



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2019

No. 40

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 6, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHERI BUSTOS 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.

IMPEACHMENT IS NOT DEAD

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, with love of country in my heart.

And still I rise, as I did some 659 days ago, more than 21 months, when I first stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and called for the impeachment of the President. In so doing, I had to fend off the multitudes who wanted to know what crime the President had committed, what law did he break.

We had to fight that fight, and we won, because it is now generally perceived and believed that the President does not have to commit a crime to be impeached.

In fact, Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States of America addresses that question when it deals with high crimes and misdemeanors as misdemeanors or misdeeds, pursuant to the understanding that we have of the Constitution of the United States of America.

And still I rise now, understanding that we have had to fend off those who have said: You have to wait for the Mueller report. You have to wait. Why not wait?

Here is why you don't have to wait: Because the Mueller report is dealing with violations of the law. Misdeeds don't necessarily require a violation of the law.

If you are corrupting society, if you are creating harm to society, if you are causing things to happen in society that are unacceptable to the people in the United States of America, an unfit President can be impeached for those misdeeds that corrupt and harm society.

We are winning that fight. This fight is one that is easily won because, as we proceed, it is going to become intuitively obvious that these misdeeds are the problems, and the misdeeds are creating the concerns in society.

It is my belief that we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation under the Constitution to deal with an unfit President.

There are those who would want me to withhold my thoughts until after there has been an investigation, when we have clear and convincing evidence before our very eyes of the misdeeds: separating babies from their mothers, who happen to be of color, I might add; talking about s-hole countries that happen to be where people of color live, I might add; talking about good people,

or very fine people, in Charlottesville, among those who are bigots, racists, xenophobes, homophobes, and Islamophobes.

Yes, the evidence is there, because the President was putting in his policies these bigoted statements. These statements went beyond his words. They became a part of his policies. For this, he can be impeached.

I stand where I stood 659 days ago, and I will continue to stand until this President is removed from office.

We can investigate to the extent that we engage in what Dr. King called the paralysis of analysis, just investigate until it is time for another election, and then the election becomes the focal point.

My dear friends, my dear brothers and sisters, those who desire to wait may do so. I will not wait. Impeachment is not dead.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the many women who have shaped our country's successes and are inspiring our future.

This month, we celebrate Women's History Month and recognize the women who have fought for equality and positively impacted their communities. The courage and resolve of our women must not go unnoticed.

In Kansas, we are always quick to highlight the great Amelia Earhart, our hometown aviation pioneer. But today, I want to highlight the millions of women around the world who have made and continue to make significant impacts on their families, communities, and workplaces through meaningful, everyday contributions.

My own mother, Nancy, taught me many family values that continue to

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.

H2373

give me strength and guide me throughout fatherhood and in my career as an obstetrician.

She instilled in me the value of proper nutrition at an early age, which I was able to go on and explain in very commonsense terms to all my patients as an obstetrician. My mom emphasized the importance of a healthy breakfast and sitting down each night as a family for dinner, something my wife, Laina, and I prioritized as parents as well.

She taught me all these lessons while also working a full-time job as an office manager. Her dedication to her family and career didn't garner news headlines, but it made a significant impact and allowed me to grow up understanding the outcomes of hard work.

My wife, Laina, went to school to be a nurse at Butler County Community College and later worked in the neonatal intensive care unit, caring for premature babies. She made a huge impact on all those babies' lives, as well as their families and their development.

Now, as a mother of four and grandmother of two, I often tell people my wife has the most important job in America: raising our children.

I know there are millions of mothers around the globe who have and continue to provide the same energy, time, and dedication to their children, families, and communities. Too often, we don't take the time to share and celebrate these contributions, but we all know a woman who has made a significant impact on our lives.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, I challenge you to thank those women who have positively influenced your life, improved our communities, and contributed to the success of this great Nation.

RECOGNIZING LEADERSHIP OF DR. BOBBY MOSER

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize my friend and fellow western Kansas physician, Dr. Bobby Moser, for his leadership with the Kansas Heart and Stroke Collaborative, an initiative funded through CMS' Health Care Innovation Awards.

The effort started in 2014 with the University of Kansas Health System, Hays Medical Center, 10 critical-access hospitals, and the First Care Clinic to provide an innovative care delivery and payment model designed to improve heart health and stroke outcomes for rural Kansans.

When they first received this 3-year Federal grant, they were nothing shy of ambitious. In their proposal, they aimed to reduce healthcare costs by nearly \$14 million and reduce deaths from stroke and heart attack by 20 percent. The collaborative wanted to accomplish this using data in a meaningful way, enhancing bedside care, and building sustainable models for access and treatment.

They have indeed shown signs of good work, and they are expanding their efforts. This group has helped hospitals track and audit data to find ways to improve patient performance.

Dr. Moser recently reported that the clinical network of hospitals has improved medications and delivery time for getting clot-busting drugs to patients that literally save lives and prevent lifelong paralysis.

Since its inception, these physicians have grown to reach more counties and are able to help more patients. Now called Care Collaborative, they are exploring new payment systems for rural hospitals and focusing on expanding into new medical treatments, like palliative care.

With more than 50 critical-access hospitals in my district, the resources developed through this collaborative have been lifesaving and critical for our hospitals and, most importantly, rural patients.

ADVOCATING FOR FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to advocate for the Federal nutrition programs that help our most vulnerable constituents and to highlight why these programs continue to need our unwavering protection and attention.

March 4 marked the beginning of National School Breakfast Week, which is designed to show parents, students, and school officials the benefits of fueling up for the day with a healthy school breakfast.

I am sure it comes as no surprise to many of you that learning improves when students are not hungry. It is awfully hard to concentrate when you don't have any fuel in your body.

Last week, I met with several anti-hunger organizations from my district, and they shared with me stories from the people they serve on how nutrition programs, food pantries, and school breakfast and lunch programs impact their lives.

Many of them wrote their thoughts on paper plates, and I would like to read a few of them to you.

Jay Keller from Jeremiah's Inn in Worcester said: "These food centers make a huge difference when it comes to preparing meals. Without them, I would not be able to make ends meet. Please keep them going. Many people may go hungry if they do not continue."

A parent from Catholic Charities in Worcester said: "SNAP and school lunches help my daughter and I eat. It helps us get by, and I work part-time. Very grateful for these programs."

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, school breakfasts and lunches are the only opportunities a child has to receive a full meal. For example, a student from Memorial Elementary School in Winchendon said: "School lunch is important because it keeps me full until I go home." Another student from Pernet Family Health Services in

Worcester wrote: "If I don't eat, my head hurts."

While many nutrition program participants are children and persons with disabilities, their reach extends to veterans. A veteran from St. Anthony's Parish in Worcester wrote: "My food bank provides myself and fellow veterans with love and nutrients. Without you guys, it would be a long month. Thanks to our nuns who help us always."

When a family is worried about whether they can afford basic necessities, nutrition programs and the food security they provide goes a long way.

In 2018, a monthly average of 40.3 million people participated in the SNAP program. Despite the fact that this number has been steadily decreasing, the Trump administration has unveiled several baseless attacks on these nutrition programs.

On December 20, 2018, the Trump administration proposed a rule that will threaten the eligibility of SNAP participants who are considered able-bodied adults without dependents. In an effort to, ironically, "restore self-sufficiency through the dignity of work," their rule stigmatizes SNAP participants and limits a State's ability to waive 20-hour work requirements.

The able-bodied adult without dependents population is a complex group. Many of them are veterans returning from overseas and having a difficult time reintegrating into our community. Many of them are young adults who have aged out of the foster care system. Some are ex-felons who are products of mass incarceration. Some are workers who are not given 20 hours of work per week.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of SNAP participants do work, but often in jobs that are either unstable or don't pay enough to put food on the table. It is not that the able-bodied adult without dependents population is jobless by choice. Many are jobless because they lack privilege and are trying to get on their feet.

This proposed rule also specifically goes against the will of Congress by imposing restrictions that were specifically rejected for inclusion in the farm bill signed into law just last year.

As if that weren't enough, the Trump administration also announced its intention to propose changes to categorical eligibility. Categorical eligibility, or Cat-el, is criteria used to determine whether a family is automatically eligible for SNAP because they already qualify for certain other low-income programs. Cat-el is fine as it is because it eliminates redundancy and minimizes hurdles that low-income families must overcome just to keep up with their basic needs.

While the administration changes are forthcoming, I don't have much optimism about how they will turn out.

The current administration is trying to solve problems that don't exist, and they are creating problems that have clear solutions. That is why we must

continue to raise these issues to the forefront of our agenda.

There is no excuse. We have the resources. It is on all of us to prioritize basic hunger needs. Supporting school breakfast and lunch programs, and maintaining reasonable eligibility for nutrition assistance programs, are the least we can do to end hunger now.

We live in the richest country in the history of the world, and we have millions and millions of people who are hungry. We should all be ashamed of that.

Hunger and food insecurity are political conditions. We can solve these problems if we have the political will. I urge my colleagues to gather that political will.

□ 1015

\$22 TRILLION DEBT AND DEBT CEILING REACHED

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America recently blew through the \$22 trillion debt mark with no end in sight.

In January, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office warned Washington that America faces an unending stream of trillion-dollar-a-year deficits beginning in FY 2022 and culminating in a \$1.4 trillion deficit in FY 2028, the amount Congress spends each year on our discretionary budget that pays for the military, NASA, ATF, FBI, and almost every other Federal agency.

The cumulative effect of these deficits is a debt that explodes from \$22 trillion today to \$33 trillion in a decade.

As debt goes up, so does debt service. The CBO warns: "In CBO's projections, outlays for net interest increase from \$325 billion in 2018 to \$383 billion . . . in 2019, and more than double by 2029, to \$928 billion" a year, which is the rough equivalent of almost 50 NASA programs.

Compounding matters, this past weekend, on March 2, the Federal Government hit the debt ceiling, which means the Federal Government's operational costs are being paid for via extraordinary measures, such as borrowing from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Washington's response to this financial firestorm is akin to that of Roman Emperor Nero, who fiddled as Rome burned.

Rather than be proactive and work to prevent a debilitating national insolvency and bankruptcy, Congress emulates an ostrich that buries its head in the sand and denies lurking danger.

In sum, America's sea of red ink and projected financial path is wholly and completely unsustainable.

America must learn from financially reckless nations like Greece and Venezuela, and from Puerto Rico, an American territory that defaulted on its \$70 billion debt.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of American voters are oblivious to America's lurking financial dangers, in large part because of minimal national media coverage.

American voters are too often seduced by debt-junkie politicians who promise free stuff to get elected, while knowing full well America can't pay for it. If American voters do not elect financially responsible officials to Washington, America will succumb to the same debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that wrecks havoc in Greece and Puerto Rico, with one major difference; unlike Greece, which has been bailed out three times by the European community, and unlike Puerto Rico, which may yet be bailed out by American taxpayers, there is no one, no one who can or will bail out America.

