Single Shot
- “Ruger No. 1H Tropical Rifle
- “Ruger No. 1S Medium Sporter
- “Ruger No. 1V Special Varminter
- “Sharps 1874 Old Reliable
- “Shiloh 1875 Rifles
- “Shiloh Sharps 1874 Business Rifle
- “Shiloh Sharps 1874 Long Range Express
- “Shiloh Sharps 1874 Military Carbine
- “Shiloh Sharps 1874 Military Rifle
- “Shiloh Sharps 1874 Montana Roughrider
- “Shiloh Sharps Creedmoor Target
- “Thompson/Center Contender Carbine
- “Thompson/Center Contender Carbine Survival System
- “Thompson/Center Contender Carbine Youth Model
- “Thompson/Center Encore
- “Thompson/Center Stainless Contender Carbine
- “Thompson/Center TCR ‘87 Single Shot Rifle
- “Thompson/Encore Rifles
- “Traditions 1874 Sharps Deluxe Rifle
- “Traditions 1874 Sharps Standard Rifle
- “Traditions Rolling Block Sporting Rifle
- “Uberti (Stoeger Industries) Sharps Rifles
- “Uberti 1871 Rolling Block Rifle/Carbine
- “Uberti 1874 Sharps Sporting Rifle
- “Uberti 1885 High Wall Rifles
- “Uberti Rolling Block Baby Carbine
- “Uberti Springfield Trapdoor Carbine/Rifle
- “DRILLINGS, COMBINATION GUNS, DOUBLE RIFLES
- “A. Zoli Rifle-Shotgun O/U Combo
- “Auguste Francotte Boxlock Double Rifle
- “Auguste Francotte Sidelock Double Rifles
- “Baikal IZH-94 Express
- “Baikal MP94- (IZH-94) O/U
- “Beretta Express SSO O/U Double Rifles
- “Beretta Model 455 SxS Express Rifle
- “Chapuis RGExpress Double Rifle
- “CZ 584 SOLO Combination Gun
- “CZ 589 Stopper O/U Gun
- “Dakota Double Rifle
- “Garbi Express Double Rifle
- “Harrington & Richardson Survivor
- “Harrington & Richardson Synthetic Handi-Rifle/Slug Gun Combo
- “Heym Model 55B O/U Double Rifle
- “Heym Model 55FW O/U Combo Gun
- “Heym Model 88b Side-by-Side Double Rifle
- “Hoenig Rotary Round Action Combination Rifle
- “Hoenig Rotary Round Action Double Rifle
- “Kodiak Mk. IV Double Rifle
- “Krieghoff Teck O/U Combination Gun
- “Krieghoff Trumpf Drilling
- “Krieghoff Drillings
- “Lebeau-Courally Express Rifle 5X5
- “Merkel Boxlock Double Rifles
- “Merkel Drillings
- “Merkel Model 160 Side-by-Side Double Rifles
- “Merkel Over/Under Combination Guns
- “Merkel Over/Under Double Rifles
- “Remington Model SPR94 .410/Rimfire
- “Remington Model SPR94 12 Gauge/Centerfire
- “Rizzini Express 90L Double Rifle
- “Savage 24F O/U Combination Gun
- “Savage 24F-12T Turkey Gun
- “Springfield Inc. M6 Scout Rifle/Shotgun
- “Tikka Model 412s Combination Gun
- “Tikka Model 412S Double Fire
- “RIMFIRE RIFLES—AUTOLOADERS
- “AMT Lightning 25/22 Rifle
- “AMT Lightning Small-Game Hunting Rifle II
- “AMT Magnum Hunter Auto Rifle
- “Anschutz 525 Deluxe Auto
- “Armscor Model 20P Auto Rifle
- “Browning Auto .22 Rifles
- “Browning Auto-22 Rifle
- “Browning Auto-22 Grade VI
- “Browning BAR .22 Auto Rifle
- “Browning SA-22 Semi-Auto 22 Rifle
- “Henry U.S. Survival .22
- “Henry U.S. Survival Rifle AR-7
- “Krico Model 260 Auto Rifle
- “Lakefield Arms Model 64B Auto Rifle
- “Marlin Model 60 Self Loading Rifles

“Marlin Model 60C
 “Marlin Model 60SB
 “Marlin Model 60S-CF
 “Marlin Model 60SN
 “Marlin Model 60ss Self-Loading Rifle
 “Marlin Model 70 Auto-loading Rifles
 “Marlin Model 70 HC Auto
 “Marlin Model 70P Papoose
 “Marlin Model 70PSS
 “Marlin Model 79S
 “Marlin Model 79SSS
 “Marlin Model 922 Magnum Self-Loading Rifle
 “Marlin Model 990l Self-Loading Rifle
 “Marlin Model 99S Self-Loading Rifle
 “Mossberg 702 Plinkster
 “Norinco Model 22 ATD Rifle
 “Remington 552BDL Speedmaster Rifle
 “Remington Model 522 Viper Autoloading Rifle
 “Remington Model 597 Blaze Camo
 “Remington Model 597 Pink Camo
 “Remington Model 597 Synthetic Scope Combo
 “Ruger 10/22 Autoloading Carbine (w/o fold-ing stock)
 “Ruger 10/22 Compact
 “Ruger 10/22 Sporter
 “Ruger 10/22 Target
 “Survival Arms AR-7 Explorer Rifle
 “Texas Remington Revolving Carbine
 “Thompson/Center R-55 All-Weather
 “Thompson/Center R-55 Benchmark
 “Thompson/Center R-55 Classic
 “Thompson/Center R-55 Rifles
 “Thompson/Center R-55 Sporter
 “Voere Model 2115 Auto Rifle
 “RIMFIRE RIFLES—LEVER & SLIDE ACTION
 “Browning BL-22 Lever-Action Rifle
 “Henry .22 Lever Action Rifles, All Models
 “Henry Golden Boy .17 HMR
 “Henry Golden Boy .22
 “Henry Golden Boy .22 Magnum
 “Henry Golden Boy Deluxe
 “Henry Lever .22 Magnum
 “Henry Lever Action .22
 “Henry Lever Carbine .22
 “Henry Lever Octagon .22
 “Henry Lever Octagon .22 Magnum
 “Henry Lever Youth Model .22
 “Henry Pump Action Octagon .22
 “Henry Pump Action Octagon .22 Magnum
 “Henry Varmint Express .17 HMR
 “Marlin 39TDS Carbine
 “Marlin Model 39A Golden Lever Action
 “Marlin Model 39AS Golden Lever-Action Rifle
 “Mossberg Model 464 Rimfire Lever Action Rifle
 “Norinco EM-321 Pump Rifle
 “Remington 572BDL Fieldmaster Pump Rifle
 “Rossi Model 62 SA Pump Rifle
 “Rossi Model 62 SAC Carbine
 “Rossi Model G2 Gallery Rifle
 “Ruger Model 96 Lever-Action Rifle
 “Taurus Model 62-Pump
 “Taurus Model 72 Pump Rifle
 “Winchester Model 9422 Lever-Action Rifle
 “Winchester Model 9422 Magnum Lever-Action Rifle
 “RIMFIRE RIFLES—BOLT ACTIONS & SINGLE SHOTS
 “Anschutz 1416D/1516D Classic Rifles
 “Anschutz 1418D/1518D Mannlicher Rifles
 “Anschutz 1700 FWT Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Anschutz 1700D Bavarian Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Anschutz 1700D Classic Rifles
 “Anschutz 1700D Custom Rifles
 “Anschutz 1700D Graphite Custom Rifle
 “Anschutz 1702 D H B Classic
 “Anschutz 1713 Silhouette
 “Anschutz Achiever
 “Anschutz Achiever Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Anschutz All other Bolt Action Rimfire Models
 “Anschutz Kadett
 “Anschutz Model 1502 D Classic
 “Anschutz Model 1517 D Classic
 “Anschutz Model 1517 MPR Multi Purpose
 “Anschutz Model 1517 S-BR
 “Anschutz Model 1710 D KL
 “Anschutz Model 1717 Classic
 “Anschutz Model 1717 Silhouette Sporter
 “Anschutz Model G4 MPB
 “Anschutz Model Woodchucker
 “Armscor Model 14P Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Armscor Model 1500 Rifle
 “Beeman/HW 60-J-ST Bolt-Action Rifle
 “BRNO ZKM 452 Deluxe
 “BRNO ZKM-456 Lux Sporter
 “BRNO ZKM-452 Deluxe Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Browning A-Bolt 22 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Browning A-Bolt Gold Medallion
 “Browning T-Bolt Rimfire Rifles
 “Cabanass Espronceda IV Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Cabanass Leyre Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Cabanass Master Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Cabanass Phaser Rifle
 “Chipmunk Single Shot Rifle
 “Cooper Arms Model 36S Sporter Rifle
 “Cooper Model 57-M Bolt Action Rifle
 “CZ 452 Bolt Action Rifles
 “Dakota 22 Sporter Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Davey Crickett Single Shot Rifle
 “Harrington & Richardson Sportster
 “Harrington & Richardson Sportster 17 Hornady Magnum Rimfire
 “Harrington & Richardson Sportster Com-pact
 “Henry ‘Mini’ Bolt Action Rifle
 “Henry Acu-Bolt .22
 “Henry Mini Bolt Youth .22
 “Kimber Bolt Action .22 Rifles
 “Krico Model 300 Bolt-Action Rifles
 “Lakefield Arms Mark I Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Lakefield Arms Mark II Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Magtech Model MT Bolt Action Rifle
 “Magtech Model MT-22C Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 15YN ‘Little Buckaroo’
 “Marlin Model 25MN Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 25N Bolt-Action Repeater
 “Marlin Model 880 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 881 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 882 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 883 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 883SS Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 915 YN ‘Little Buckaroo’
 “Marlin Model 915Y (Compact)
 “Marlin Model 915YS (Compact)
 “Marlin Model 917
 “Marlin Model 917S
 “Marlin Model 917V
 “Marlin Model 917VR
 “Marlin Model 917VS
 “Marlin Model 917VS-CF
 “Marlin Model 917VSF
 “Marlin Model 917VST
 “Marlin Model 917VT
 “Marlin Model 925
 “Marlin Model 925C
 “Marlin Model 925M
 “Marlin Model 925R
 “Marlin Model 925RM
 “Marlin Model 980S
 “Marlin Model 980S-CF
 “Marlin Model 981T
 “Marlin Model 982 Bolt Action Rifle
 “Marlin Model 982VS
 “Marlin Model 982VS-CF
 “Marlin Model 983
 “Marlin Model 983S
 “Marlin Model 983T
 “Marlin Model XT-17 Series Bolt Action Rifles
 “Marlin Model XT-22 Series Bolt Action Rifles
 “Mauser Model 107 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Mauser Model 201 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Meacham Low-Wall Rifle
 “Mossberg Model 801/802 Bolt Rifles
 “Mossberg Model 817 Varmint Bolt Action Rifle
 “Navy Arms TU-33/40 Carbine
 “Navy Arms TU-KKW Sniper Trainer
 “Navy Arms TU-KKW Training Rifle
 “New England Firearms Sportster Single Shot Rifles
 “Norinco JW-15 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Norinco JW-27 Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Remington 40-XR Rimfire Custom Sporter
 “Remington 541-T
 “Remington 541-T HB Bolt-Action
 “Rifle Remington 581-S Sportsman Rifle
 “Remington Model Five
 “Remington Model Five Youth
 “Rossi Matched Pair Single Shot Rifle
 “Ruger 77/17
 “Ruger 77/22
 “Ruger 77/22 Rimfire Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Ruger 77/44
 “Ruger K77/22 Varmint Rifle
 “Savage CUB T Mini Youth
 “Savage Mark I-G Bolt Action
 “Savage Mark II Bolt Action Rifles
 “Savage Model 30 G Stevens Favorite
 “Savage Model 93 Rifles
 “Thompson/Center Hotshot Youth Rifle
 “Ultra Light Arms Model 20 RF Bolt-Action Rifle
 “Winchester Model 52B Sporting Rifle
 “Winchester Wildcat Bolt Action Rifle 22
 “COMPETITION RIFLES—CENTERFIRE & RIMFIRE
 “Anschutz 1803D Intermediate Match
 “Anschutz 1808D RT Super Match 54 Target
 “Anschutz 1827B Biathlon Rifle
 “Anschutz 1827BT Fortner Biathlon Rifle
 “Anschutz 1903 Rifles
 “Anschutz 1903D Match Rifle
 “Anschutz 1907 Match Rifle
 “Anschutz 1910 Super Match II
 “Anschutz 1911 Match Rifle
 “Anschutz 1912 Rifles
 “Anschutz 1913 Super Match Rifle
 “Anschutz 54.18MS REP Deluxe Silhouette Rifle
 “Anschutz 54.18MS Silhouette Rifle
 “Anschutz 64 MP R Silhouette Rifle
 “Anschutz 64-MS Left Silhouette
 “Anschutz Super Match 54 Target Model 2007
 “Anschutz Super Match 54 Target Model 2013
 “Beeman/Feinwerkbau 2600 Target Rifle
 “Cooper Arms Model TRP-1 ISU Standard Rifle
 “E.A.A./HW 60 Target Rifle
 “E.A.A./HW 660 Match Rifle
 “E.A.A./Weihrauch HW 60 Target Rifle
 “Ed Brown Model 704, M40A2 Marine Snip-er
 “Finnish Lion Standard Target Rifle
 “Krico Model 360 S2 Biathlon Rifle
 “Krico Model 360S Biathlon Rifle
 “Krico Model 400 Match Rifle
 “Krico Model 500 Kricotronic Match Rifle
 “Krico Model 600 Match Rifle
 “Krico Model 600 Sniper Rifle
 “Lakefield Arms Model 90B Target Rifle
 “Lakefield Arms Model 91T Target Rifle
 “Lakefield Arms Model 92S Silhouette Rifle
 “Marlin Model 2000 Target Rifle
 “Mauser Model 86-SR Specialty Rifle
 “McMillan 300 Phoenix Long Range Rifle
 “McMillan Long Range Rifle
 “McMillan M-86 Sniper Rifle
 “McMillan M-89 Sniper Rifle
 “McMillan National Match Rifle
 “Parker-Hale M-85 Sniper Rifle
 “Parker-Hale M-87 Target Rifle
 “Remington 40-X Bolt Action Rifles
 “Remington 40-XB Rangemaster Target Centerfire
 “Remington 40-XBBR KS
 “Remington 40-XC KS National Match Course Rifle
 “Remington 40-XR KS Rimfire Position Rifle