Instead, America will be more like Venezuela, whose annual inflation rate now exceeds 2 million percent, where the International Monetary Fund reports there are: "Widespread shortages of essential goods, including food, exacting a tragic toll," where grocery stores have rows and rows of empty shelves and Venezuelans can't find food to feed their families.

Worse yet, Venezuela's bankruptcy has made it one of the most violent countries in the world, with a chilling 82 homicides per 100,000 population, roughly 20 times worse than America's homicide rate. Caracas, Venezuela's capital is the world's most violent city, with a war-zone-like 120 murders per 100,000 citizens.

Mr. Speaker, America must learn from the financially irresponsible mistakes of others. As the adage says, We can either learn from history, or we are doomed to repeat it.

American voters must wake up and stop being seduced by the wily ways of debt-junkie politicians who promise anything to get elected, who pretend to be Santa Claus, when, in fact, they are the Grinch that stole America's future.

Time is running out. The American people must start being good stewards of our Republic, and elect Washington officials who both understand the threat posed by defaults, and deficit, and debt, and have the backbone to fix it. America's future depends on it.

PROTECTING ATLANTIC COASTAL ECONOMIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am profoundly concerned with the possible permitting of seismic airgun blasting off the Atlantic Coast, from Jacksonville, Florida, to Cape May, New Jersey, to Portland, Maine. This is an extremely serious issue.

Late last year, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, also known as NOAA, issued five Incidental

Harassment Authorizations which advanced permit applications for seismic airgun blasting in the Atlantic Ocean. This action essentially sets the stage for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to approve these permits at any day now.

Seismic airgun blasting is not only the first step toward offshore oil and gas exploration and development, but it is harmful to marine mammal life and to marine life in general, and it encroaches on vital military operations.

At a time when we are attempting to limit the dangers of climate change, such as extreme weather events like Superstorm Sandy, it is unthinkable to further harm the environment and endanger our coastal economy in South Jersey and along the coast, which is largely based on fishing and based on tourism.

Our public policy goal is to create a cleaner and healthier environment, an environment that we can pass on to our children and on to our grandchildren so that they may enjoy it.

I am proud that broad arrays of organizations in New Jersey have supported my legislation. These organizations include the Chambers of Commerce of Cape May County, Ocean City, Vineland, Greater Wildwood, Greater Atlantic City, the Garden State Seafood Association, the Recreational Fishing Alliance, the Jersey Shore Partnership, Clean Ocean Action, Surfers Environmental Alliance, the American Littoral Society, Oceana, and the New Jersey chapters of the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, Audubon Society, and Environment America.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to have worked with Congressman RUTHERFORD of Florida on H.R. 1149. I am also grateful that several of our elite colleagues joined us on important efforts, including JOE CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina, CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, DONNA SHALALA of Florida, and BRIAN MAST of Florida, as well.

Our bipartisan bill, the Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act, would prevent the five seismic airgun blasting permits that are now under consideration from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from being issued. It would stop them.

I urge my colleagues to protect our precious coastline and to protect the livelihoods of those that depend upon it by supporting H.R. 1149. It is a bipartisan bill. It is the Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include three letters of support for the RECORD.

[From the Greater Atlantic City Chamber]
RESOLUTION OPPOSING BOEM 2019-2024 OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM

Whereas, on January 8, 2018, the federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) announced in the Federal Register notice the release of their Draft Proposed Program (DPP) for the 2019-2024 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program. BOEM is requesting public comment on the

DPP as well as formal scoping for a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the 2019-2024 Program; and

Whereas, this new plan includes the entire Atlantic Ocean from Maine to Florida, including the waters off New Jersey within 3 miles of beaches, as well as including other ocean areas totaling some 90% of US ocean waters; and

Whereas, New Jersey boasts over 127 miles of beautiful ocean coastline and hundreds of miles of back-bays, estuaries, and other waterways connected to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas, the Jersey Shore is essential to the health of the our communities, environment and the thriving economy of New Jersey; and

Whereas, the physical, hydrodynamic, and biological characteristics of the ocean off the Jersey Shore are unique in the world, as more than 300 species of fish, nearly 350 species of birds, 5 species of sea turtles, and many marine mammals such as 20 species of whales and dolphins, 1 species of porpoise, and 4 species of seals, frequent this region. Nine endangered species, four of which are whales, can be found in these ocean waters, including the Atlantic Right Whale, one of the world's most endangered marine mammals. The region also serves as an essential migratory pathway for many of these species; and

Whereas, the Jersey Shore sustains the economy of the region with its bounty of natural resources and intrinsic values for millions of people through tourism. Tourism brings more than \$44 billion to NJ's economy each year and provides jobs to more than 500,000 people with \$6.2 billion generated in Cape May County alone; and

Whereas, recreational and commercial fisheries in NJ provide enormous economic benefits, including revenue, food production, and recreational activities with the port of Cape May and Wildwood ranking as the second largest seaport on the east coast. In 2014, recreational fishing supported nearly 20,000 jobs and resulted in \$2 billion of retail sales. Commercial fishing supports nearly 7,300 jobs and provides \$152 million in landings, not including restaurant and retail sales; and

Whereas, current estimates of the amount of technically recoverable oil off the entire Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida would only last the nation approximately 229 days, and the amount of technically recoverable gas would only last approximately 562 days; and

Whereas, offshore oil and gas development, causes substantial environmental impacts, including: (a) onshore damage due to infrastructure, (b) water pollution from drilling muds and the water brought-up from a well with oil and gas (called "produced waters"), (c) noise from seismic surveys, (d) air pollution, and (e) oil spills; and

Whereas, the harmful environmental consequences of offshore oil and gas exploration and development are serious and threatens the environmental and economic assets of New Jersey; and

Whereas, The BP Horizon disaster in the Gulf of Mexico (2010) is clear evidence of the dangers associated with offshore drilling, including costing the lives of 11 people, devastating coastal economies and countless livelihoods, and killing countless marine animals, as well as continuing to cause harm to marine life as documented by a steady flow of studies; and

Whereas, Federal Administration officials are also weakening protections of ocean resources by undermining rules and regulations, cutting funding sources for spill response; and

Whereas, oil spills travel vast distances, and the Gulf Stream and Labrador Ocean

Current all flow toward New Jersey making the region vulnerable to impacts from spills anywhere in the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas, Within 5 days of the release of the DPP Governor Scott from Florida was able to convince Department of Interior Secretary Zinke to remove Florida from further consideration for drilling due to the importance of coastal tourism to that state and NJ shares this same economic dependence on tourism and clean ocean economies;

Whereas, bi-partisan opposition against drilling off the New Jersey coast has included every Governor since 1985, and a majority of the congressional delegation and most coastal towns; and

Whereas, in the January 8, 2018, BOEM Federal Register to requests comments on the Draft Proposed Program (DPP) and scoping comments for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Study

Whereas, energy conservation and efficiency measures can significantly reduce the nation's need to explore and drill for non-renewable resources, such as oil and natural gas; and

Whereas, coastal municipalities have a profound interest in maintaining strong federal protections for our nation's coastal environment, as well as the economic and social benefits it supports;

Now, therefore, be it resolved on March 5, 2018, that the Greater Atlantic City Chamber hereby opposes offshore oil and gas exploration and drilling activities that would affect the coast of New Jersey, and calls upon Secretary of the Interior Ryan K. Zinke who oversees the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to withdraw New Jersey and the entire Atlantic Ocean from consideration for the offshore oil and gas exploration, development, or drilling.

JOSEPH D. KELLY,
President.

OCEAN CITY REGIONAL CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE AND VISITORS SERVICES,

Ocean City, NJ, February 6, 2019.

Congressman JEFF VAN DREW,
Mays Landing, NJ.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN DREW: On behalf of the Ocean City Regional Chamber of Commerce, I would like to extend our endorsement of Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act to prohibit the Department of the Interior from issuing certain geological and geophysical exploration permits under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and for other purposes.

The Ocean City Regional Chamber of Commerce, which is comprised of more than 550 member businesses, strongly supports this act as we are against seismic airgun blasting in the Atlantic Ocean.

We stand by you and your support of the Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act.

Kindest regards,

MICHELE GILLIAN,
Executive Director.

GREATER VINELAND CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,

Vineland, NJ, February 7, 2019.

U.S. Representative JEFFREY VAN DREW,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN DREW: On behalf of our organization, including more than 450 members, we write this letter as an endorsement of your proposed bill, known as the "Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act", to prohibit the Department of Interior from issuing certain geological and geophysical exploration permits under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and for other purposes.

We agree that seismic air-gun blasting in the Atlantic Ocean has the potential to harm

or kill marine mammals and other marine life that are vital to our region's coastal economies. We are also wary that the survey data collected is not available to the public.

Thank you for your efforts in proposing this bill.

Sincerely,

DAWN S. HUNTER,
Executive Director.

VISITS TO RICHLAND, CAMBRIA HEIGHTS, AND PURCHASE LINE HIGH SCHOOLS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of weeks I had the honor of visiting three high schools in my district, the Richland High School, near Johnstown, Cambria Heights High School, in Patton, and Purchase Line High School in Commodore, Pennsylvania.

As a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I love speaking with students about their learning experiences, and hearing from faculty and staff as well.

Last week, the Richland School District invited me to join them for their Teacher-in-Service event with award-winning educator and principal, Salome Thomas-El. It was a pleasure to be with educators from the Cambria County area to hear the ways that we can work together to improve education in America.

I enjoyed hearing Mr. Thomas-El discuss the change in attitudes and strategies of school staff, parents, and members of the community to help the students in most need of guidance. He is currently the head of the Thomas Edison Charter School in Wilmington, and before that, began his career as a teacher and chess coach at Vaux Middle School.

Since then, he has published several books, received prestigious awards, appeared on television, and Disney recently optioned the movie rights to his best-selling book titled "I Chose to Stay." He has committed more than 20 years of his life to answering the question of how to ensure that every child achieves their greatest potential.

The question is one that all educators seek to answer and even policymakers in Congress; and that is why I will continue to support legislation and initiatives that meet the needs and grow the potential of every student.

We must also address family poverty, child nutrition, community violence, and other barriers that affect student success.

As Mr. Thomas-El says, All children can and will learn as long as they have adults who care enough. And he is right. In order for our country's students to truly succeed, they need the support from adults at home, in the classroom, and throughout their communities.

I left the in-service event with Richland School District encouraged and

confident that our educators are providing essential support to their students.

That feeling stayed with me the next day as I visited Cambria Heights High School. There, I met with students representing music, athletics, student council, and vocational programs at the school. Students showed me the ongoing renovations to the high school building as part of a major renovation of the classrooms and the cafeteria.

They also shared with me their many accomplishments that included earning top scores in the county on the State's Keystone Exams for literature and biology.

Earlier this week I participated in an assembly at the Purchase Line High School in Indiana County. The students asked great questions about civic engagement, and we had an open dialogue about the challenges and the opportunities that are facing our Nation.

Meeting with all these students gives me great hope for the future, and I know these students will become our next generation of leaders, regardless of what fields they enter after graduation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Richland School District, Cambria Heights High School, and the Purchase Line High School for inviting me into their schools and sharing with me the ways they are transforming education to help students not only graduate, but go on to earn a higher degree or a certification or, quite frankly, go successfully into the workforce.

A good education opens so many doors in life. I am tremendously proud of the students, faculty, and staff of each of these outstanding institutions.

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 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

During these days on the Hill, there are many Americans walking the halls, speaking to their Representatives about interests of great concern to them. The American Osteopathic Society, the National Kidney Foundation, the VFW, the National Down Syndrome Society, the Lupus Foundation, the Boy and Girl Scouts of America,

among others, have been advocates for so many who are in need.

We thank You that we live in a nation blessed by the rights and opportunities for Americans to petition their government.

Bless the Members of this assembly, who know best how to respond to such entreaties, with the ability to meet so many needs.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California 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

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

CLEANING UP OUR DEMOCRACY AND DELIVERING POWER BACK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the efforts in Congress to clean up our democracy and deliver power back to the American people.

I never thought that I would run for Congress. I never thought that I would have the chance to stand right here on

the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am here today because I was tired of watching corporations and special interests cutting to the front of the line ahead of the people. I was tired of watching dark money grow, gerrymandering polarize our politics, and the American people pushed aside.

Now we have a precious chance to fix this and to build the kind of government the American people deserve. As we make up our minds and cast our votes, I ask us not to think of this as a partisan issue. I assure you that the people in my district on both sides believe that the system isn't working for them.

I call on my colleagues to vote to pass H.R. 1 and deliver the change our constituents demand and deserve.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

(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. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Ambassador Bulgaria Caucus, I appreciate Ambassador Tihomir Stoytchev and Mrs. Lubka Stoytchev for their hosting a reception yesterday in recognition of National Day of the Republic of Bulgaria at the Library of Congress, celebrating 141 years of liberation.

Bulgaria is a close strategic ally and partner of the United States. This month, we celebrate 15 years since Bulgaria joined the NATO alliance.

During his time recently in Sofia, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg noted: "Bulgaria has contributed to strengthening the Alliance." He also thanked Prime Minister Boyko Borissov for his government's commitment to reach the NATO defense spending goal of 2 percent.

I am confident the partnership between the United States and Bulgaria will continue to grow in the years ahead. It will be mutually beneficial to promote peace through strength.

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

CONSTITUENTS SHOULD BE THE TOP PRIORITY

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to represent them, to be a voice for their families, to fight for their values, to vote in their best interest. I am here for the residents of Arizona's Second Congressional District. I am here to work for them.

We must reject the culture of corruption here and put the power back in the hands of the people we represent. Our government works best when it is focused on people and American families,

not some special interest group or large corporation.

We can clean up the muddy swamp behaviors by passing H.R. 1. We need to reduce the role of dark special interest money and to make it easier to vote. We need to have some accountability here.

I will be voting for H.R. 1 so that our constituents become the top priority for all of us, not special interest groups.

FAIRNESS IN DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no room for anti-Semitism anywhere in this Chamber.

This past January, the House voted nearly unanimously to condemn white supremacy, and it named a Republican Member as we did that. I voted for that.

Back in January, around the same exact time, we had a Member apologize for remarks about how Israel had hypnotized the world, an anti-Semitic trope; a month later, apologizing for an allegation that if you support Israel, then you have been bought off by Jews; and now, claiming that if you support Israel, then that means that you have allegiance to a foreign government.

But this time there will be no apology. I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have spoken out against it. This Chamber today should be taking action to condemn anti-Semitism, to be naming names; and where that Member in January was removed from his committees, including the Small Business Committee, the Member who has been putting out all those anti-Semitic tropes should not be serving on her committees, especially the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for many reasons.

I encourage a vote today and to remove Congresswoman OMAR from the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

SERVANT LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

It is no coincidence that the largest freshman class since Watergate will also be the one to pass H.R. 1 this week. We are a class that is born of voters' frustrations with a broken system.

Americans have seen this Chamber pass bills that hurt the middle class, raise prescription drug prices, gut consumer protections, and fail to act on climate change. Why? Because the special interests have more power than the American people. It is the exact opposite of what should happen in the people's House.

In the Army, I was taught the values of servant leadership. As a captain, that meant leading by example. I jumped out of the plane first, and only then would my soldiers follow.

As a Member of Congress, it means we hold ourselves to the highest standards of ethics, accountability, and transparency. Servant leaders don't hold a tight grip on power; they empower those around them. The first step to doing that is to pass H.R. 1 and return power to the people who sent us here.

Let's show America that we are their Representatives, and that we are elected to serve them, not the mega-donors and not the special interests.

WE THE PEOPLE

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, my favorite three words in our Constitution are the first three words, "We the people."

The will of the people is the basis of our entire democracy. But for far too long, special interests and big money have rigged that system against everyday Americans.

This week, we take a major step to change that. We are voting on H.R. 1, transformational legislation that will finally put the power back in the hands of the American people, by toughening Federal ethics laws, fixing the broken campaign finance system, and strengthening voting rights, including two bills that I have worked on with my colleagues to end partisan gerrymandering and requiring same-day voter registration.

I encourage everyone to support H.R. 1 this week, because it is long past time we return our government to one that is of the people, by the people, and for the people once again.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, amidst the tragedies of the Iraq war, I witnessed one of the proudest demonstrations of democracy in modern times. When Iraqis voted for the first time, they dipped their fingers in ink and, rather than hiding those fingers for fear of reprisal, they held them high walking through the streets.

What they were saying was that, for the first time in their lives, their opinion mattered. Their vote counted. It is the most fundamental requirement of a democracy. Yet, today, we know that this basic right has never been truly guaranteed here at home.

Our elections are not free when Americans must choose between providing for their families and casting a vote; our elections are not fair when gerrymandering predetermines them or

dark money makes some votes count more than others; and our people do not have a voice when they are turned away by voter ID laws that make it easier to buy a gun than cast a vote.

H.R. 1 changes that, taking a stand against Citizens United, resolving to end gerrymandering, and making it far easier for Americans to vote.

I believe that America, however imperfect, is the greatest democracy on Earth. H.R. 1 finally makes us act that way.

WE CAN AND WE MUST DO BETTER

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my full-hearted support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

As I spend time with parents and business owners, retirees and millennials, Republicans and Democrats back home in Minnesota, one thing is clear: People are losing faith in the integrity and fairness of our political system, and for good reason.

When I arrived in Washington, I witnessed firsthand the corrupting influence of money and politics: envelopes with PAC checks offered after handshakes and a culture in which votes often seem to have price tags attached.

We can do better, and we must do better. That is why I say, no matter your number one issue, please make campaign finance reform your number two because we cannot address our country's greatest challenges when we place special interests over our common interests.

So let's pass H.R. 1 and begin the hard and principled work of restoring our democracy for the people.

AMERICANS ARE LOSING FAITH IN THEIR GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1.

When I was running for Congress, I heard again and again that Americans are losing faith in their government, asking why the votes they cast don't lead to the outcomes they want.

At a time when we are so divided, I can think of nothing more unifying than a bill that addresses the source of their discontent.

To those who have raised concerns about H.R. 1 here, let me say that, in my district, I have not met a single person, Republican or Democrat, who thinks it is a good idea to let non-donors spend millions of untraceable dollars on political attack ads or to have a campaign finance system so opaque that Russian oligarchs can easily channel money into it.

I haven't met a single person, Republican or Democrat, who thinks it is

just fine for Members of Congress to serve on corporate boards or for Presidents to hide their tax returns, or anyone who is pleased with partisan gerrymandering or who is happy that we have done nothing to secure our elections from foreign hacking since 2016.

These are not partisan issues among the American people. On the contrary, when I vote “yes” on H.R. 1, I will be doing what the vast majority of my constituents are demanding: to make our democracy work better for everyone, regardless of our party or our point of view.

I can't wait to cast that vote.

□ 1215

EXPANDING ACCESS TO QUALITY AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Act, a bill that I am proud to cosponsor. This bill is a critical step in expanding access to quality affordable healthcare by bringing down prescription drug costs.

Too many of my constituents and too many Americans across this country can't afford the healthcare coverage they need. There is no bigger driver of this problem than the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs.

The United States pays the highest prices for prescription drugs in the world, and over the past decade, the prices of 90 percent of brand name drugs have more than doubled.

How is it that one in five American adults cannot afford the medicine they need?

In the wealthiest country in the world, it is inexcusable that we have seniors who have to choose between their prescriptions and buying groceries, cancer patients who can't afford their drugs, and diabetics who need to ration the insulin they need to survive.

The Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act couldn't be more commonsense. It allows the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate Medicare drug prices, putting consumers first, not the drug industry.

My constituents sent me here with a clear mandate to fight for quality affordable healthcare, and this bill is a crucial part of that work.

OUR POLITICS IS BROKEN

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

I am an engineer, and as an engineer, I fix things that are broken, but it doesn't take an engineer to tell you that our politics is broken. Confidence in our government and in the House of Representatives has never been lower.

We have a system of gerrymandering where in many parts of the country today, voters don't choose their politicians, politicians choose their voters.

Special interest money has drowned out the voices of working people.

H.R. 1 is an opportunity to fix this imbalance. H.R. 1 will ensure the peoples' voices are heard at the ballot box.

H.R. 1 will ensure the influence of big money in our politics and our policies is ended.

H.R. 1 will ensure the voices of the people are heard.

Passing this bill is a moral imperative for our democracy and our Nation.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES EXPANSION TO CHILDCARE

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

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

Running for Federal office requires 60- to 90-hour workweeks. I worked every single day, every single weekend, and I also worked challenging hours, most days starting at 6:45 in the morning and ending with campaign events stretching well into the night.

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

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

For the past two centuries, Congress has written many, many laws about what women may and may not do, but until this year, women's representation in Congress was less than 20 percent.

Even with the election of my historic class, we are only 102 women. There are even fewer moms in Congress and even fewer single moms, as in, nobody but me.

I have introduced language today as a standalone bill I will introduce.

MAKING IT EASIER, NOT HARDER, FOR PEOPLE TO VOTE

(Ms. WEXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, our democracy isn't working the way it should for a majority of Americans, but H.R. 1, the For the People Act, can fix that.

This legislation will end partisan gerrymandering by creating independent redistricting commissions, letting the voters choose the politicians, not the politicians choosing their voters.