"Sako TRG-21 Bolt-Action Rifle "Sako TRG-22 Bolt Action Rifle "Springfield Armory M-1 Garand "Steyr-Mannlicher SSG Rifles "Steyr-Mannlicher Match SPG-UIT Rifle "Steyr-Mannlicher SSG P-I Rifle "Steyr-Mannlicher SSG P-II Rifle "Steyr-Mannlicher SSG P-III Rifle "Steyr-Mannlicher SSG P-IV Rifle "Tanner 300 Meter Free Rifle "Tanner 50 Meter Free Rifle "Tanner Standard UIT Rifle "Time Precision 22RF Bench Rifle "Wichita Silhouette Rifle "SHOTGUNS—AUTOLOADERS "American Arms "American Arms/Franchi Black Magic 48/ AL "Benelli Bimillioneaire "Benelli Black Eagle Competition Auto Shotgun "Benelli Cordoba "Benelli Executive Series "Benelli Legacy Model "Benelli M1 "Benelli M1 Defense "Benelli M1 Tactical "Benelli M1014 Limited Edition "Benelli M2 "Benelli M2 Field Steady Grip "Benelli M2 Practical "Benelli M2 Tactical "Benelli M2 American Series "Benelli M3 Convertible "Benelli M4 Models Vinci Steady Grip "Benelli Montefeltro Super 90 20-Gauge Shotgun "Benelli Montefeltro Super 90 Shotgun "Benelli Raffaello Series Shotguns "Benelli Sport Model "Benelli Super 90 M1 Field Model "Benelli Super Black Eagle II Models "Benelli Super Black Eagle II Steady Grip "Benelli Super Black Eagle Models "Benelli Super Black Eagle Shotgun "Benelli Super Black Eagle Slug Gun "Benelli Super Vinci "Benelli Supersport "Benelli Two-Gun Sets "Benelli Ultralight "Benelli Vinci "Beretta 390 Field Auto Shotgun "Beretta 390 Super Trap, Super Skeet Shotguns "Beretta 3901 Citizen "Beretta 3901 Rifled Slug Gun "Beretta 3901 Statesman "Beretta A-303 Auto Shotgun "Beretta A400 Series "Beretta AL-2 Models "Beretta AL-3 Deluxe Trap "Beretta AL390 Series "Beretta AL391 Teknys Gold "Beretta AL391 Teknys Gold Sporting "Beretta AL391 Teknys Gold Target "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Camo AP "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Camo Max-4 "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Classic "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Gold "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Gold Sporting "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Parallel Target SL "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Sporting "Beretta AL391 Urika 2 Synthetic "Beretta ES100 Pintail Series "Beretta Model 1200 Field "Beretta Model 1201F Auto Shotgun "Beretta Model 300 "Beretta Model 301 Series "Beretta Model 302 Series "Beretta Model 60 "Beretta Model 61 "Beretta Model A304 Lark "Beretta Model AL391 Series "Beretta Model TX4 Storm "Beretta Silver Lark "Beretta UGB25 Xcel "Beretta Vittoria Auto Shotgun	"Beretta Xtrema2 "Breda Altair "Breda Altair Special "Breda Aries 2 "Breda Astro "Breda Astrolux "Breda Echo "Breda Ermes Series "Breda Gold Series "Breda Grizzly "Breda Mira "Breda Standard Series "Breda Xanthos "Brolin BL-12 "Brolin SAS-12 "Browning A-500G Auto Shotgun "Browning A-500G Sporting Clays "Browning A-500R Auto Shotgun "Browning Auto-5 Light 12 and 20 "Browning Auto-5 Magnum 12 "Browning Auto-5 Magnum 20 "Browning Auto-5 Stalker "Browning B2000 Series "Browning BSA 10 Auto Shotgun "Browning BSA 10 Stalker Auto Shotgun "Browning Gold Series "Browning Maxus Series "Charles Daly Field Grade Series "Charles Daly Novamatic Series "Charles Daly Tactical "Churchill Regent "Churchill Standard Model "Churchill Turkey Automatic Shotgun "Churchill Windsor "Cosmi Automatic Shotgun "CZ 712 "CZ 720 "CZ 912 "Escort Escort Series "European American Armory (EAA) Bundra Series "Fabarms Ellegi Series "Fabarms Lion Series "Fabarms Tactical "FNH USA Model SLP "Franchi 610VS "Franchi 612 Series "Franchi 620 "Franchi 712 "Franchi 720 "Franchi 912 "Franchi AL 48 "Franchi AL 48 Series "Franchi Elite "Franchi I-12 Inertia Series "Franchi Prestige "H&K Model 512 "H&R Manufiance "H&R Model 403 "Hi-Standard 10A "Hi-Standard 10B "Hi-Standard Semi Automatic Model "Hi-Standard Supermatic Series "Ithaca Mag-10 "Ithaca Model 51 Series "LaSalle Semi-automatic "Ljutic Bi-matic Autoloader "Luger Ultra-light Model "Marlin SI 12 Series "Maverick Model 60 Auto Shotgun "Model AL-1 "Mossberg 1000 "Mossberg Model 600 Auto Shotgun "Mossberg Model 930 All-Purpose Field "Mossberg Model 930 Slugster "Mossberg Model 930 Turkey "Mossberg Model 930 Waterfowl "Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Combos "Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Flyway Se- ries Waterfowl "Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Grand Slam Series Turkey "Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Turkey "Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Waterfowl "New England Firearms Excell Auto Combo "New England Firearms Excell Auto Syn- thetic	"New England Firearms Excell Auto Tur- key "New England Firearms Excell Auto Wal- nut "New England Firearms Excell Auto Wa- terfowl "Nighthawk Tactical Semi-auto "Ottomanguns Sultan Series "Remington 105Ti Series "Remington 1100 20-Gauge Deer Gun "Remington 1100 LT-20 Auto "Remington 1100 LT-20 Tournament Skeet "Remington 1100 Special Field "Remington 11-48 Series "Remington 11-96 Series "Remington Model 105 Cti "Remington Model 11 Series "Remington Model 1100 Classic Trap "Remington Model 1100 Competition "Remington Model 1100 G3 "Remington Model 1100 G3 "Remington Model 1100 Series "Remington Model 1100 Shotgun "Remington Model 1100 Sporting Series "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Camo "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Super Mag Synthetic "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Super Mag Waterfowl "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Syn- thetic "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Youth "Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Youth Synthetic "Remington Model 48 Series "Remington Model 58 Series "Remington Model 870 Classic Trap "Remington Model 878A Automaster "Remington Model SP-10 Magnum Satin "Remington Model SP-10 Waterfowl "Remington Model SPR453 "Remington Versa-Max Series "Savage Model 720 "Savage Model 726 "Savage Model 740C Skeet Gun "Savage Model 745 "Savage Model 755 Series "Savage Model 775 Series "Scattergun Technologies K-9 "Scattergun Technologies SWAT "Scattergun Technologies Urban Sniper Model "SKB 1300 Upland "SKB 1900 "SKB 300 Series "SKB 900 Series "SKS 3000 "Smith & Wesson Model 1000 "Smith & Wesson Model 1012 Series "Spartan Gun Works SPR453 "TOZ Model H-170 "Tri-Star Diana Series "Tri-Star Phantom Series "Tri-Star Viper Series "Tula Arms Plant TOZ 87 "Verona 401 Series "Verona 405 Series "Verona 406 Series "Verona SX801 Series "Weatherby Centurion Series "Weatherby Field Grade "Weatherby Model 82 "Weatherby SA-08 Series "Weatherby SA-459 TR "Weatherby SAS Series "Winchester 1500 "Winchester Model 50 "Winchester Model 59 "Winchester Super X1 Series "Winchester Super X2 Series "Winchester Super X3 Series "SHOTGUNS—SLIDE ACTIONS "ADCO Diamond Grade "ADCO Diamond Series Shotguns "ADCO Mariner Model "ADCO Sales Inc. Gold Elite Series "Armcor M-30 Series
--	--	---