H.R. 1 will promote online registration, same day and automatic voter registration, because we should be making it easier, not harder, for people to vote.

It also prohibits arbitrary voter roll purges, expands early voting and vote-by-mail options, and ensures the restoration of voting rights for those who have paid their dues to society.

The right to vote is the cornerstone of our democracy. It is as sacred as the freedom of religion and speech.

The American people want clean and fair elections, and H.R. 1 is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to restore the faith and function in American democracy.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

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. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes. 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 two hours 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, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-7, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees, 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.

SEC. 4. After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 7, 2019, or March 8, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, 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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 172, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 2 hours of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution self-executes Chairwoman LOFGREN's manager's amendment and provides for the consideration of 72 amendments debatable for 10 minutes each.

The rule also provides authority for en bloc amendments, debatable for 20 minutes each.

The rule also provides 10 minutes of final general debate after amendment

consideration equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees.

Lastly, the rule provides suspension authority through Friday, March 8, 2019.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this past weekend, I had the honor of traveling to Selma, Alabama, with over 40 of our congressional colleagues on a pilgrimage to observe the 54th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, the violent confrontation at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma.

That confrontation seized the Nation's attention and launched one of the most important periods in the history of our Republic, culminating in the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

When our colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, along with Martin Luther King and other civil rights pioneers, organized voters to register, crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge and marched from Selma to Montgomery, they did so knowing that their lives and the lives of those they loved were at risk.

The institutional opposition they faced was fierce and violent, but their message of nonviolence and justice strengthened them and their resolve.

They marched and risked their lives in order to secure the right to vote. They understood that they would never be equal citizens of the United States until they had a voice in their destiny, and they understood that the United States could never be the republic it aspired to become until all of its citizens had the right to participate in decisions affecting their future.

We undeniably have made progress since then, but not enough, and frighteningly, we seem to be moving backward.

In recent years, we have seen new forms of voter suppression emerge, whether in the guise of strict voter ID laws, purges of voting rolls, partisan gerrymandering, or unfounded allegations of voter fraud.

As an election official, election protection organizer, and voting rights advocate for over 3 decades, I have seen all of these tactics in play. In fact, several of us in the Pennsylvania delegation were able to join this Congress in part because a Federal court ordered that Pennsylvania's congressional districts had been so gerrymandered that they must be redrawn, they were unconstitutional.

We have heard, and will undoubtedly hear again today, that Democrats are pushing voting rights reform because of the expectation that new voters will likely be Democratic voters. I would hope that those with a sense of history would resist this, recognizing that the very same argument was used to oppose the Voting Rights Act in 1965 out of fear that those who had been oppressed would factor that experience into their voting decisions.

It is telling that a similar fear motivates some in this Chamber today who

would rather deprive citizens of a fundamental right than face them at the ballot box.

The cynicism of those who would continue to place barriers in the way of those who wish to vote goes a long way to explaining why our citizens lack faith in us to work for them.

Those with power, voting and otherwise, too often try to preserve that power through means that are neither transparent nor understood by the people of this country. We have to be bold, and shed some of that institutional power in order to regain the trust of the people.

□ 1230

I thank my colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES, who has worked for years in tirelessly crafting this legislation. I also thank Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership team for making this bill the top priority in the House for the 116th Congress. I am so proud that the first order of business of this Congress, our H.R. 1, is dedicated to good government and restoring trust in our democratic institutions.

Our elections are the bedrock of our democracy. During the recent midterm elections, the American people charged us, the new Congress, to make sure that our government works for them. They put their trust in us to champion our uniquely American creed: a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

H.R. 1, the For the People bill, is our commitment to that trust. This reform package will address many of the barriers to democracy that prevent too many eligible voters from having their voices heard, including our seniors, communities of color, servicemembers, college students, those with disabilities, and low-income families. But it is up to us to see it through.

I am immensely proud to be part of a Caucus that is prioritizing legislation that the people are asking for, legislation that will protect the right to vote for every American and ensure clean and fair elections, that will end the dominance of big money in our politics, and that will crack down on corruption to make sure that public servants put the public interest first.

Recent polls have found that many Americans do not vote because of difficulty registering or accessing their polling places and that Americans are really concerned about the ethical standards of their elected representatives and government officials and are equally concerned about the influence of special interests and corruption in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority takes what the people are asking for seriously. This is a bill that addresses their concerns and resets our democracy so that it works for the people, not special interests.

H.R. 1 will make it easier for eligible Americans to vote. Allowing and enabling Americans to vote should not be a divisive partisan issue. Our Nation

can only stand to benefit when all eligible voters have a voice.

The very fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have greater electoral success when fewer people come out to vote is not just a stain on our democracy but a direct threat to it.

Automatic voter registration will make it easier for young adults and working families to make sure that they are not left out of the process due to issues with registration.

This bill will make critical fixes to voter purging policies that have disenfranchised millions since section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was struck down by the Supreme Court in *Shelby v. Holder*. Over 4 million more names were purged from voter rolls after that decision came down than they were in the years before. These purges affected poor minority communities at a vastly disproportionate rate, further marginalizing people who already face significant institutional barriers to voting.

Election security has been a bipartisan concern across the country for years, and H.R. 1 will make considerable investments to ensure our elections are secure, independent, and free from foreign interference. Empowering the Election Assistance Commission will allow States to get the funding they need to upgrade or improve their election infrastructure, and improvements in election administration will help protect voting systems from cyber threats.

Election infrastructure is critical, and this bill finally recognizes the role that Congress must play in protecting our elections.

A specific priority of mine that I am excited to see included in the bill will make it easier for persons with disabilities to participate in the electoral process. For too long, individuals with disabilities have faced barriers that prevent them from participating in our democracy at the ballot box. I have introduced legislation included in H.R. 1 that will direct and assist States to improve access to voter registration and the ballot box for persons with disabilities.

These democracy-driven policies represent just a handful of the voting rights reforms contained in H.R. 1. They will improve access to voting, promote integrity in the voting process, and ensure the security of our elections.

Going further, H.R. 1 acts to shine a light and address the dark money which the Citizens United decision unleashed into our politics. Each year that we do not act on reversing *Citizens United*, more and more untraceable money is spent on campaigns.

This bill will overhaul the Federal Election Commission, the FEC, so that we have a real cop on the beat to enforce our campaign finance laws.

It will upgrade political advertising disclosures and require donors giving

more than \$10,000 to politically active organizations to be publicly identified.

Simultaneously, this bill seeks to empower everyday Americans by creating a small-dollar match system that will bring more people into the conversation while reducing the impact large donors can have on any one campaign. While small-dollar campaign funding is relatively new to the Federal system, it has been trialed in States and larger cities to great effect.

I am proud that H.R. 1 also includes a bill that I drafted to keep Presidential inaugural funds from becoming shadowy slush funds or opportunities for dark forces, whether foreign or domestic, to influence our government. The bill will prohibit donations to inaugural funds by foreign nationals or corporations, ban personal use of inaugural funds by a candidate, and require disclosure of all donations and disbursements.

H.R. 1 will also help to restore voter confidence in our democracy by codifying ethics standards for all three branches of government. The bill requires the development of a code of ethics for Supreme Court Justices, mandatory recusal of Presidential appointees from matters that concern the President, and increased enforcement of the registration of foreign agents.

The bill will prohibit Members of Congress from using taxpayer funds to settle employment discrimination cases against them, preventing Members of Congress from hiding this conduct and protecting taxpayer money from being misused.

Finally, H.R. 1 will address Presidential conflicts of interest by requiring sitting Presidents and Vice Presidents, as well as Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, to release their tax returns. Those occupying the highest office in the land should be required to show if they have financial interests that would influence their decisionmaking. Having an executive beholden in any way to a private company or a nation only serves to undermine our democracy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we had quite the debate on this bill in the Rules Committee last night, and I expect the debate on the floor today will be along similar lines. Today's bill is H.R. 1, which my friends on the other side of the aisle are calling by the misnomer "For the People Act." Unfortunately, this bill is completely misnamed.

It is not for the people. It is, instead, for the Democratic majority, by the Democratic majority, in hopes of maintaining the Democratic majority for many years to come. Every provision in this bill reflects that goal.

That began with the process the majority used to put this bill together.

H.R. 1 was referred to 10 different committees, yet only one, House Administration, held a markup. My friends hold a 2-to-1 advantage on that committee. There are only three Republicans who can participate.

Later, we will be hearing from some of the Republican ranking members of these committees, each of whom will talk about provisions that they had hoped to address, had their respective committees marked up the bill. This failure to allow other committees with jurisdiction to mark up the bill reinforces the desire of the majority to push this bill through as quickly as possible without any additional consideration. Without further hearings and markups, it is all too easy for the majority to sweep the bill's flaws under the rug and pass it quickly without allowing the American people to see what they are up to.

This bill would be more aptly named the "For the Politicians Act" or "Welfare for Politicians Act." It reinforces the idea that the majority cares only about passing a bill that will lead to more Democrats in the House of Representatives.

We do not have time today to go over every provision in this bill, but for now, I will take a moment to point out some of the bigger flaws in this product.

First, H.R. 1 takes taxpayer dollars and uses them to create a special piggy bank for campaigns. That is right, Democrats want to use taxpayer dollars of the American people to finance their political campaigns. H.R. 1 creates a matching program for small-dollar campaign contributions, thereby shifting taxpayer dollars to politicians to run their campaigns. In essence, Democrats are demanding that your tax dollars be used to subsidize and fund political candidates.

According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, since 2000, total spending on Federal elections has exploded, going from \$2.7 billion that cycle to \$6.4 billion in 2016. With so much money being raised from private sources, one wonders why the majority wants to waste taxpayer dollars adding even more money into campaigns.

Second, H.R. 1 completely takes over elections, removing authority from States and local election boards and giving it to Washington, D.C. Currently, States have the authority to determine how they want to structure their own elections, including voter registration, timing, and even redistricting. But all that goes away under H.R. 1. States would no longer be able to set voter registration requirements, nor hold elections where and how often they want, nor reapportion voters into appropriate districts. Instead, under H.R. 1, Washington, D.C., takes over all these functions.

I doubt any secretary of state or supervisor of elections in America supports this federalization of the election process. In fact, last night in the Rules Committee meeting, Mr. Speaker, I entered into the record a letter from the

Oklahoma State Election Board opposing H.R. 1 on precisely these grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD that letter again today.

OKLAHOMA STATE ELECTION BOARD,
Oklahoma City, OK, March 4, 2019.

Re Election Administration Provisions of
H.R. 1.

Hon. TOM COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COLE: As Oklahoma's chief state election official, I am very proud of Oklahoma's election system. Our state has one of the most effective and efficient election systems in the world. It is uniform, it is fair, it is secure, it is accurate and it is fast.

As the House of Representatives prepares to consider H.R. 1, I want to take a moment to express some concerns about several of its provisions related to election administration. While I believe H.R. 1 to be well-intentioned by its sponsors, its "one-size-fits-all" requirements for state election systems would require Oklahoma to make extensive changes to the way we run elections. I am concerned that some of H.R. 1's mandates could negatively impact the very things Oklahoma's election system does so well.

Based on my review of H.R. 1, here is a list of my top concerns.

"Voting by Mail": To combat Oklahoma's past history of absentee ballot fraud, several decades ago the Oklahoma Legislature enacted legislation requiring most voters to have their identity confirmed by a notary public when voting by absentee ballot. Oklahoma law also requires absentee ballots to be received by the county election board no later than 7:00 p.m. on Election Day. These procedures help prevent fraud and enable county election boards to have 100% of absentee ballots counted on election night. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 seems to do away with these safeguards and efficiencies, instead requiring county election boards to (1) accept signed affidavits in lieu of notarized ones and (2) to accept an absentee ballot postmarked on Election Day. H.R. 1's mandates would prevent Oklahoma from counting all absentee ballots by Election Day, would require the counting of absentee ballots to continue for days or weeks after an election, and would take away a critical security feature of our election system.

"Early voting": In Oklahoma, county election boards typically have a very small staff. (Many have only the secretary and one assistant.) For federal and state elections, Oklahoma currently allows "early voting" on the Thursday, Friday and Saturday prior to Election Day. Most counties have a single early voting site, but several have two sites. Even with the assistance of absentee voting boards paid for by the State Election Board, most counties barely have enough budget and staff to successfully conduct early voting on the three days currently required. H.R. 1's requirement for FIFTEEN CONSECUTIVE DAYS of early voting is simply not feasible given the small budgets and staffing levels of the 77 county election boards. This would make it virtually impossible for county election board staff to perform their other critical duties (e.g., processing mail absentee ballots, processing voter registration applications, and preparing supplies for precinct workers) if they are instead conducting early voting during this time.

"Same Day Voter Registration": Oklahoma has a very reasonable deadline for voter registration (applications must be submitted by the 24th day prior to an election). H.R. 1 requires county election boards to conduct voter registration during "early"

voting periods and on Election Day. This mandate is not currently feasible with the current funding and staffing levels of county election boards. The logistics of predicting how many ballots to print and how many precinct officials to assign to polling places, with the number of potential voters unknown, would be extremely difficult and inefficient. Same day voter registration increases the risk that due to error or fraud an ineligible person is allowed to register and vote.

"Provisional ballots": Oklahoma has a county-based election system. While Oklahoma uses the same voting system statewide, for security reasons each county's system is siloed and does not directly interact with other counties' systems. (For example, one county cannot print or count another county's ballot.) Oklahoma law requires a voter to vote in the assigned polling place in the county where the voter is registered. Provisional ballots are issued for a variety of reasons, and, if eligible, are counted after 2:00 p.m. on the Friday following Election Day. However, H.R. 1 requires a provisional ballot to be counted even if it is cast in the wrong county, which creates a security risk and is not currently possible given Oklahoma's election security features.

"Online Voter Registration": Oklahoma will implement online voter registration in the near future. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 sets different requirements for its federally-mandated online voter registration system than is required by Oklahoma law. (For example, H.R. 1 does everything from defining acceptable signature requirements, to mandating a telephone version of an online voter registration system, to micromanaging the features required for a state's customer support system.) Further, Oklahoma's future online voter registration system will require that a registrant's identity be conformed by matching the person's information with an existing driver license or state I.D., but H.R. 1 sets different (and less secure) standards for confirming a registrant's identity.

"Federalism": While I believe H.R. 1's sponsors are well-intentioned, a great many of its election provisions—even those that are not concerns—relate to policy decisions that are best left to the states under our federal system. I am concerned that, in its current form, H.R. 1 could lead to costly and lengthy litigation.

While these are not my only concerns, they are the most serious. I appreciate your representation of our state in Congress, and I feel it is my duty as Oklahoma's chief election official to make you aware of some of the potential negative impacts H.R. 1 could have on our state's election system.

If you ever have any questions about elections in Oklahoma, please feel free to contact me or Assistant Secretary Pam Slater. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL ZIRIAX, SECRETARY,
Oklahoma State Election Board.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that, in the case of redistricting, if the State cannot reach a resolution, H.R. 1 hands over the redistricting function to an unelected Federal court here in Washington, D.C. Everywhere you look, this bill represents an erosion of traditional State authority and a power grab for Democrats here in Washington.

Perhaps even more egregiously, the bill places limits on freedom of speech, criminalizing actions that we would currently describe as mere advocacy for candidates. Not since the Sedition Act of 1798 has the Federal Government

tried to pass something that tramples so heavily on freedom of speech as H.R. 1. The bill is so bad in this regard that even the American Civil Liberties Union is opposing it, which is a perfect illustration of just how bad H.R. 1 really is.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. Everywhere you look, H.R. 1 fails to do what the majority has promised. They have promised it is to be about returning power to the people. Instead, this bill only gives power and money to Democratic politicians. It takes away authority from States and gives it to the Federal Government, wastes taxpayer dollars on political campaigns, weakens the voting system, and limits freedom of speech.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine how any Member can stand up with a straight face and support this bill. I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Rules Committee for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the For the People Act, H.R. 1, and the rule.

We promised the American people, and our neighbors back home have urged us on, to strengthen America's ethics laws, to fix our broken campaign finance system, and to empower American voters.

I represent the State of Florida, and you better believe that we have to protect access to the ballot box, ensure the voting rights of everyone, and count every vote.

I thank the Rules Committee for including a bipartisan amendment that I have worked on to address the abuse of zombie campaigns. Many folks don't understand this, but sometimes Members who retire from Congress keep their campaign accounts, and they live on for decades, hence the title "zombie campaigns." Oftentimes, they will misuse the unspent campaign funds. It is wrong for campaign accounts to live on forever, and we are going to address that abuse as well.

This bill has important reforms that strengthen American democracy, root out corruption, and ensure that our government here in the United States of America works for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), my good friend.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution for consideration of H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 includes provisions that fall under the jurisdiction of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, of which I am ranking member.

Buried in the 600-page bill are requirements that would greatly expand

the role of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, in election security. NIST is an important agency under our committee's jurisdiction. NIST also plays an important nonregulatory role, providing guidance to State and local governments to help ensure that election results are secure and accurate.

Keeping our elections safe from cyberattacks and fraud is not a partisan priority. It is a priority for all of us.

Unlike the more partisan parts of H.R. 1, I believe that if we had been given a chance on the committee, Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and I would have been able to come to an agreement on bipartisan legislation to update NIST election security activities.

□ 1245

However, the Democratic leadership has rushed this legislation to the floor without giving our committee an opportunity to even hold a single hearing on the bill.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, quite simply, all of the issues raised from NIST were ignored. The opportunity to have a hearing on this subject matter in the committee was ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and the underlying bill. We can do better.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and, of course, in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which would provide the most significant reform to our democratic system in decades.

This landmark legislation represents the fulfillment of a promise to the American people to restore our democracy by expanding access to the ballot, reducing the corrupting influence of corporate money and political campaigns, and restoring ethics, integrity, and transparency to government.

We live in a time in our Nation's history where Americans have a deep sense that government does not work for them, and they are right. That cynicism is caused by policies that respond to the voices of the rich and powerful while ignoring those of ordinary Americans and practices that seek to reduce and restrict participation in our electoral process.

Americans are sick and tired of corruption and mismanagement here in Washington, and they elected us with the expectation that we will take real steps to clean up the mess and return power to the people of our great country.

H.R. 1 provides us with the opportunity to do this by offering the most sweeping reforms to our democracy since Watergate, and it makes real

strides in rooting out corruption, strengthening voting rights, and restoring government by and for the people.

I want to particularly thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your extraordinary leadership in shaping this bill and drafting it and working with our colleagues all across the Caucus and producing this product.

H.R. 1 includes the DISCLOSE Act, which I introduced to shine the light on unlimited corporate spending that has overrun our elections.

Without fixing our broken campaign finance system and taking power from the powerful special interests and returning it to the people of this country, it will also be impossible to make progress on the other issues that are important to the American people.

The DISCLOSE Act will require organizations that spend money on elections to promptly disclose donors who give \$10,000 or more during the election cycle and prevent political operatives from actions meant to conceal the identity of donors.

I have also introduced legislation which would require motor vehicle registries to automatically register all eligible citizens to vote when they obtain services from their motor vehicle registries.

In 2006, at least 32.6 million eligible Americans were not registered to vote and, thus, unable to cast a ballot.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, making registration automatic will ensure that everyone who wishes to be added to the voter rolls will not have to think twice about it, and I am proud that H.R. 1 will implement automatic voter registration.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, Washington has acted on behalf of wealthy and powerful special interests. Last Congress, Republicans passed legislation to take away healthcare from 23 million Americans, to give billions in tax cuts to billionaires, and to ease gun restrictions in the wake of the deadliest shooting in modern America. Americans responded by voting them out and entrusting us to clean up this culture of corruption. Let us repay that trust by passing this landmark legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the For the People Act, and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is about what is called the For the People Act, but, to me, it should be called the "For the Swamp Act."

Now, we are going to have plenty of time later to debate the particulars of

the bill, but right now we are talking about the rule and what brings this to the floor.

I just want to remind everybody that this bill was given jurisdiction in 10 committees—10 committees—but 1 committee marked it up; one committee took a look at it and said: Well, this is wrong. Let's fix this. Let's change that.

One committee with nine people—2 percent of Congress—has been involved in this bill.

Now, we understand we are in the minority here. We get that. We get that we are not going to get our way, but we are asking to have a say. That is all we are asking for here.

This bill is about shutting down the open process and honest debate—this rule resolution, which actually makes sense, because the underlying bill does the same thing for the American people.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee of Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, I stood on this floor and urged action to fix our broken campaign finance system. I spoke then about how newspapers were filled with daily stories detailing how unregulated campaign contributions were corrupting our political system and threatening the very essence of our democracy. That was my first year serving in this institution.

I am sorry to say that this problem hasn't only persisted, it has gotten worse than many of us could have ever imagined.

Who could have thought that the Supreme Court would issue a disaster ruling like Citizens United? that some would try to have us believe that corporations are people? that we would have a President in the White House who has taken the Republican culture of corruption to a whole new level?

Now, I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. The news that once made the front page of the newspaper is now in front of us on our smartphones non-stop.

We see over and over again how big money has infected our political process and prevented action on things that the American people care most about, how new roadblocks are being put in place to prevent some eligible Americans from casting their ballots, and how some have used their office to side with special interests over the public interest.