“Armscor M-5
 “Baikal IZH-81
 “Baikal MP133
 “Benelli Nova Series
 “Benelli Supernova Series
 “Beretta Ariete Standard
 “Beretta Gold Pigeon Pump
 “Beretta Model SL-12
 “Beretta Ruby Pigeon Pump
 “Beretta Silver Pigeon Pump
 “Brolin Field Series
 “Brolin Lawman Model
 “Brolin Slug Special
 “Brolin Slugmaster
 “Brolin Turkey Master
 “Browning BPS Game Gun Deer Special
 “Browning BPS Game Gun Turkey Special
 “Browning BPS Pigeon Grade Pump Shotgun
 “Browning BPS Pump Shotgun
 “Browning BPS Pump Shotgun (Ladies and Youth Model)
 “Browning BPS Series Pump Shotgun
 “Browning BPS Stalker Pump Shotgun
 “Browning Model 12 Limited Edition Series
 “Browning Model 42 Pump Shotgun
 “Century IJ12 Slide Action
 “Century Ultra 87 Slide Action
 “Charles Daly Field Hunter
 “Ducks Unlimited Dinner Guns
 “EAA Model PM2
 “Escort Field Series
 “Fort Worth Firearms GL18
 “H&R Pardner Pump
 “Hi-Standard Flite-King Series
 “Hi-Standard Model 200
 “Interstate Arms Model 981
 “Interstate Arms Model 982T
 “Ithaca Deerslayer II Rifled Shotgun
 “Ithaca Model 87 Deerslayer Shotgun
 “Ithaca Model 87 Deluxe Pump Shotgun
 “Ithaca Model 87 Series Shotguns
 “Ithaca Model 87 Supreme Pump Shotgun
 “Ithaca Model 87 Turkey Gun
 “Magtech Model 586-VR Pump Shotgun
 “Maverick Models 88, 91 Pump Shotguns
 “Mossberg 200 Series Shotgun
 “Mossberg 3000 Pump shotgun
 “Mossberg 535 ATS Series Pump Shotguns
 “Mossberg Field Grade Model 835 Pump Shotgun
 “Mossberg Model 500 All Purpose Field
 “Mossberg Model 500 Bantam
 “Mossberg Model 500 Bantam Combo
 “Mossberg Model 500 Bantam Pump
 “Mossberg Model 500 Camo Pump
 “Mossberg Model 500 Combos
 “Mossberg Model 500 Flyway Series Waterfowl
 “Mossberg Model 500 Grand Slam Series Turkey
 “Mossberg Model 500 Muzzleloader
 “Mossberg Model 500 Muzzleloader Combo
 “Mossberg Model 500 Series Pump Shotguns
 “Mossberg Model 500 Slugster
 “Mossberg Model 500 Sporting Pump
 “Mossberg Model 500 Super Bantam All Purpose Field
 “Mossberg Model 500 Super Bantam Combo
 “Mossberg Model 500 Super Bantam Slug
 “Mossberg Model 500 Super Bantam Turkey
 “Mossberg Model 500 Trophy Slugster
 “Mossberg Model 500 Turkey
 “Mossberg Model 500 Waterfowl
 “Mossberg Model 505 Series Pump Shotguns
 “Mossberg Model 505 Youth All Purpose Field
 “Mossberg Model 535 ATS All Purpose Field
 “Mossberg Model 535 ATS Combos
 “Mossberg Model 535 ATS Slugster
 “Mossberg Model 535 ATS Turkey
 “Mossberg Model 535 ATS Waterfowl
 “Mossberg Model 835 Regal Ulti-Mag Pump
 “Mossberg Model 835 Series Pump Shotguns
 “Mossberg Model 835 Ulti-Mag
 “Mossberg Turkey Model 500 Pump
 “National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTf) Banquet/Guns of the Year
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Combo
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Field
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Slug Gun
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Synthetic
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Turkey Gun
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump Walnut
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump-Compact Field
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump-Compact Synthetic
 “New England Firearms Pardner Pump-Compact Walnut
 “Norinco Model 98 Field Series
 “Norinco Model 983
 “Norinco Model 984
 “Norinco Model 985
 “Norinco Model 987
 “Orvis Grand Vazir Series
 “Quail Unlimited Limited Edition Pump Shotguns
 “Remington 870 Express
 “Remington 870 Express Rifle Sighted Deer Gun
 “Remington 870 Express Series Pump Shotguns
 “Remington 870 Express Turkey
 “Remington 870 High Grade Series
 “Remington 870 High Grades
 “Remington 870 Marine Magnum
 “Remington 870 Special Field
 “Remington 870 Special Purpose Deer Gun
 “Remington 870 Special Purpose Synthetic Camo
 “Remington 870 SPS Special Purpose Magnum
 “Remington 870 SPS-BG-Camo Deer/Turkey Shotgun
 “Remington 870 SPS-Deer Shotgun
 “Remington 870 SPS-T Camo Pump Shotgun
 “Remington 870 TC Trap
 “Remington 870 Wingmaster
 “Remington 870 Wingmaster Series
 “Remington 870 Wingmaster Small Gauges
 “Remington Model 11-87 XCS Super Magnum Waterfowl
 “Remington Model 870 Ducks Unlimited Series Dinner Pump Shotguns
 “Remington Model 870 Express
 “Remington Model 870 Express JR.
 “Remington Model 870 Express Shurshot Synthetic Cantilever
 “Remington Model 870 Express Super Magnum
 “Remington Model 870 Express Synthetic
 “Remington Model 870 Express Youth Gun
 “Remington Model 870 Express Youth Synthetic
 “Remington Model 870 SPS Shurshot Synthetic Cantilever
 “Remington Model 870 SPS Shurshot Synthetic Turkey
 “Remington Model 870 SPS Special Purpose Magnum Series Pump Shotguns
 “Remington Model 870 SPS Super Mag Max Gobbler
 “Remington Model 870 XCS Marine Magnum
 “Remington Model 870 XCS Super Magnum
 “Winchester 12 Commercial Riot Gun
 “Winchester 97 Commercial Riot Gun
 “Winchester Model 12 Pump Shotgun
 “Winchester Model 120 Ranger
 “Winchester Model 1200 Series Shotgun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Ranger Pump Gun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Ranger Pump Gun Combo & Deer Gun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Series Shotgun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Slug Hunter Deer Gun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Turkey Gun
 “Winchester Model 1300 Walnut Pump
 “Winchester Model 42 High Grade Shotgun
 “Winchester Speed Pump Defender
 “Winchester SXP Series Pump Shotgun
 “Zoli Pump Action Shotgun
 “SHOTGUNS—OVER/UNDERS
 “ADCO Sales Diamond Series Shotguns
 “American Arms/Franchi Falconet 2000 O/U
 “American Arms Lince
 “American Arms Silver I O/U
 “American Arms Silver II Shotgun
 “American Arms Silver Skeet O/U
 “American Arms Silver Sporting O/U
 “American Arms Silver Sport O/U
 “American Arms WS/OU 12, TS/OU 12 Shotguns
 “American Arms WT/OU 10 Shotgun
 “American Arms/Franchi Sporting 2000 O/U
 “Armsport 2700 O/U Goose Gun
 “Armsport 2700 Series O/U
 “Armsport 2900 Tri-Barrel Shotgun
 “AYA Augusta
 “AYA Coral A
 “AYA Coral B
 “AYA Excelsior
 “AYA Model 37 Super
 “AYA Model 77
 “AYA Model 79 Series
 “Baby Bretton Over/Under Shotgun
 “Baikal IZH27
 “Baikal MP310
 “Baikal MP333
 “Baikal MP94
 “Beretta 90 DE LUXE
 “Beretta 682 Gold E Skeet
 “Beretta 682 Gold E Trap
 “Beretta 682 Gold E Trap Bottom Single
 “Beretta 682 Series
 “Beretta 682 Super Sporting O/U
 “Beretta 685 Series
 “Beretta 686 Series
 “Beretta 686 White Onyx
 “Beretta 686 White Onyx Sporting
 “Beretta 687 EELL Classic
 “Beretta 687 EELL Diamond Pigeon
 “Beretta 687 EELL Diamond Pigeon Sporting
 “Beretta 687 series
 “Beretta 687EL Sporting O/U
 “Beretta Alpha Series
 “Beretta America Standard
 “Beretta AS
 “Beretta ASE 90 Competition O/U Shotgun
 “Beretta ASE 90 Gold Skeet
 “Beretta ASE Gold
 “Beretta ASE Series
 “Beretta ASEL
 “Beretta BL Sereis
 “Beretta DT10 Series
 “Beretta DT10 Trident EELL
 “Beretta DT10 Trident L Sporting
 “Beretta DT10 Trident Skeet
 “Beretta DT10 Trident Sporting
 “Beretta DT10 Trident Trap Combo
 “Beretta Europa
 “Beretta Field Shotguns
 “Beretta Gamma Series
 “Beretta Giubileo
 “Beretta Grade Four
 “Beretta Grade One
 “Beretta Grade Three
 “Beretta Grade Two
 “Beretta Milano
 “Beretta Model 686 Ultralight O/U
 “Beretta Model SO5, SO6, SO9 Shotguns
 “Beretta Onyx Hunter Sport O/U Shotgun
 “Beretta Over/Under Field Shotguns
 “Beretta Royal Pigeon
 “Beretta S56 Series
 “Beretta S58 Series

“Beretta Series 682 Competition Over/Unders	“Charles Daly Country Squire Model	“Franchi Falconet Series
“Beretta Silver Pigeon II	“Charles Daly Deluxe Model	“Franchi Instinct Series
“Beretta Silver Pigeon II Sporting	“Charles Daly Diamond Series	“Franchi Model 2003 Trap
“Beretta Silver Pigeon III	“Charles Daly Empire Series	“Franchi Renaissance Series
“Beretta Silver Pigeon III Sporting	“Charles Daly Field Grade O/U	“Franchi Sporting 2000
“Beretta Silver Pigeon IV	“Charles Daly Lux Over/Under	“Franchi Undergun Model 3000
“Beretta Silver Pigeon S	“Charles Daly Maxi-Mag	“Franchi Veloce Series
“Beretta Silver Pigeon V	“Charles Daly Model 105	“Galef Golden Snipe
“Beretta Silver Snipe	“Charles Daly Model 106	“Galef Silver Snipe
“Beretta Skeet Set	“Charles Daly Model 206	“Golden Eagle Model 5000 Series
“Beretta SO-1	“Charles Daly Over/Under Shotguns, Japanese Manufactured	“Griffon & Howe Black Ram
“Beretta SO-2	“Charles Daly Over/Under Shotguns, Prussian Manufactured	“Griffon & Howe Broadway
“Beretta SO-3	“Charles Daly Presentation Model	“Griffon & Howe Claremont
“Beretta SO-4	“Charles Daly Sporting Clays Model	“Griffon & Howe Madison
“Beretta SO5	“Charles Daly Superior Model	“Griffon & Howe Silver Ram
“Beretta SO6 EELL	“Charles Daly UL	“Griffon & Howe Superbrite
“Beretta SO-10	“Churchill Imperial Model	“Guerini Apex Series
“Beretta SO10 EELL	“Churchill Monarch	“Guerini Challenger Sporting
“Beretta Sporting Clay Shotguns	“Churchill Premiere Model	“Guerini Ellipse Evo
“Beretta SV10 Perennia	“Churchill Regent Trap and Skeet	“Guerini Ellipse Evolution Sporting
“Beretta Ultralight	“Churchill Regent V	“Guerini Ellipse Limited
“Beretta Ultralight Deluxe	“Churchill Sporting Clays	“Guerini Essex Field
“Bertuzzi Zeus	“Churchill Windsor III	“Guerini Flyaway
“Bertuzzi Zeus Series	“Churchill Windsor IV	“Guerini Forum Series
“Beschi Boxlock Model	“Classic Doubles Model 101 Series	“Guerini Magnus Series
“Big Bear Arms IJ-39	“Cogswell & Harrison Woodward Type	“Guerini Maxum Series
“Big Bear Arms Sterling Series	“Connecticut Shotgun Company A. Galazan Model	“Guerini Summit Series
“Big Bear IJ-27	“Connecticut Shotgun Company A-10 American	“Guerini Tempio
“Blaser F3 Series	“Connecticut Valley Classics Classic Field Waterfowler	“Guerini Woodlander
“Bosis Challenger Titanium	“Connecticut Valley Classics Classic Sporter O/U	“H&R Harrich #1
“Bosis Laura	“Continental Arms Centaure Series	“H&R Model 1212
“Bosis Michaelangelo	“Cortona Over/Under Shotguns	“H&R Model 1212WF
“Bosis Wild Series	“CZ 581 Solo	“H&R Pinnacle
“Boss Custom Over/Under Shotguns	“CZ Canvasback 103D	“Hatfields Hatfield Model 1 of 100
“Boss Merlin	“CZ Limited Edition	“Heym Model 55 F
“Boss Pendragon	“CZ Mallard 104A	“Heym Model 55 SS
“Breda Pegaso Series	“CZ Redhead Deluxe 103FE	“Heym Model 200
“Breda Sirio Standard	“CZ Sporting	“Holland & Holland Royal Series
“Breda Vega Series	“CZ Super Scroll Limited Edition	“Holland & Holland Sporting Model
“Bretton Baby Standard	“CZ Upland Ultralight	“IGA 2000 Series
“Bretton Sprint Deluxe	“CZ Wingshooter	“IGA Hunter Series
“BRNO 500/501	“Dakin Arms Model 170	“IGA Trap Series
“BRNO 502	“Darne SB1	“IGA Turkey Series
“BRNO 801 Series	“Darne SB2	“IGA Waterfowl Series
“BRNO 802 Series	“Darne SB3	“K.F.C. E-2 Trap/Skeet
“BRNO BS-571	“Depar ATA	“K.F.C. Field Gun
“BRNO BS-572	“Dommoulin Superposed Express	“Kassnar Grade I O/U Shotgun
“BRNO ZH-300	“Ducks Unlimited Dinner Guns/Guns of the Year, Over/Under Models	“KDF Condor Khan Arthemis Field/Deluxe
“BRNO ZH-301	“Dumoulin Boss Royal Superposed	“Kimber Augusta Series
“BRNO ZH-302	“E.A.A. Falcon	“Kimber Marias Series
“BRNO ZH-303	“E.A.A. Scirocco Series	“Krieghoff K-80 Four-Barrel Skeet Set
“Browning 325 Sporting Clays	“E.A.A./Sabatti Falcon-Mon Over/Under	“Krieghoff K-80 International Skeet
“Browning 625 Series	“E.A.A./Sabatti Sporting Clays Pro-Gold O/U	“Krieghoff K-80 O/U Trap Shotgun
“Browning 725 Series	“ERA Over/Under	“Krieghoff K-80 Skeet Shotgun
“Browning B-25 Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Aries	“Krieghoff K-80 Sporting Clays O/U
“Browning B-26 Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Castrone	“Krieghoff K-80/R/T Shotguns
“Browning B-27 Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Dove Gun	“Krieghoff Model 20 Sporting/Field
“Browning B-125 Custom Shop Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Excaliber Series	“Krieghoff Model 32 Series
“Browning Citori 525 Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Jorema	“Lames Field Model
“Browning Citori GTI Sporting Clays	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Leonardo	“Lames Skeet Model
“Browning Citori Lightning Series	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Pegasus	“Lames Standard Model
“Browning Citori O/U Shotgun	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Posiden	“Lames California Model
“Browning Citori O/U Skeet Models	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Quail Gun	“Laurona Model 67
“Browning Citori O/U Trap Models	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Royal	“Laurona Model 82 Series
“Browning Citori Plus Trap Combo	“Famars di Abbiatico & Salvinelli Royale	“Laurona Model 83 Series
“Browning Citori Plus Trap Gun	“Fausti Boutique Series	“Laurona Model 84 Series
“Browning Cynergy Series	“Fausti Caledon Series	“Laurona Model 85 Series
“Browning Diana Grade	“Fausti Class Series	“Laurona Model 300 Series
“Browning Lightning Sporting Clays	“Ferlib Boss Model	“Laurona Silhouette 300 Sporting Clays
“Browning Micro Citori Lightning	“Finnclassic 512 Series	“Laurona Silhouette 300 Trap
“Browning Midas Grade	“Franchi 2004 Trap	“Laurona Super Model Over/Unders
“Browning Special Sporting Clays	“Franchi 2005 Combination Trap	“Lebeau Baron Series
“Browning Sporter Model	“Franchi Alcione Series	“Lebeau Boss Verres
“Browning ST-100	“Franchi Aristocrat Series	“Lebeau Boxlock with sideplates
“Browning Superlight Citori Over/Under	“Franchi Black Majic	“Lebeau Sidelock
“Browning Superlight Citori Series		“Lebeau Versailles
“Browning Superlight Feather		“Lippard Custom Over/Under Shotguns
“Browning Superposed Pigeon Grade		“Ljutic LM-6 Deluxe O/U Shotgun
“Browning Superposed Standard		“Longthorne Hesketh Game Gun
“BSA Falcon		“Longthorne Sporter
“BSA O/U		“Marlin Model 90
“BSA Silver Eagle		“Marocchi Avanza O/U Shotgun
“Cabela's Volo		“Marocchi Conquista Over/Under Shotgun
“Caprinus Sweden Model		“Marocchi Conquista Series
“Centurion Over/Under Shotgun		“Marocchi Model 100
“Century Arms Arthemis		“Marocchi Model 99
“Chapuis Over/Under Shotgun		“Maverick HS-12 Tactical
		“Maverick Hunter Field Model

- “McMillan Over/Under Sidelock
- “Merkel 201 Series
- “Merkel 2016 Series
- “Merkel 2116 EL Sidelock
- “Merkel 303EL Luxus
- “Merkel Model 100
- “Merkel Model 101
- “Merkel Model 101E
- “Merkel Model 200E O/U Shotgun
- “Merkel Model 200E Skeet, Trap Over/Unders
- “Merkel Model 200SC Sporting Clays
- “Merkel Model 203E, 303E Over/Under Shotguns
- “Merkel Model 204E
- “Merkel Model 210
- “Merkel Model 301
- “Merkel Model 302
- “Merkel Model 304E
- “Merkel Model 310E
- “Merkel Model 400
- “Merkel Model 400E
- “Merkel Model 2000 Series
- “Mossberg Onyx Reserve Field
- “Mossberg Onyx Reserve Sporting
- “Mossberg Silver Reserve Field
- “Mossberg Silver Reserve Series
- “Mossberg Silver Reserve Sporting
- “Norinco Type HL12-203
- “Omega Standard Over/Under Model
- “Orvis Field
- “Orvis Knockabout
- “Orvis Premier Grade
- “Orvis SKB Green Mountain Uplander
- “Orvis Sporting Clays
- “Orvis Super Field
- “Orvis Uplander
- “Orvis Waterfowler
- “Pederson Model 1000 Series
- “Pederson Model 1500 Series
- “Perazzi Boxlock Action Hunting
- “Perazzi Competition Series
- “Perazzi Electrocibles
- “Perazzi Granditalia
- “Perazzi Mirage Special Four-Gauge Skeet
- “Perazzi Mirage Special Skeet Over/Under
- “Perazzi Mirage Special Sporting O/U
- “Perazzi MS80
- “Perazzi MT-6
- “Perazzi MX1/MX2
- “Perazzi MX3
- “Perazzi MX4
- “Perazzi MX5
- “Perazzi MX6
- “Perazzi MX7 Over/Under Shotguns
- “Perazzi MX8/20 Over/Under Shotgun
- “Perazzi MX8/MX8 Special Trap, Skeet
- “Perazzi MX9 Single Over/Under Shotguns
- “Perazzi MX10
- “Perazzi MX11
- “Perazzi MX12 Hunting Over/Under
- “Perazzi MX14
- “Perazzi MX16
- “Perazzi MX20 Hunting Over/Under
- “Perazzi MX28, MX410 Game O/U Shotguns
- “Perazzi MX2000
- “Perazzi MX2005
- “Perazzi MX2008
- “Perazzi Sidelock Action Hunting
- “Perazzi Sporting Classic O/U
- “Perugini Maestro Series
- “Perugini Michelangelo
- “Perugini Nova Boss
- “Pietro Zanoletti Model 2000 Field O/U
- “Piotti Boss Over/Under Shotgun
- “Pointer Italian Model
- “Pointer Turkish Model
- “Remington 396 Series
- “Remington 3200 Series
- “Remington Model 32 Series
- “Remington Model 300 Ideal
- “Remington Model 332 Series
- “Remington Model SPR310
- “Remington Model SPR310N
- “Remington Model SPR310S
- “Remington Peerless Over/Under Shotgun
- “Remington Premier Field
- “Remington Premier Ruffed Grouse
- “Remington Premier Series
- “Remington Premier STS Competition
- “Remington Premier Upland
- “Richland Arms Model 41
- “Richland Arms Model 747
- “Richland Arms Model 757
- “Richland Arms Model 787
- “Richland Arms Model 808
- “Richland Arms Model 810
- “Richland Arms Model 828
- “Rigby 401 Sidelock
- “Rota Model 650
- “Rota Model 72 Series
- “Royal American Model 100
- “Ruger Red Label O/U Shotgun
- “Ruger Sporting Clays O/U Shotgun
- “Ruger Woodside Shotgun
- “Rutten Model RM 100
- “Rutten Model RM285
- “S.I.A.C.E. Evolution
- “S.I.A.C.E. Model 66C
- “S.I.A.C.E.600T Lusso EL
- “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 800 Series
- “SKB Model 880 Series
- “SKB Model 885 Over/Under Trap, Skeet, Sporting Clays
- “SKB Model 885 Series
- “SKB Model 5600 Series
- “SKB Model 5700 Series
- “SKB Model 5800 Series
- “SKB Model GC-7 Series
- “Spartan SPR310/320
- “Stevens Model 240
- “Stevens Model 512
- “Stoeger/IGA Condor I O/U Shotgun
- “Stoeger/IGA ERA 2000 Over/Under Shotgun
- “Techni-Mec Model 610 Over/Under
- “Tikka Model 412S Field Grade Over/Under
- “Traditions 350 Series Traditions 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 Model 300
- “Tri-Star Model 333 Series
- “Tri-Star Setter Model
- “Tri-Star Silver Series
- “Tri-Star Sporting Model
- “TULA 120
- “TULA 200
- “TULA TOZ34
- “Universal 7112
- “Universal 7312
- “Universal 7412
- “Universal 7712
- “Universal 7812
- “Universal 7912
- “Verona 501 Series
- “Verona 680 Series
- “Verona 702 Series
- “Verona LX692 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/Us
- “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 Snipe
- “Zoli Snipe
- “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 Sidelock Model
- “ADCO Sales Diamond Series Shotguns
- “American Arms Brittany Shotgun
- “American Arms Derby Side-by-Side
- “American Arms Gentry Double Shotgun
- “American Arms Grulla #2 Double Shotgun
- “American Arms TS/SS 10 Double Shotgun
- “American Arms TS/SS 12 Side-by-Side
- “American Arms WS/SS 10
- “Arizaga Model 31 Double Shotgun
- “Armes de Chasse Sidelock and Boxlock Shotguns
- “Armsport 1050 Series Double Shotguns
- “Arrieta Sidelock Double Shotguns
- “Auguste Francotte Boxlock Shotgun
- “Auguste Francotte Sidelock Shotgun
- “AYA Boxlock Shotguns
- “AYA Sidelock Double Shotguns
- “Baikal IZH-43 Series Shotguns
- “Baikal MP210 Series Shotguns
- “Baikal MP213 Series Shotguns
- “Baikal MP220 Series Shotguns
- “Baker Gun Sidelock Models
- “Baltimore Arms Co. Style 1
- “Baltimore Arms Co. Style 2
- “Bayard Boxlock and Sidelock Model Shotguns
- “Beretta 450 series Shotguns
- “Beretta 451 Series Shotguns
- “Beretta 452 Series Shotguns
- “Beretta 470 Series Shotguns
- “Beretta Custom Grade Shotguns
- “Beretta Francia Standard
- “Beretta Imperiale Montecarlo
- “Beretta Model 452 Sidelock Shotgun
- “Beretta Omega Standard
- “Beretta Side-by-Side Field Shotguns
- “Beretta Verona/Bergamo
- “Bertuzzi Ariete Hammer Gun
- “Bertuzzi Model Orione
- “Bertuzzi Venere Series Shotguns
- “Beschi Sidelock and Boxlock Models
- “Bill Hanus Birdgun Doubles
- “Bosis Country SxS
- “Bosis Hammer Gun
- “Bosis Queen Sidelock
- “Boss Robertson SxS
- “Boss SxS