This legislation is about finally fixing our broken democracy, including modernizing and securing our election system. We care so much about this that the For the People Act is literally our top priority. That is why it is H.R. 1.

Now, my Republican friends are talking about process like it is something

to be ashamed of. Are they kidding? I mean, these are crocodile tears. When they were in charge at the last Congress, their priority, their H.R. 1, was a tax cut for the superrich. Ours is literally a bill for the people.

And their H.R. 1, by the way, as you can see from this chart, had zero hearings. None. Our H.R. 1 had five.

Our H.R. 1 had 15 hours of hearings. Do you know how many hours of hearings their H.R. 1 had? Zero, a big fat zero. No hearings at all.

We had expert witnesses come to testify and give their input, pro and con. They had none when they did H.R. 1.

Our bill, as we have a structured rule, we have made over 70 amendments in order. When they had their H.R. 1 bill to help the superrich, do you know how many amendments they made in order? Zero. None. A big fat closed rule.

The cost of our legislation to kind of cleanup our democracy is zero. Do you know how much theirs was? At least \$1.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is how the legislative process is supposed to work. And imagine what we could achieve once we get special interests out of the way, whether it is lowering the cost of prescription drugs or strengthening our healthcare system or passing sensible gun safety legislation or protecting the Dreamers.

This is about ensuring that our elections actually reflect the Constitution my friends on the other side of the aisle so often talk about. The Preamble does not begin with “We, the corporations” or “We, the special interests.” It says, “We, the People.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with the majority in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation so we can finally put our government back in the hands of the people.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend and distinguished Republican ranking member on the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his service on the important Rules Committee as our ranking member and for his service in Congress and on that particular committee.

Much of this grab bag of Democratic party favors in this bill are entirely unrelated to each other. How, for example, does imposing unfunded Federal mandates on State administration of elections relate to mandating the President divest from business holdings?

The House Administration Committee is the only committee to mark up this legislation. However, House Administration only marked up the portions of the bill that were in their jurisdiction.

The amendment in the nature of the substitute was 447 pages; the Rules print was 622 pages.

The Committee on Oversight and Reform had substantial jurisdiction over this legislation. We sent a letter to the chairman asking for a markup. We got a letter back from him saying we would do that after the vote on the bill. Now, how the heck does that work? How the heck does that work?

So this needs to slow down. I think the underlying legislation is wrong for the country. The idea that every single taxpayer is now going to have to finance public campaigns, finance election campaigns—just what the voters wanted, just what they need. The very people who are in this swamp, you now have to pay for them to get reelected to stay in this swamp.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we oppose the rule. If the rule does pass, I would certainly urge that we oppose the legislation as well.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Texas is ground zero for voter suppression. Texas Republicans enacted the most stringent voter ID law in the country. They slashed communities across our State through partisan gerrymandering. And now, this year, in what a Federal court has just described as a “ham-handed move” which “exemplifies the power of government to strike fear and anxiety and to intimidate the least powerful among us,” the Abbott administration has initiated a massive voter purge by making the false claim that tens of thousands of people have voted illegally in our State.

Our State has a problem. It is not too many people voting illegally; it is too few people voting at all. The difference that you see in this debate is that we believe elections should be won for one party or the other based on turning out the voters, and too often, our Republican colleagues believe they are won by throwing out the voters.

I believe that the important reform that we are considering today will replace these purges with the urge to have voters participate by removing the many obstacles that stand in their way.

It makes the right to vote more than a paper guarantee. It makes it a reality by allowing people to know their own power, to shape our democracy, and hold every public official accountable. “For the People” means stopping the steady Trump erosion of our democracy by empowering the people to make their voices heard.

I am so pleased that this legislation includes a provision that I authored to ensure that we seek the business tax returns, as well as the personal individual returns, of candidates for President.

Now, this particular amendment is directed not specifically at Mr. Trump, but his conduct underscores why we must require it. He had his personal law firm review his tax returns, and they awarded him an all-clear from any Russian connection.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, they noted that he was the sole or principal owner of 500 separate business entities that stretched from Azerbaijan to Miami, and they gave him an all-clear, upon which he asked us to rely without noting that the same firm had proudly boasted that it was “the Russia law firm of the year.”

Some of us believe we need a little more credible source to review his conduct. But not just review his conduct, that of anyone, for either party, who aspires to be the most powerful person in the entire world.

Even President Nixon invited the Joint Committee on Taxation to review his tax returns, explaining that the people have got to know whether their President is a crook—something very relevant to our times. Candidates who cannot meet the very low Richard Nixon standard have no right to our highest office.

If left untouchable and unreachable, without exposure to sunlight, we will find business tax returns hide the darkest secrets. It is good that we have a strong act demanding disclosure of those returns.

□ 1300

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and classmate.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 years ago, President Trump stood on the west front of this Capitol and pledged to dedicate his administration to taking care of the forgotten men and women of this country. This bill does not take seriously the plight of those forgotten men and women. It does take seriously the plight of protecting Democratic incumbents and candidates.

This bill can't become law. It is never going to pass in the Senate. It is never going to be signed by the President. But it is important to talk about it because it reveals the agenda of the Democratic majority here in the House of Representatives.

This bill, things like the Green New Deal, things like a massive single-payer healthcare system, and it is pretty clear that Democrats don't care about the economy. They don't care about the middle class. Every election I have been in, people talk about rebuilding the middle class.

My gosh, Donald Trump has rebuilt the middle class, but you don't care

about that. You don't care about jobs. You don't care about what people earn in those jobs, otherwise you wouldn't be opening the borders the way you are. You care about your own power. You care about maintaining your own power. It is our job to notify and magnify what is going on with the Democratic leadership of this House of Representatives. That is why I am speaking out about it today.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Our friends across the aisle are nothing if not courageous. They have got the brazen temerity to raise the question of process after running the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America; the most closed House of Representatives that anyone has ever seen.

Let's compare their H.R. 1 when they got started with our H.R. 1. Well, their's was filed, marked up, and passed in 2 weeks with no hearings, no amendments made in order, and no expert testimony at all.

Our H.R. 1 was filed on the first day of the new Congress for all of the public to read. There have been hearings in five different committees with over 15 hours of expert testimony, culminating in a full committee markup in House Administration. Sixty days later, we are now on the floor for consideration in an open and transparent way.

You would think they would have the decency not to raise the question of process after running the House of Representatives like King Kong over the last 2 years. But the people who ran it like King Kong now want to turn it into a Quaker meeting house somehow. They should be thanking us for the openness of our proceedings.

Their H.R. 1 blew a \$1.5 trillion hole in the deficit, a staggering and unprecedented assault on the fiscal integrity of the United States of America, to shower tax cuts on the wealthy and well-connected.

Our H.R. 1 is an effort to reclaim our democracy from the wealthy and well-connected people who were the beneficiaries of their H.R. 1 by creating a 21st century campaign finance system that responds to the people.

On the substance of the matter, it is amazing to me that my colleagues raise the question of the swamp. They got elected 2.5 years ago campaigning against the swamp. It was a great slogan they borrowed from NANCY PELOSI. They moved to Washington. They moved into the swamp. They built a hotel on it, and they have turned the Government of the United States into a money-making operation for the President, and the President's family, and the President's friends and business associates.

Now, what are we doing in H.R. 1? We are trying to reclaim American democ-

racy. This legislation is anti-gerrymandering legislation. This legislation says that every State in the Union will have to have an independent redistricting commission. No politicians involved.

They want the politicians to be involved. Amazingly, they embrace the title of being the gerrymander party. They want to keep gerrymandering because that is how they maintain their stranglehold on political power.

The whole purpose of H.R. 1 is to liberate us from the gerrymandering of our elections. That is why we start with independent redistricting commissions. We move to publicly financed elections, because either the big, wealthy, special interests are going to own the elections, or else the people are going to own them through a small, donor-leveraged system. And that is what we are doing. We have got ethics reform in this legislation.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage, everyone to actually read the terms of this landmark reform legislation, which insists upon ethics reform at the Supreme Court, ethics reform in the executive branch, empowering the Office of Government Ethics to have real subpoena power, and to actually be able to ferret out the corruption which is engulfing the Trump administration today, and to prevent corruption in the future.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my friend and the ranking Republican Member on the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here and follow my colleague on the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Obviously, as you will hear over the next 1 minute and 50 seconds, we disagree. This bill was rushed. This bill does not live up to the promises that the Democratic majority said they were going to do when they ran the House and how open, how bipartisan, and how transparent they were supposed to be.

H.R. 1 means this is the Democrat majority's priority. This bill was introduced on January 3, and at a press conference introducing this bill, many different outside, special interest groups were noted for having helped craft this piece of legislation.

It was 571 pages. It has turned into 622 pages. It has turned into 72 amendments that were ruled in order.

Now, let's take a step back. Ten committees of this House had jurisdiction within this bill. One committee, the smallest committee in the House of Representatives, the House Administration Committee is the only one to mark this bill up.

That is not regular order. That is not an open process. And, frankly, it is a process that the American people should demand be much different.

We Republicans were not consulted during the drafting of this piece of legislation. We Republicans during the only markup that lasted 5 hours, offered 28 amendments that would have made this bill better, and not a single one was passed. All failed on a party-line vote.

That is not bipartisanship. That is not openness. That is not a process that is inclusive, and, frankly, the American people should be very perturbed what this bill will do. It is not a bill that responds to people, as my colleague, Mr. RASKIN, just mentioned. This is a bill that is going to cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars, creating a mandatory program that is going to line the campaign coffers of every single Member of Congress with government money.

That is not what the American taxpayers are wanting. That is not what this institution should be doing. We want every single person in this country to be able to cast their vote and make sure that they have the right to do it, the ability to do it, and to ensure that that vote is protected. This bill does nothing to make sure that happens.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am confused when I listen to the gentleman from Illinois when he complains about process. He complains that we have over 70 amendments in order, as if that were a bad thing.

We think that is a good thing. And when they did their H.R. 1, which was a big, fat giveaway to big corporate special interests in this country, they had no amendments. They had no hearings in any committees.

The House Administration Committee happens to be the main committee of jurisdiction, and they did a hearing and a markup. So did the other committees. They all did hearings. I don't understand what the problem is.

The problem is, you don't like this bill because it undercuts your stranglehold on the political system where all of the big money, corporate special interests can basically get their way with the Republican majority. Enough.

People, whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, have had enough of this corrupt political system that my Republican friends have embraced. We are sick of it. They are sick of it. We are going to change it and it begins here today with passing H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both side of the aisle: stand with us, clean up our political system and support H.R. 1.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. COLE, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time to speak on this most important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I tell those of you who are here today and throughout America, this is a terrible bill. I have to tell you, the more that I read about it, the more that I study about it, the worse I think that it is.