"Boswell Boxlock Model
 "Boswell Featherweight Monarch Grade
 "Boswell Merlin Sidelock
 "Boswell Sidelock Model
 "Breda Andromeda Special
 "BRNO ZP Series Shotguns
 "Brown SxS Shotgun
 "Browning B-SS
 "Browning B-SS Belgian/Japanese Proto-
 type
 "Browning B-SS Sidelock
 "Browning B-SS Sporter
 "Bruchet Model A
 "Bruchet Model B
 "BSA Classic
 "BSA Royal
 "Cabela's ATA Grade II Custom
 "Cabela's Hemingway Model
 "Casartelli Sidelock Model
 "Century Coach SxS
 "Chapuis RGP Series Shotguns
 "Chapuis RP Series Shotguns
 "Chapuis Side-by-Side Shotgun
 "Chapuis UGP Round Design SxS
 "Charles Daly 1974 Wildlife Commemora-
 tive
 "Charles Daly Classic Coach Gun
 "Charles Daly Diamond SxS
 "Charles Daly Empire SxS
 "Charles Daly Model 306
 "Charles Daly Model 500
 "Charles Daly Model Dss Double
 "Charles Daly Superior SxS
 "Churchill Continental Series Shotguns
 "Churchill Crown Model
 "Churchill Field Model
 "Churchill Hercules Model
 "Churchill Imperial Model
 "Churchill Premiere Series Shotguns
 "Churchill Regal Model
 "Churchill Royal Model
 "Churchill Windsor Series Shotguns
 "Cimarron Coach Guns
 "Classic Doubles Model 201
 "Classic Clot 1878 Hammer Shotgun
 "Cogswell & Harrison Sidelock and
 Boxlock Shotguns
 "Colt 1883 Hammerless
 "Colt SxS Shotgun
 "Connecticut Shotgun Co. Model 21
 "Connecticut Shotgun Co. RBL Series
 "Continental Arms Centaure
 "Crescent SxS Model
 "Crucelegui Hermanos Model 150 Double
 "CZ Amarillo
 "CZ Bobwhite
 "CZ Competition
 "CZ Deluxe
 "CZ Durango
 "CZ Grouse
 "CZ Hammer Models
 "CZ Partridge
 "CZ Ringneck
 "CZ Ringneck Target
 "Dakin Model 100
 "Dakin Model 147
 "Dakin Model 160
 "Dakin Model 215
 "Dakota American Legend
 "Dakota Classic Grade
 "Dakota Classic Grade II
 "Dakota Classic Grade III
 "Dakota Premier Grade
 "Dan Arms Deluxe Field Model
 "Dan Arms Field Model
 "Darne Sliding Breech Series Shotguns
 "Davidson Arms Model 63B
 "Davidson Arms Model 69SL
 "Davidson Arms Model 73 Stagecoach
 "Dumoulin Continental Model
 "Dumoulin Etendard Model
 "Dumoulin Europa Model
 "Dumoulin Liege Model
 "E.A.A. SABA
 "E.A.A./Sabatti Saba-Mon Double Shotgun
 "E.M.F. Model 1878 SxS
 "E.M.F. Stagecoach SxS Model
 "ERA Quail SxS
 "ERA Riot SxS
 "ERA SxS
 "Famars Boxlock Models
 "Famars Castore
 "Famars Sidelock Models
 "Fausti Caledon
 "Fausti Class
 "Fausti Class Round Body
 "Fausti DEA Series Shotguns
 "Ferlib Mignon Hammer Model
 "Ferlib Model F VII Double Shotgun
 "FN Anson SxS Standard Grade
 "FN New Anson SxS Standard Grade
 "FN Sidelock Standard Grade
 "Fox Higher Grade Models (A-F)
 "Fox Sterlingworth Series
 "Franchi Airone
 "Franchi Astore Series
 "Franchi Destino
 "Franchi Highlander
 "Franchi Sidelock Double Barrel
 "Francotte Boxlock Shotgun
 "Francotte Jubilee Model
 "Francotte Sidelock Shotgun
 "Galef Silver Hawk SxS
 "Galef Zabala SxS
 "Garbi Model 100
 "Garbi Model 101 Side-by-Side
 "Garbi Model 103A, B Side-by-Side
 "Garbi Model 200 Side-by-Side
 "Gastinne Model 105
 "Gastinne Model 202
 "Gastinne Model 353
 "Gastinne Model 98
 "Gib 10 Gauge Magnum
 "Gil Alhambra
 "Gil Diamond
 "Gil Laga
 "Gil Olimpia
 "Greener Sidelock SxS Shotguns
 "Griffin & Howe Britte
 "Griffin & Howe Continental Sidelock
 "Griffin & Howe Round Body 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&R Anson & Deeley SxS
 "H&R Model 404
 "H&R Small Bore SxS Hammer Gun
 "Hatfield Uplander Shotgun
 "Henry Atkin Boxlock Model
 "Henry Atkin Sidelock Model
 "Holland & Holland Cavalier Boxlock
 "Holland & Holland Dominion Game Gun
 "Holland & Holland Northwood Boxlock
 "Holland & Holland Round Action Sidelock
 "Holland & Holland Round Action Sidelock
 Paradox
 "Holland & Holland Royal Hammerless
 Ejector Sidelock
 "Holland & Holland Sidelock Shotguns
 "Holloway premier Sidelock SxS Model
 "Hopkins & Allen Boxlock and Sidelock
 Models
 "Huglu SxS Shotguns
 "Husqvarna SxS Shotguns
 "IGA Deluxe Model
 "IGA Turkey Series Model
 "Interstate Arms Model 99 Coach Gun
 "Ithaca Classic Doubles Series Shotguns
 "Ithaca Hammerless Series
 "Iver Johnson Hammerless Model Shot-
 guns
 "Jeffery Boxlock Shotguns
 "Jeffery Sidelock Shotguns
 "K.B.I. Grade II SxS
 "Khan Coach Gun
 "Kimber Valier 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
 "Leforgeron Boxlock Ejector
 "Leforgeron Sidelock Ejector
 "Liberty Coach Gun Series
 "MacNaughton Sidelock Model
 "Malin Boxlock Model
 "Malin Sidelock Model
 "Masquelier Boxlock Model
 "Masquelier Sidelock Model
 "Medwell SxS Sidelock
 "Merkel Model 8, 47E Side-by-Side Shot-
 guns
 "Merkel Model 47LSC Sporting Clays Dou-
 ble
 "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
 "Merkel Model 1622 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 DHO 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 Piuma 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 SPR210
 "Remington Model SPR220
 "Remington Model SPR220 Cowboy
 "Remington Premier SxS
 "Richland Arms Co. Italian made SxS
 Models
 "Richland Arms Co. Spanish made SxS
 Models
 "Rigby Boxlock Shotgun
 "Rigby Hammer Shotgun
 "Rizzini Boxlock Side-by-Side
 "Rizzini Sidelock Side-by-Side
 "Rossi Overlud
 "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
 "SAE Model 209E
 "SAE Model 210S
 "SAE Model 340X

“Sarasqueta Mammerless Sidelock
 “Sarasqueta Model 3 Boxlock
 “Sauer Boxlock Model Shotguns
 “Sauer Sidelock Model Shotguns
 “Savage Fox Model FA-1
 “Savage Model 550
 “Scott Blenheim
 “Scott Bowood
 “Scott Chatsworth
 “Scott Kinmount
 “SIACE Italian made SxS Shotguns
 “SKB Model 100
 “SKB Model 150
 “SKB Model 200
 “SKB Model 280
 “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 10-Ga. Magnum Shotgun
 “Universal Double Wing SxS
 “Vouzelaud Model 315 Series
 “Walther Model WSF
 “Walther Model WSFD
 “Weatherby Atheana
 “Weatherby D’Italia Series
 “Weatherby Orion
 “Westley Richards Best Quality Sidelock
 “Westley Richards Boxlock Shotguns
 “Westley Richards Connaught 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 301A
 “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 Recoilless Trap Shotgun
 “Browning Recoilless Trap Shotgun
 “Crescent Single Shot Models
 “CZ Cottontail
 “Desert Industries Big Twenty Shotgun
 “Fefever Long Range Field
 “Frigon FS-4
 “Frigon FT-1
 “Frigon FT-C
 “Gibbs Midland Stalker
 “Greener General Purpose GP MKI/MKII

“H&R Survivor
 “H&R Tracker Slug Model
 “Harrington & Richardson N.W.T.F. Turkey Mag
 “Harrington & Richardson Pardner
 “Harrington & Richardson Pardner Compact
 “Harrington & Richardson Pardner Compact Turkey Gun
 “Harrington & Richardson Pardner Screw-In Chokey
 “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 Thumbhole Stock
 “Harrington & Richardson Ultra-Lite Slug Hunter
 “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 Shotgun
 “Iver Johnson Excel
 “Krieghoff K-80 Single Barrel Trap Gun
 “Krieghoff KS-5 Special
 “Krieghoff KS-5 Trap Gun
 “Lefever Trap Gun
 “Ljutic LTX Super Deluxe Mono Gun
 “Ljutic Mono Gun Single Barrel
 “Ljutic Recoilless 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 Models 80, 83, 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 395 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 TM1 Special Single Trap
 “Remington 90-T Super Single Shotgun
 “Remington Model No. 9
 “Remington Model 310 Skeet
 “Remington Model No. 3

“Rossi Circuit Judge Lever Action Shotgun
 “Rossi Circuit Judge Shotgun
 “Ruger Single Barrel Trap
 “S.W.D. Terminator
 “Savage Kimel Kamper Single Shot
 “Savage Model 210F Slug Warrior
 “Savage Model 212 Slug Gun
 “Savage Model 220 Series
 “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 RSG-16
 “Tangfolio Blockcard Model
 “Tangfolio Model DSG
 “Tangfolio Model RSG-12 Series
 “Tangfolio Model RSG-20
 “Tangfolio RSG-Tactical
 “Taurus Circuit Judge Shotgun
 “Thompson/Center Encore Shotgun
 “Thompson/Center Pro Hunter Turkey Shotgun
 “Thompson/Center TCR ’87 Hunter Shotgun
 “Universal Firearms Model 7212 Single Barrel Trap
 “Winchester Model 36 Single Shot
 “Winchester Model 37 Single Shot
 “Winchester Model 41 Bolt Action
 “Winchester Model 9410 Series
 “Zoli Apache Model
 “Zoli Diano Series
 “Zoli Loner Series”.

SEC. 04. PENALTIES.

Section 924(a)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “(or (q) of section 922” and inserting “(q), (r), (v), (w), or (aa) of section 922”.

SEC. 05. BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR TRANSFERS OF GRANDFATHERED SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended—

- (1) by repealing subsection (s);
- (2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s);
- (3) in subsection (s), as redesignated—
 - (A) in paragraph (3)(C)(ii), by striking “(as defined in subsection (s)(8))”; and
 - (B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) In this subsection, the term ‘chief law enforcement officer’ means the chief of police, the sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such individual.”; and
- (4) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

“(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 semiautomatic 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 semiautomatic assault weapon for the purpose of complying with subsection (s). Upon taking custody of the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon, the licensee shall comply with all requirements of this chapter as if the licensee were transferring the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon from the licensee’s inventory to the unlicensed transferee.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a temporary transfer of possession for the purpose of participating in target shooting in 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 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 (g)(5)(B)”.

(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 “section 922(s)”.

(c) 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. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) 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, Mr. ROUNDS, 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 155, line 10, insert after “one-year period.” the following: “*Provided further*, that upon request by an owner of a project financed by an existing loan under section

514 or 515 of the Act, the Secretary may renew the rental assistance agreement for a period of 20 years or until the term of such loan has expired, subject to annual appropriations.”

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 place in 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 rural housing facilities and staff needs, which shall include prioritizing—

(1) capital repairs for aging properties participating in the rental housing programs of the Rural Housing Service;

(2) the needs of staff overseeing the Rural Housing Service and field staff conducting housing inspections; and

(3) enforcement against property owners when those owners fail to make necessary repairs.

SA 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 service and tribally operated detention and public safety facilities in Indian country that are in poor condition, including associated cost estimates.”

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 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau;

(B) contains any surface or subsurface mineral right; and

(C) is located within 15 miles of Service land or water.

(2) BUREAU.—The term “Bureau” means the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) SERVICE LAND OR WATER.—The term “Service land or water” means land or water under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

(4) STATE DIRECTOR.—The term “State Director” means a State Director of the Bureau.

(b) 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 each applicable Superintendent 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, archaeological 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 recreational user groups;

(D) conduct a viewshed 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 resources;

(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 oil and gas leasing on the 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.

(3) LIGHT POLLUTION.—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

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:

SEC. ____ . 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 national strategy 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 passages by removing or replacing unnatural barriers to the passage of fish and other aquatic organisms;

"(3) to decommission unneeded roads and trails; and

"(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 restores—

"(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.

"SEC. 9. ROAD SYSTEM ANALYSIS.

"(a) DEFINITION OF DECOMMISSION.—In this section, the term 'decommission' means, with respect to a road—

"(1) to restore, through active or passive means, natural drainage, watershed function, or other ecological conditions and processes that are disrupted or adversely impacted by the road; and

"(2) to remove the road from the transportation system.

"(b) IDENTIFICATION OF MINIMUM ROAD SYSTEM.—

"(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.

"(c) 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; and

"(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.

"(d) UNNEEDED ROADS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall decommission any roads 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 pose the greatest risk—

"(A) to public safety; or

"(B) of environmental degradation.

"(e) 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).

"(f) 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:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . Section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-148) is amended—

(1) by striking "An amended" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—An amended"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PENDING APPLICATIONS.—With respect to an application for an insulin biological product submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) with a filing date that is not later than December 31, 2019, until the Secretary makes a determination on final approval with respect to such application, the Secretary shall continue to review and approve (as appropriate) such application under such section 505, even if such review and approval process continues after March 23, 2020. For purposes of completing the review and approval process for such an application, any listed drug referenced in the application shall be treated as a listed drug under sec-

tion 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, even if such listed drug is deemed licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act during such review and approval process. Effective on the later of March 23, 2020, or the date of approval under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of any such application, such approved application shall be deemed to be a license for the biological product under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act."

SA 1029. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) 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 "Act." and insert "Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds included under this heading, \$3,000,000 shall be for ethylene oxide ambient air monitoring in communities identified as having an elevated cancer risk due to emissions of ethylene oxide by the most recent National Air Toxics Assessment published 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 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. ____ . 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. 387j) or a substantial equivalence order under subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) of such section 910, for any electronic nicotine delivery system, including any liquid, solution, or other component or part or 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 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. 8101 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. MORAN) 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 "\$13,500,000" and insert "\$6,500,000".

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. 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 223, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding subsections (d) and (e) of section 5 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 RESCISSION.

(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) STATUTORY 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) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this section and the amendments made by this section shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(3) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth 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 164, line 21, strike "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

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. _____. In addition to other amounts made available under this division to continue a Special Behavioral Health Pilot 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.

(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:

On page 52, line 14, strike "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000".

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, 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. _____. (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 \$1,790,290,000, 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 of the funds included under this heading, \$2,000,000 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(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o))."

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:

ELECTRIC PATHWAYS

SEC. 4 _____. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a detailed work plan that describes how the Environmental Protection Agency will comply with the requirement with respect to applications for the electric pathway in the report accompanying this Act.

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, 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 7, line 22, strike “\$279,500,000” and insert “\$291,500,000”.

On page 7, line 24, insert “, and of which \$17,000,000 shall be for assistance to nuclear power plant closure communities” after “27”.

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 121, line 2, strike “\$22,301,000” and insert “\$17,301,000”.

On page 223, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 7 _____. There is appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out section 1673(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926(d)).

SA 1044. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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—FAIR COMPENSATION FOR LOW-WAGE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT OF 2019

SECTION 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, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for each Federal agency subject to the lapse in appro-

priations 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 EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS 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) \$965.

(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(3) 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 Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth 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, 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 for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement

has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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 by this paragraph shall be used 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 _____. (a) An additional \$3,000,000 shall be available for rental assistance and associated administrative fees for Tribal HUD-VASH under the heading “TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE” under the heading “PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING” under this title, provided that \$1,000,000 shall be used for tribal outreach and technical assistance, and the funds available under this title for necessary salaries and expenses for Administrative Support Offices under the heading “ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES” under the heading “MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION” under this title shall be decreased by \$3,000,000.

SA 1047. Mr. TOOMEY (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, 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 A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NICS DENIAL NOTIFICATION ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “NICS Denial Notification Act of 2019”.

(b) **REPORTING OF BACKGROUND CHECK DENIALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 925A the following:

“§ 925B. Reporting of background check denials to State authorities

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) (commonly referred to as ‘NICS’) provides a notice pursuant to section 922(t) of this title that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of this title or State law, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with subsection (b) of this section—

“(1) report to the law enforcement authorities of the State where the person sought to

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 specific 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 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 or State law, 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 a person to be made to the same State 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:

“§ 925C. 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 Federal 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;

“(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;

“(D) the number of denials overturned through the national instant criminal background check system appeals process and the reasons for overturning the denials;

“(E) 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;

“(F) the number of persons charged with a Federal criminal offense in connection with a denial; and

“(G) the number of convictions obtained by Federal authorities in connection with a denial.

“(2) The number of background check notices reported to State authorities pursuant to section 925B (including the number of the notices that would have been so reported but 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. ____ HADIYA PENDLETON AND NYASIA PRYER-YARD GUN TRAFFICKING AND CRIME PREVENTION ACT OF 2019.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryer-Yard Gun Trafficking and Crime Prevention Act of 2019”.

(b) FIREARMS 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

“(a) OFFENSES.—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 recipient 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 a statement 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

“(4) to direct, promote, or facilitate conduct specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

“(b) PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates, or conspires to violate, subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

(2) ORGANIZER ENHANCEMENT.—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 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 persons convicted of 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 the 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 guideline penalties for violations of section 932 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.

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 (referred to 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 monitor the market for mail, television, internet, telemarketing, and recorded message telephone call (referred to in this section as “robocall”) fraud targeting seniors and shall coordinate with other relevant agencies regarding the requirements of this section.

(2) CONSUMER EDUCATION.—The Commission through the advisory office shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the

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 general information on mail, television, internet, telemarketing, and robocall fraud targeting seniors, including descriptions of the most common fraud schemes;

(B) 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, where such complaints will become immediately available to appropriate law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the attorneys general of the States;

(C) in response to a specific request about a particular entity or individual, provide publically available information of enforcement action taken by the Commission for mail, television, internet, telemarketing, and robocall fraud against such entity; and

(D) maintain a website to serve as a resource for information for seniors and families and caregivers of seniors regarding mail, television, internet, telemarketing, robocall, and other identified fraud targeting seniors.

(3) COMPLAINTS.—The Commission through the advisory office shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, establish procedures to—

(A) log and acknowledge the receipt of complaints by individuals who believe they have been a victim of mail, television, internet, telemarketing, and robocall fraud in the Consumer Sentinel Network, and shall make those complaints immediately available to Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities; and

(B) provide to individuals described in subparagraph (A), and to any other persons, specific and general information on mail, television, internet, telemarketing, and robocall fraud, including descriptions of the most common schemes using such methods of communication.

(b) COMMENCEMENT.—The Commission shall commence carrying out the requirements of this section not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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, 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:

NONPOINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 4 _____. Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1329) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsections (h) and (i) \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024, of which not more than \$7,500,000 for each fiscal year may be used to carry out subsection (i).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.”.

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, 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 _____. 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 sale of wild horses and burros that results in the destruction of the sold wild horses or burros for processing into commercial products.

SA 1052. 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 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 1053. 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 VI of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 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, diethyl phthalate, and benzyl butyl phthalate, in baby diapers, adult diapers, menstrual products, and obstetrical and gynecological devices described in section 884.5400, 884.5425, 884.5435, 884.5460, 884.5470, or 884.5900 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

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, 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. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service shall—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, restore on the website of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service the searchable Animal Care Information System and Enforcement Action databases, and the contents of those databases,

that were available on the website on January 30, 2017;

(2) for all content generated on or after January 30, 2017, not later than 60 days after receiving or generating such content, make publicly available through a searchable database, in their entirety and without redaction (except for signatures)—

(A) all inspection records maintained pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.), including—

(i) all animal inventories; and

(ii) all inspection reports by officials of the Department of Agriculture—

(I) dated after the settlement of any appeal; and

(II) that document noncompliance with that Act;

(B) all enforcement records created pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) or the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821 et seq.), including warning letters, stipulations, settlement agreements, administrative complaints, and court orders; and

(C) all research facility annual reports (including attachments) required to be submitted under the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.); and

(3) ensure that each instance of noncompliance, as observed by a Department of Agriculture inspector—

(A) with the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) is documented on an inspection report; and

(B) with the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821 et seq.) is documented on an inspection form.