First of all, it is a total overreach of the Federal Government into States' rights. In this bill, the majority didn't even consult with the secretaries of States and the election officials throughout the entire country to see if they even liked it. And so you are mandating to the States how they should run their elections.

Not only that, it is mandating to the States how they should run redistricting. Now, in the State of Arizona, the voters of Arizona set up a redistricting commission and determined how it should be run. But in this bill it says, no, no, it shouldn't be up to the State. It shouldn't be up to the voters. We know better here in Washington, D.C. how to do your business.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, the worst part is that it subsidizes politicians with public money, a 6-to-1 matching ratio giving millions, billions more dollars to candidates. My constituents don't want to see any more of those TV commercials at all; no more signs; no more robocalls. This bill would add more money to those nasty things.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the distinguished Republican ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican leader on the Rules Committee for yielding.

It is unfortunate we are here today to debate a bill like this. This bill is nothing more than a partisan power grab. That is the sum and substance of what has been offered here as H.R. 1.

This is about the priorities of Democrats in the House, and the priorities of Democrats in the House is to change our election laws in such a way as to benefit their party and hurt the American voters and their will at the ballot box. That is the deep problem here with H.R. 1.

This is a partisan power grab by one party to seize power by manipulating our laws to get an outcome counter to the will of the people.

It is not about fairness. It is just the opposite. This is a problem, the process that the Democrats went through, the majority went through for this bill. We had one markup in one committee even though we had multiple committees, including the House Financial Services

Committee. That is how big this bill is. It had multiple committees of jurisdiction that were supposed to have markups on this, and they did not go through that full process.

This bill, at the end of the day, seeks to limit free speech. It uses taxpayer dollars to fund partisan campaign efforts, and mandates outcomes designed to get more Democrats into power.

This is not about fairness. It is just the opposite. Let's vote against this rule, and let's vote down this bad bill.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I am hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Against higher ethics in Congress, they are, what, accepting any kind of corruption in this institution and what corrupts our democracy? You are for gerrymandering? You want dark money to continue?

This is absurd. This is about strengthening our democracy. This should have 435 votes. I am so proud that two of my bills have been incorporated into H.R. 1; one is that we have a national holiday for our national elections. People shouldn't have to choose between their job or their families. They should be able to go and vote.

□ 1315

Presidents and all Presidential candidates should be mandated to put out 10 years of their tax returns so that the American people can vet them in their own minds to see if they are worthy of the highest office in the land.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to add a provision that bars candidates from receiving matching funds under this bill unless that candidate certifies that no tax lien exists on any property owned by that candidate by reason of a failure of the candidate to pay any Federal, State, or local tax.

Mr. Speaker, the logic of this is simple. If the majority is going to insist that millions—really, billions—of Federal tax dollars should be spent subsidizing campaigns, then the candidates should also certify that they have paid all the taxes due from them. If a candidate has a tax lien against them, then they should not receive taxpayer dollars to subsidize their campaign. This is common sense and simple fairness.

Mr. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Oklahoma has any more speakers.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure. The majority has brought up a misnamed bill that instead serves only to preserve its own power. H.R. 1 will create a taxpayer-funded ATM to waste Federal dollars on political campaigns.

Let me say that again: to waste Federal dollars on campaigns.

My friends are worried about the power of money, but they are injecting billions of new taxpayer dollars into this. And not only that, the taxpayer has no say in where those dollars go. They don't get to pick a candidate or whatever. We are just going to willy-nilly have their dollars support candidates whom they may or may not agree with.

This does not only apply to Democrats and Republicans. There are fringe candidates who will get funding under this, too, candidates, quite frankly, who will probably embarrass my friends and ourselves.

So I think this is an enormously misguided idea. It will take over elections and voter registration from States and transfer power to Washington.

Let me say that again. My friends are voting to literally turn over the State election operations of 50 separate States and federalize them. They haven't talked to very many secretaries of state. I think there was only one who actually was allowed to testify in opposition to this bill.

Instead, we are going to foist off billions of dollars in unpaid mandates on every State in the country so my friends can continue this misguided effort to alter the political landscape of the greatest Republic and democracy in the world.

This bill will weaken voting systems and weaken the enforcement mechanism that guards against fraud, and it will undermine Americans' fundamental First Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my friends on the other side to reconsider their course of action. This bill is not going to be heard by the Senate; it will never be signed by the President of the United States; and instead of building a bipartisan coalition for election and campaign reform, it will partisanize this process further.

There was and still is an opportunity to have this bill considered in markups across every committee of jurisdiction. Instead, the majority is simply ramming it through, using a committee where they hold a 2-to-1 majority and limiting, frankly, the ability of Members to participate in the process of writing the bill.

We can do better than this, Mr. Speaker, and we should strive to do better than this now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the reforms in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will remove barriers to our democracy that drown out the voices of too many Americans.

H.R. 1 will put the people back in charge. These reforms will bring about systemic change which, in turn, will lead to policy outcomes that improve the lives of all Americans.

From lowering the cost of prescription drugs to rebuilding our Nation’s infrastructure to raising wages and creating better job opportunities, each of these policies requires the voice of the people to be fully heard and respected. They all rest on fixing our broken democracy.

We have heard the call for change from our friends, neighbors, and constituents. That is how I got here and how so many of my colleagues did, too.

To those people who voted for such historic change, know that Democrats hear you, and we are ready to give you the government you deserve.

Crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma last weekend was a poignant reminder that change does not come quickly, and it certainly does not come easily. Heroes like Representative JOHN LEWIS remind us of the sacrifices that were made in order to preserve our uniquely American creed: “of the people, by the people, for the people.”

H.R. 1 is the top priority of Democrats because it will strengthen the very core of our democracy. It is a mandate with which we were entrusted by voters this past November, and it is the first step in restoring faith in our institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this House to support this rule to show that you want big money out of politics. Support this bill to show that you believe voting should be made easier—not harder—for eligible voters, and support this rule to show that you believe those elected to public positions deserve to be held to the highest possible ethical standards.

In the words of our esteemed colleague, Representative LEWIS: “The fight to vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful nonviolent tool or instrument that we have in a democratic society.”

To the American people: We hear you. In the words of the civil rights anthem, we must keep our eyes on the prize and hold on to the vision of a more perfect Union, one in which the voices of the people are heard and respected. Our Caucus is eager to restore the promise of our democracy and give you the government you deserve. That is why we are urging passage of H.R. 1—“For the People.”

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

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 7 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Cole of Oklahoma or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in section 6 is as follows:

Page 421, insert after line 11 the following: “(5) The candidate certifies that no lien exists on any property of the candidate by reason of a failure of the candidate to pay any Federal, State, or local tax.”

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 172, if ordered; and

Approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 191, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]
YEAS—232

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

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Sherrill
Lewis	Pappas	Sires
Lieu, Ted	Pascarell	Slotkin
Lipinski	Payne	Smith (WA)
Loeb	Perlmutter	Soto
Lofgren	Peters	Spanberger
Lowenthal	Peterson	Speier
Lowe	Phillips	Stanton
Luján	Pingree	Stevens
Luria	Pocan	Suozi
Lynch	Porter	Swalwell (CA)
Malinowski	Pressley	Takano
Maloney	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Raskin	Titus
McAdams	Rice (NY)	Tlaib
McBath	Richmond	Tonko
McCollum	Rose (NY)	Torres (CA)
McEachin	Rouda	Torres Small (NM)
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Trahan
McNerney	Ruiz	Trone
Meeke	Ruppersberger	Underwood
Meng	Rush	Van Drew
Moore	Ryan	Vargas
Morelle	Sánchez	Veasey
Moulton	Sarbanes	Vela
Mucarsel-Powell	Scanlon	Velázquez
Murphy	Schakowsky	Vislosky
Nadler	Schiff	Wasserman
Napolitano	Schneider	Schultz
Neal	Schrader	Waters
Neguse	Schrier	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Welch
O’Halloran	Scott, David	Wexton
Ocasio-Cortez	Serrano	Wild
Omar	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Shalala	Yarmuth
	Sherman	

NAYS—191

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

Watkins	Williams	Wright
Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Yoho
Webster (FL)	Wittman	Young
Wenstrup	Womack	Zeldin
Westerman	Woodall	

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne	Griffith	Spano
Carter (TX)	Horsford	Walden
Clark (MA)	Rutherford	

□ 1351

Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRAWFORD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). 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. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—232

Adams	Dean	Johnson (TX)
Aguilar	DeFazio	Kaptur
Allred	DeGette	Keating
Axne	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Barragán	DelBene	Kennedy
Bass	Delgado	Khanna
Beatty	Demings	Kildee
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kimmer
Beyer	Deutch	Kim
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kind
Blumenauer	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Blunt Rochester	Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi
Bonamici	F.	Kuster (NH)
Boyle, Brendan	Engel	Lamb
F.	Escobar	Langevin
Brindisi	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Brown (MD)	Españillat	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Evans	Lawrence
Bustos	Finkenauer	Lawson (FL)
Butterfield	Fletcher	Lee (CA)
Carbajal	Foster	Lee (NV)
Cárdenas	Frankel	Levin (CA)
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Levin (MI)
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lewis
Case	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Casten (IL)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Garcia (IL)	Loeb
Castro (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Lofgren
Chu, Judy	Golden	Lowenthal
Cicilline	Gomez	Lowe
Cisneros	Gonzalez (TX)	Lujan
Clarke (NY)	Gottheimer	Luria
Clay	Green (TX)	Lynch
Cleaver	Grijalva	Malinowski
Clyburn	Haaland	Maloney,
Cohen	Harder (CA)	Carolyn B.
Cannolly	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Cooper	Hayes	Matsui
Correa	Heck	McAdams
Costa	Higgins (NY)	McBath
Courtney	Hill (CA)	McCollum
Cox (CA)	Himes	McEachin
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	McGovern
Crist	Horsford	McNerney
Crow	Houlihan	Meeks
Cuellar	Hoyer	Meng
Cummings	Huffman	Moore
Cunningham	Jackson Lee	Morello
Davids (KS)	Jayapal	Moulton
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)	Murphy

Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Suoizzi
Napolitano	Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)
Neal	Ruppersberger	Takano
Neguse	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Norcross	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
O'Halleran	Sánchez	Titus
Ocasio-Cortez	Sarbanes	Tlaib
Omar	Scanlon	Tonko
Pallone	Schakowsky	Torres (CA)
Panetta	Schiff	Torres Small
Pappas	Schneider	(NM)
Pascarella	Schrader	Trahan
Payne	Schrier	Underwood
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Van Drew
Peters	Scott, David	Vargas
Peterson	Serrano	Veasey
Phillips	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Pingree	Shalala	Velázquez
Pocan	Sherman	Visclosky
Porter	Sherrill	Wasserman
Pressley	Sires	Schultz
Price (NC)	Slotkin	Waters
Quigley	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Raskin	Soto	Welch
Rice (NY)	Spanberger	Weston
Richmond	Speier	Wild
Rose (NY)	Stanton	Wilson (FL)
Rouda	Stevens	Yarmuth