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, 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. _____. None of the funds made available by 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. 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 263, line 9, strike “\$136,244,000” and insert “\$125,755,000”.

On page 294, 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”.

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, 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. _____. 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 on the feasibility of banning all electronic cigarette devices and components. The report shall consider how such products affect public health, particularly with respect to minors, pregnant women, never-smokers, and former smoker populations, and shall include detailed reasoning behind the conclusion.

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, 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. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs shall issue final regulations establishing tobacco product standards. Such standards shall include lowering nicotine levels in cigarettes to a non-addictive level, addressing levels of toxicants and impurities in e-liquids, regulations on flavors including menthol for combustible cigarettes and electronic cigarettes, and addressing safety hazards including battery explosions in electronic cigarettes and children's exposure to nicotine.

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, 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. _____. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs shall issue regulations deeming the use of any ortho-phthalate chemical as a food contact substance to be a use of an unsafe food additive within the meaning of section 402(a)(2)(C) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 342(a)(2)(C)).

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, 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 346, line 14, strike the period and insert “: *Provided*, That, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum shall submit 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:

SEC. _____. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Department of Transportation to engage with local communities, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation commissions on advancing data and intelligent transportation systems technologies and other smart cities solutions.

SA 1062. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. _____. 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(h) 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 addition of 4 full-time equivalent employees and administrative costs associated with the development by the Council on Rural Community Innovation and Economic Development established under section 6306 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (7 U.S.C. 2204b-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 perform a cost benefit analysis 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:

On page 52, line 14, after “disabilities,” insert the following: “\$2,500,000 is for law enforcement training grant programs 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 by him 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. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OPIOID LITIGATION SETTLEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Thousands of lawsuits have been brought by governmental entities in every State against manufacturers and suppliers of opioids seeking compensation for costs and damages that governments have incurred due to the defendants’ alleged role in the current public health crisis of opioid addiction and abuse.

(2) Opioid litigation settlements have resulted in payments of hundreds of millions of dollars, to date, from opioid manufacturers and suppliers to governmental entities, with the potential for additional settlements providing more funds to government entities.

(3) Only 8 percent of tobacco litigation settlement funds paid to government 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 government 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 pray-

er 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.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ROBERT BEATO 2019 MICHIGAN
PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

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 or spend the night on the roof of the high school, and he honors those commitments, noting to the Sentinel, "I've done it before."

Madam Speaker, this Friday, October 25, 2019, the South Lake High School community will come together at an assembly to show their pride that Robert Beato was named this year's Michigan Principal of the Year. I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for this richly deserved recognition, and in wishing him, his students, and his colleagues continued success.

HONORING THE 74TH BIRTHDAY
AND 40 YEARS OF SERVICE OF
JUDGE WAYNE C. SHELTON

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Judge Wayne C. Shelton of Clarksville, Tennessee on the occasion of his 74th birthday and 40 years of service as a judge.

Judge Shelton was appointed as the judge for Montgomery County's General Sessions and Juvenile Court Div. II by Governor Lamar Alexander on July 1, 1979. At present, he is the longest-serving judge in the State of Tennessee. For the past 40 years, Judge Shelton has served with distinction and devotion.

Fittingly, the Tennessee Juvenile Judges Association recently presented Judge Shelton with a lifetime achievement award to honor Judge Shelton's decades of faithful service to the people of Tennessee as a judge.

As the father of a son with Down's Syndrome, Judge Shelton is a strong advocate for those with special needs. His family is establishing a scholarship in his honor at Austin Peay State University for students who intend to work with people like his son, William Isaac Shelton, to help them lead successful and fulfilling lives.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in commending Judge Shelton for his faithful service to the law and his contributions towards improving the lives of those in need.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT DOUGLAS CHAPMAN, 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 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 Sergeant Douglas Chapman of McKinney, Texas.

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.

Following his time in uniform, Mr. Chapman received degrees from Saddleback College, California State University-Fullerton, and his Teaching Credential from National University in Quantico. 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 their 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 example of a servant leader who has used his experiences to better the community around him.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Sergeant Chapman 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 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

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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 their remarkable work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was absent due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 571; NAY on Roll Call No. 572; YEA on Roll Call No. 573; NAY on Roll Call No. 574; YEA on Roll Call No. 575; YEA on Roll Call No. 576; and NAY on Roll Call No. 577.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the opioid epidemic and our efforts to

H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, was a highlight for me last Congress.

Because it was a moment where Congress was focused on legislating and actually getting things done.

The House took 39 bipartisan bills, moved them through the legislative process, and gave

each member a chance to vote for or against them.

We didn't include any partisan, poison pills—we gave both sides an opportunity to legislate on an issue that doesn't see party lines and we got something done.

Now, we're seeing progress—the majority, 1.27 million Americans, are now receiving treatment for their addiction and we're seeing the overdose deaths decline in this country.

But we can't let up.

I am hoping we can repeat the success of this legislation—on many issues, including continuing to help communities fight opioid addiction.

This week, I'm introducing a bill that came from a local police officer in my district.

A police officer from the Normal Police Department was trying to track down a case of 'pharmacy shopping,' where someone had come down from Chicago and was trying to get an opioid prescription for someone else filled at multiple pharmacies.

But there was no way to track who had tried to fill this prescription because no ID is required to pick up these highly addictive pain killers.

My bill, the Opioid Prescription Verification Act, changes that by requiring pharmacists to record the ID of a person picking up an opioid prescription.

This is similar to ID requirements that were placed on Sudafed sales in 2005 to combat the meth epidemic.

I'm looking forward to hopefully passing this bill to continue fighting this epidemic from all angles.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT STEVEN DEFFIBAUGH, 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 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 Sergeant Steven Deffibaugh of Princeton, Texas.

A native of Borger, Texas, Sergeant Steven Deffibaugh served in the United States Marine Corps in the 5th Marine Division from 1969 to 1972. For his distinguished service to our Nation, he was awarded the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and Marksman Rifle Badge. He received degrees from Grayson County College and Abilene Christian University at Dallas.

After returning from his time in service, Sergeant Deffibaugh chose to pursue a new ave-

nue of leadership in law enforcement, serving in both the Van Alstyne and McKinney Police Departments prior to working as a Collin County Deputy Sheriff. Mr. Deffibaugh would later begin a career as an investigator with the Collin County District Attorney's office where he would remain until his retirement in 2011. Due to his deep commitment in Collin County, he would also serve as Reserve Deputy Constable for Precinct 2. In addition to his stellar service in law enforcement, Mr. Deffibaugh also played a role as a volunteer fireman, County Fire Marshall, and Assistant Fire Chief for the City of Princeton until his retirement in 2018. Mr. Deffibaugh's leadership and commitment to his community was further reflected in his role as the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tempore of Princeton, and through his efforts as the President of the Princeton Community Development Corporation.

In his 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 Slocum. 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 opportunities 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 transformed. From humble beginnings in Elizabeth Park in 1919, Wayne County Parks have since 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, playgrounds, 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 residents for a century. Wayne County Parks truly foster inclusive, lively, and enjoyable environments 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 anniversary 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 founder and president Professor Zafra Lerman, and the important work that the conferences facilitate. This year marks the ninth meeting of the Malta Conferences. The conferences help identify unique opportunities for collaboration to meet the scientific and technological challenges 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 possible for scientists from countries that are often on opposing sides of political and cultural conflicts to meet in a politically neutral environment, where they can collaborate on solving regional problems, and forge relationships that bridge deep chasms of mistrust and intolerance. These unique gatherings draw scientists from many Middle East countries, including Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.

In each of the Malta Conferences, Middle East scientists meet with science Nobel Laureates to catalyze enduring collaborations on scientific and technological problems, including water scarcity, environmental degradation, nuclear and chemical security, science and technology 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 nations whose governments are hostile to one another.

Professor Lerman has received over 40 international awards, including the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Mentoring from President Clinton, the Royal Society of Chemistry Nyholm Education Award, the American Chemical Society George C. Pimentel Award, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Award for Science and Diplomacy, the American Physical Society Andrei 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 Institute 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 Quality Assessment 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 empower 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 security, 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 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 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 Corporal 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. Originally from Farmersville, Texas, as the son of a WWII veteran, Ronnie's sense of patriotism was developed early on. Shortly after graduating from high school, RD would be assigned to the 1st Force Logistics Command driving resupply and gun 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 Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Good Conduct Medal, and Rifle Sharpshooter Badge.

In the decades that would follow, RD pursued a music career as a singer songwriter and worked as a tour bus operator for famed musicians and performers. In an effort to recognize 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 mission to identify all the men and women from Collin County who died while serving our Nation going back to the Great War. Upon conclusion 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 result was the Collin County Veterans Memorial, which was dedicated in November 2011. Further in 2013, RD cofounded the Collin County Fallen Warrior Portrait Project which has resulted in 70 portraits of fallen warriors on permanent display at the Collin County Courthouse. Corporal Foster would also organize the efforts to rename Courthouse to the Russell A. Steindam Courts Building in honor of the posthumously awarded Medal of Honor recipient. Foster's recognitions include Patriot of the Year by the Texas Veterans Commission and recognition as a recipient of the Distinguished Citizens Medal from the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Corporal Foster 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. 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 rollcall 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 Americans 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 the Southgate 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 though, 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 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 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 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 Paul Huff of McKinney, Texas.

Paul Huff entered the United States Army in 1962 and was assigned to the 5th Missile Battalion, 517th Artillery Division in Abilene, Texas following his completion of basic training. Following his promotion to Fire Control Specialist, Paul was assigned to the United States Army Signal School and later served under the United States Army Intelligence Training Center in Fort Ritchie, Maryland. Mr. Huff was promoted to a Specialist E-6 rank and was assigned with the Signal Corps in Vietnam and Thailand. In 1967, Paul returned home to his wife and children. For his service, Specialist 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 evidenced by his role as President of the Collin County Vietnam Veterans of America (Chapter 1122), and active membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars (Allen 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 also serves 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 selflessly 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 within our community and deserves our unwavering gratitude for his many efforts.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Specialist Huff for his exceptional service and congratu-

lates 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 Washtenaw 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 hometown heroes. The organization's mission is to provide immediate financial funding to families of law enforcement and firefighting personnel in Washtenaw County who have died in the line of duty, helping them through their grief. In addition, the organization strives to serve active duty law enforcement officers and firefighters by providing grants to local departments and offering annual scholarships to their children to bolster their educational opportunities.

The Washtenaw 100's Annual Dinner exemplifies the organization's continued dedication 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 Harshberger, 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.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Detective Sergeant Jason Hohner. His bravery, dedication, and service to the citizens of Washtenaw County is deeply appreciated and truly makes a difference in our community.

HONORING MAHOMED AKBAR KHAN

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mahomed Akbar Khan for his dedication to our youth and the Muslim community. With over 30 years of commitment to the people of Southern California, Mr. Khan has focused on conflict resolution, interfaith 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 Sandile, 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 has committed his life to serving his local and global community by continuing to advocate for tolerance, peace, and non-violence. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and recognizing Mahomed Akbar Khan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

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 Marksman (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.

Ordained 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 Chuckulnaskit (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 completion 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 preaches 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 Arab 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 inside 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 SYA 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 for its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

GEORGIANA VINES

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, today I recognize longtime East Tennessee journalist Georgiana Vines as she celebrates her 80th birthday this week.

Over the last five decades, Georgiana has had a successful career as a reporter and editor. She retired from full-time work in 2005 but continues to cover East Tennessee news and politics as a newspaper freelancer. In addition to working in the news industry, Georgiana has spent a great deal of time teaching and sharing her experience with future journalists at the University of Tennessee's College of Communications and Information.

I am honored to call her my friend, and I know I speak for many in East Tennessee when I say Happy Birthday, Georgiana.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of the Society for Neuroscience, an organization at the forefront of medical research and positively affecting the lives of people across America and all over the world. The Society for Neuroscience

is the world's largest organization of scientists and physicians devoted to understanding the brain and nervous system.

Over the past few days, more than 30,000 scientists from more than 70 countries have gathered at the Society's Neuroscience 2019 Conference in Chicago to present emerging science, learn from experts, forge collaborations with peers, and explore new tools and technologies. Some of the research being presented includes the latest projects and discoveries surrounding Alzheimer's and opioid addiction research, both of which are issues I care deeply about and have advocated for here in Congress.

At the annual conference, the state of Illinois is represented by nearly 1,400 attendees who are sharing cutting-edge research conducted by Illinois' research institutions and academic centers. One of these institutions taking part in the gathering of minds is Northern Illinois University (NIU), which I proudly represent in Illinois's 16th Congressional District. NIU had 10 researchers showcasing their dedicated work to the Society, representing their passion to better the sciences and find answers to questions we all hope to uncover.

In Fiscal Year 2019, the state of Illinois received over \$485 million in funding through grants from the National Institute of Health (NIH). Of that funding, \$424,000 went to IL-16 and included funding to conduct research aimed at better understanding the nervous system and to improve the treatment and prevention of brain and nervous system disorders. I want to commend the institutions in my district and state, as well as the Society for Neuroscience, for being leaders in neuroscience research and highlighting the importance of scientific research to advance our understanding of the nervous system to ultimately improve the health of people across the world.

IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT MICHAEL GRISSOM

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Michael Grissom and congratulate him on receiving The Washtenaw 100 Firefighter of the Year Award. Lieutenant Grissom'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 hometown heroes. The organization's mission is to provide immediate financial funding to families of law enforcement and firefighting personnel in Washtenaw County who have died in the line of duty, helping them through their grief. In addition, the organization strives to serve active duty law enforcement officers and firefighters by providing grants to local departments and offering annual scholarships to their children to bolster their educational opportunities.

The Washtenaw 100's Annual Dinner exemplifies the organization's continued commitment 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 Lieutenant Michael Grissom as the 2019 Firefighter of the Year.

Lieutenant Michael Grissom is an experienced and valuable member of the Dexter Area Fire Department. Nominated by Chief Robert Smith, Lieutenant Grissom is known as a leader who consistently goes above and beyond what is expected of him in his position. Lieutenant Grissom has a host of remarkable accomplishments that make him deserving of the Firefighter of the Year Award, but some of his most noteworthy achievements include his involvement with Active 911, a mobile app that enables responders to easily access pertinent information and communicate effectively with one another, and his leadership in repurposing old radios.

When asked about his impressive work, Lieutenant Grissom responded, "It's not about me." Lieutenant Grissom truly embodies all the qualities of a dedicated firefighter—he humbly strives for excellence without seeking praise or recognition for any of his significant accomplishments.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Lieutenant Michael Grissom. His bravery, dedication, and service to the citizens of Washtenaw County is deeply appreciated and truly makes a difference in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE COTTONDALE HIGH SCHOOL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA CHAPTER

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Cottondale High School Future Farmers of America (FFA) Chapter for winning the 2019 state championship for both Agriculture Communication and Parliamentary Procedure.

Cottondale FFA Chapter members Josh Scurlock, Addison Griffin, Taylor Dumas, Lillie Livingston, Blayton See, Carl Young, Joey Jackson and their Advisor Stan Scurlock did an outstanding job preparing and practicing for this competition.

Agriculture will always be vital to the sustainability of this great nation and we are fortunate to have FFA Chapters across the country that instill its importance in our youth.

The Cottondale FFA members will compete at the National FFA Convention in Indianapolis, Indiana for the national title.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Cottondale FFA chapter and wishing them luck at the National FFA Convention next week.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF MICHAEL SCHNEIDER

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of my good friend, and true leader of labor, Mike Schneider of Rochelle Park, New Jersey. After thirty-

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 joining as an 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 North 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, 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 service to the Anaheim community. His work in education impacted countless lives. On behalf of the community, I wish to thank him for his contributions.

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. Furthering his own education, 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 principal and Director of the Head Start Program for 15 years.

Mr. Peraza served as the Anaheim Planning Commissioner for nine 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, Evangeline, 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. 569, 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."

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 communitywide.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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."

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 improve 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 courageous 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 buy school supplies at Oak Park Mall. Through her remarkable efforts and heroism, Ms. Bazzi was able to stay calm and quickly maneuver the car through three lanes of traffic without harming any other motorists. As she directed the car into safety, her sons recall watching flames shoot from the hood while she provided escape instructions to ensure everyone had a clear exit route once the vehicle stopped. As the car burned, all six of Ms. Bazzi's children were able to escape without

serious injury. 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 business-woman, 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 panic 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 charities.

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 civil rights 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 Annunziata (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 for justice 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'Alesandro 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 politically. My deepest sympathy to his entire family.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF REVEREND GREG JACKSON

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. 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 Baptist 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 for themselves.

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. Their revolutionary vision propels our country forward and truly makes them part of our nation's leaders and best.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

SPEECH OF

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 2019

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with affection in memoriam of Congressman Elijah E. Cummings of Baltimore, Maryland. He was a man for our time.

Today, I join a grateful nation in honoring the life, as well as, mourning the death of an exceptional American, a man of deep faith in his creator and fellow human beings. As I learned of Elijah's passing, I was deeply saddened by the loss of such a magnanimous human being, a devoted patriot, and a man whose heart for others never stopped beating. During my tenure in the House of Representatives, I had 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 overused, 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, in 1982, at only 31 years old, Elijah became the youngest chairman of the Legislative Black Caucus 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 mantra of 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. STEFANK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. STEFANK. 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

group setting for students with emotional disabilities or autism spectrum disorders in the northeastern Colorado region. Artwork is a critical component of many therapy programs, and I commend Elijah for his commitment to serving his community in this capacity.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Elijah Marler for his many accomplishments, including earning the rank of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

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.

COMMENDING PASTOR TOMMY LEGRAND

HON. DAN BISHOP

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I wish to commend Pastor Tommy Legrand, who has been a leader in our community for 50 years.

After Tommy Legrand served our country, he served in a different capacity as a Pastor of the Faith Temple Church of God and Christ in Hamlet, NC. Starting with street-side sermons, Legrand has shepherded the church to become a figure in the local community. He has started several ministries within the church such as the Southview Learning Center, Faith Academy, Prayer and Faith Temple Food Pantry and Life Center which continue to serve countless members of our society.

Pastor Legrand continued to follow his calling and later graduated from Shaw University with a Master's degree in religion and philosophy, and later from Family Bible Institute with a Doctorate in divinity 2015. As a prayer leader in the National Church of God in Christ and the Greater North Carolina jurisdiction, and even on his own radio ministry, Pastor Legrand is a true example of a life dedicated to service in every sense of the word. It is a pleasure and an honor to represent him in Congress.

COMMEMORATING THE COMPLETION OF A RAIL SPUR TRANSFER IN MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

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.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of 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 for Thursday, October 24, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

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 Sander, 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

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. Gilchrist, 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

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

Daily Digest

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.

Pages S6091–92

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)

H.R. 1420, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies. (S. Rept. No. 116–145)

Page S6091

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”.

Pages S6053–80

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.

Page S6080

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 950, to make a technical correction.

Page S6080

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.

Page S6086

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, October 24, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination.

Page S6134

Messages from the House:

Page S6089

Measures Referred:

Page S6089

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Page S6089

Executive Communications:

Pages S6089–91

Petitions and Memorials:

Page S6091

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S6092–94

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S6094–95

Additional Statements:

Pages S6088–89

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S6096–S6133

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S6133–34

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S6134

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—331)

Page S6080

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. **Pages H8455–57**

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.

Pages H8398–H8403, H8409, H8410–H8442

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.

Pages H8439–42

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.

Pages H8418–24

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;

Pages H8424–25

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;

Pages H8426–27

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;

Pages H8427–28

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;

Pages H8428–30

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;

Pages H8430–31

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;

Pages H8431–32

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;

Pages H8432–33

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;

Pages H8433–34

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;

Pages H8434–35

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;

Pages H8435–36

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;

Page H8436

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

Pages H8436–37

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.

Pages H8437–38

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:

Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019:

H.R. 777, amended, to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 584.

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

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2932, the “Homeland Security for Children Act”; H.R. 3469, the “Covert Testing and Risk Mitigation Improvement Act of 2019”; H.R. 3787, the “DHS Countering Unmanned Aircraft Systems Coordinator Act”; H.R. 4237, the “Advancing Cybersecurity Diagnostics and Mitigation Act”; H.R. 4402, the “Inland Waters Security Review Act”; H.R. 4713, the “Department of Homeland Security Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Authorization Act”; H.R. 4727, the “Department of Homeland Security Mentor Protégé Program Act of 2019”; H.R. 4739, the “Synthetic Opioid Exposure Prevention and Training Act”; H.R. 4737, the “Department of Homeland Security Climate Change Research Act”; H.R. 4753, the “Drone Origin Security Enhancement Act”; H.R. 4761, the “DHS Opioid Detention Resilience Act of 2019”; and H.R. 4782, the “National Commission on Online Platforms and Homeland Security Act”. H.R. 3787, H.R. 4237, H.R. 4713, H.R. 4737, and H.R. 4782 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 2932, H.R. 3469, H.R. 4402, H.R. 4727, H.R. 4739, H.R. 4753, and H.R. 4761 were ordered reported, without amendment.

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 Sup-

press 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

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 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.)

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Dan, N.C., E1337, E1340
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1336
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E1339
 Boyle, Brendan F., Pa., E1335
 Buck, Ken, Colo., E1339
 Burchett, Tim, Tenn., E1335
 Chu, Judy, Calif., E1337
 Cole, Tom, Okla., E1340
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E1330, E1332
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E1332, E1333, E1336
 Crawford, Eric A. "Rick", Ark., E1339

Davis, Rodney, Ill., E1330
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1329, E1330, E1332, E1333, E1334, E1335, E1336, E1337, E1338
 Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E1332, E1335
 Evans, Dwight, Pa., E1332
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E1331
 Gottheimer, Josh, N.J., E1335, E1338
 Green, Mark E., Tenn., E1329
 Hayes, Jahana, Conn., E1334
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1337
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1338
 Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1335
 Larsen, Rick, Wash., E1334

Levin, Andy, Mich., E1329
 McEachin, A. Donald, Va., E1336
 Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1336
 Rutherford, John H., Fla., E1333
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1331
 Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1334
 Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1339, E1340
 Spanberger, Abigail Davis, Va., E1334
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1339
 Taylor, Van, Tex., E1329, E1330, E1331, E1332, E1333
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1330



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.