NAYS—192

Abraham	Gooden	Norman
Aderholt	Gosar	Nunes
Allen	Granger	Olson
Amash	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Pence
Arrington	Green (TN)	Perry
Babin	Griffith	Posey
Bacon	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Baird	Guest	Reed
Balderson	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Banks	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Barr	Harris	Riggleman
Bergman	Hartzler	Roby
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bilirakis	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	Scalise
Bucshon	Hunter	Schweikert
Budd	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Katko	Smucker
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Steil
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Steube
Comer	Kinziger	Stewart
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Cook	LaHood	Taylor
Crawford	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Thornberry
Curtis	Latta	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Long	Turner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Wagner
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duncan	Marchant	Walker
Dunn	Marshall	Walorski
Emmer	Massie	Waltz
Estes	Mast	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Wenstrup
Flores	McHenry	Westerman
Fortenberry	McKinley	Williams
Fulcher	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wittman
Gallagher	Miller	Womack
Gianforte	Mitchell	Woodall
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Wright
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Young
	Newhouse	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Byrne	Rutherford	Walden
Carter (TX)	Spano	
Clark (MA)	Trone	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1400

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.” 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. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at memorial services following the untimely passing of Dennis Richardson, Oregon's 26th Secretary of State, I was in Oregon and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 106 and “nay” on rollcall No. 107.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE DON YOUNG AS THE LONGEST-SERVING REPUBLICAN MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark a historic moment in our institution as DON YOUNG, the dean of the House, becomes the longest-serving Republican in the House's history.

Is that a blushing DON YOUNG that we see behind the beard there?

On behalf of the entire House, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Congressman YOUNG on this honor and on your 46 years of proud service on behalf of the people of Alaska.

DON YOUNG has served alongside, from Alaska, six Senators and 11 governors of his proud State. Photographs of eight Presidents signing his bills into law proudly cover the walls of his Rayburn office.

Despite the length of time, every single day he serves here, it is clear that DON is passionate about his patriotism and about working in this institution to make a difference for America.

As he said upon becoming dean—remember we celebrated his becoming dean not that long ago—he said:

I love this body, I believe in this body, my heart is in the House.

Just over 2 months ago, DON honored one of the special traditions of our institution when he, as dean, administered the oath of office to me, a woman Speaker of the House. That oath began: “. . . I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic . . .”

As DON's name becomes further etched in the history of this House, his caucus and this Congress will look to him for leadership to protect our Constitution, to defend our institution, and to drive progress for the American people.

Just so you know, my colleagues, in becoming the longest-serving Republican of the House, DON surpasses the

record held by the legendary former Speaker of the House, Joseph Cannon.

Mr. Cannon once observed that, and this is a quote:

The House is the most peculiar assemblage in the world, and only a man who has had long experience there can fully know its idiosyncrasies. It is true we engage in fierce combat, we are often intense partisans, sometimes we aren't fair, yet I venture to say that nowhere else will you find such a ready appreciation of merit and character.

Joseph Cannon, now surpassed by DON YOUNG as the longest-serving Republican in the Congress.

DON, thank you for being a leader of merit and character. Congratulations to you and your entire family on this milestone.

Congratulations, DON.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for yielding.

I too rise to congratulate Representative DON YOUNG, the dean of the House, who today, as stated, becomes the longest-serving Republican in the history of Congress and, as the Speaker noted, has surpassed Joe Cannon.

DON YOUNG doesn't quote Joe Cannon, but he reminds me they named a building after him.

Now, like me, DON was born in California. He got to know Alaska the way many of us did, he read Jack London's "The Call of the Wild," and he moved there right when it became a State.

As of today, DON has represented Alaska for 46 years, over 75 percent of the entire time it has been a State.

His career is an important reminder of how young this wonderful experience we call America truly is.

They lied to me during freshman orientation. They told me nobody had an assigned seat in this House. That is how I got to know DON YOUNG. I made the mistake of coming in and sitting down right over by that door.

I also learned another valuable lesson: DON keeps a knife.

Now, DON has been a very effective Member. He has been chair of the Committee on Natural Resources, chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, he has worked with nine Presidents, nine Speakers, he has numerous bills on his wall in between all the animals, but DON was prepared for this job.

You see, when he was in Alaska, he was a riverboat captain, he was a mayor, but he told me the job that prepared him the most to be a Member of Congress, he taught the fifth grade. I don't know how good of a teacher you were, but I imagine it was good.

But DON has been a mentor to many of us. You see, you can watch him, how he carries himself in conference, how he carries himself on the floor, but the way that he can mentor all of us is by the love and respect that he always had for his spouse. Lula was always next to him, and Anne is there now.

He has been a Member of Congress, but he has been a father, and he has been a very, very great husband.

Mr. Speaker, we all travel far and wide to be here to represent our constituents, but no one travels further, no one has the challenge to match DON. There are times, if the weather requires, he takes a dogsled, and it is no joking matter. That is his dedication.

DON also makes sure this institution stays running on time. I noticed that last vote went a little long. I do like to monitor the difference when we are in the minority. On average, the votes lasted 5 to 10 minutes less when we were in the majority, not by anything I did, but by the calls of DON YOUNG.

But on a serious note, Madam Speaker, I have always heard that if you find a job you love, you will not work a day in your life. It is clear that DON YOUNG loves what he does, because he loves this institution and he loves the people's House.

So to DON, we say congratulations on this incredible accomplishment, something nobody probably sitting here today will ever be able to achieve, but you did it for your passion, you did it for the love, but more importantly, you did it for your country.

I thank you.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the distinguished dean is eager to take to the microphone, but not yet. There is more to come.

When the distinguished Republican leader of the House referenced the animals in your office, the menagerie there, I was reminded of one of your ties, and I shared this story with Members on the day that you became the dean of the House, now the longest-serving Republican today. But I saw you one day with a tie that really gave me hope, because it had an owl and an eagle and a baby seal on it, and I said, "Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am so happy to see you paying tribute to these endangered species," to which you said, "I call this tie lunch."

I knew you were only kidding, right?

So, in any event, we have all had our stories with the chairman. We all respect and admire him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic majority leader of the House for purposes of commenting on the distinguished dean, the longest-serving Republican in the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate DON YOUNG, who the minority leader and the Speaker have both indicated loves this House. The minority leader then added apparently you haven't worked a day in your life, at least that is how I interpreted it, DON. That was a liberal interpretation, you know, this side of the aisle. What can I tell you?

We just lost the longest-serving Member of the House just a few weeks ago, and as I sat here, I thought, what a resemblance there is between the longest-serving Democrat of the House

and the longest-serving Republican of the House: irascible comes to mind; caring about this institution comes to mind; faithful to principle comes to mind; blunt, speaks truth, not only to power, but to everybody else as well. DON YOUNG has made a difference.

DON YOUNG comes from Alaska, as all of us know, although the Speaker and the minority leader recognized that he came from California, but, DON, you have really made a difference, particularly for your State.

As chairman of Natural Resources, you were focused like a laser on making sure that your State was treated fairly. I know there are still some things you didn't accomplish that you would like to have accomplished, and you have much time left to do that, but the fact is all of us have benefited, I think, from your honesty, your recognition of how the House ought to work, and, yes, your regular order, which you demanded and didn't always get.

Of course, you took that with just very low-key responses, as I recall, walking by your seat from time to time.

□ 1415

But DON YOUNG is an institution. DON YOUNG is an institutionalist. DON YOUNG is the kind of Member that makes this House, over the decades, work as constructively as it can, not as constructively as it should.

Hopefully, we will follow DON YOUNG and John Dingell's example, because both of them are lions of partisanship, but both of them were not only willing but thought it appropriate to work across the aisle to reach objectives that they could hold in common.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank DON for his service. DON and I have served together for 37 years. Between us, we have a little bit of time on us. I look forward to serving with him for some years to come. God bless him and God-speed.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished Republican whip of the House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker PELOSI for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is really a special moment for all of us to pay tribute to DON YOUNG for this great achievement, being the longest serving Republican in the House, especially for someone who loves this institution so much. As we talked about John Dingell and had the honor of serving with John Dingell in the House Energy and Commerce Committee and seeing his passion, not just for the issues he believed in, in fighting for the auto industry and so many other issues, but for his love of the people's House, DON YOUNG has that same love. In fact, anybody who knows DON YOUNG knows that his secrets to longevity are always speaking his mind,

fighting every day to be a champion for the great people of Alaska, and always speaking his mind.

On a somber note, DON started his career out of a tragedy. A lot of you remember that back in October of 1972, there was a plane crash in Alaska. Nicholas Begich and Hale Boggs, who at the time was the majority leader, went down in a plane crash. There was a massive search to try to find the plane. They never did find that plane. Ultimately, when they finally recognized that we had lost two great leaders, they had special elections.

I get to serve and actually work every day in the office that Hale Boggs once worked in, the same office that Majority Leader HOYER worked in as well, and I think about Hale a lot, as we think about Nicholas Begich as well. But I know DON was elected in a special election. That is when he came to Congress. Somebody else came to Congress: Hale Boggs' wife, Lindy Boggs, who some of you may have served with. They are probably too very different personalities, but they formed a special bond because of the unique nature in which they came to Congress. He shared with me some of those stories.

It just shows you how sometimes our differences can, ultimately, bring us together to at least pay tribute not only to an institution, but to respect our backgrounds and how we all come here from different walks of life. Ultimately, it is our desire to serve the people who we represent.

That is the thing I love the most about serving with DON YOUNG. It is that he has such a passion. He fights for his beliefs, and he works with other people.

We all know that, for 37 years, one of his great causes was to open up ANWR. Finally, we were on the White House lawn in December 2017 to have that ceremony and watch DON YOUNG giddy as a schoolchild as the President was making that announcement, and then to see him still this day, and every day, come to work with the passion of representing the great people of Alaska and continuing to work with all of us on all the different issues that we come here to address.

As we celebrate this great achievement, I think, as we all know, he comes and sits in that same spot and he yells "order," and he yells a few other things, and he pushes us all to do our job in a much more efficient way. But how fitting it is that the United States' largest State has such a larger than life personality as its representative.

Congratulations, DON. It is an honor to serve with you.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from listening to the comments of the bipartisan leadership of the House of Representatives that, as Speaker, I can say, on behalf of the entire House of Representatives: Thank you, DON YOUNG, and congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the distin-

guished longest serving Republican in history in the Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker PELOSI for those kind words, the kind words of the Republican leaders, and the kind words of all my colleagues.

It was mentioned that I love this institution, and I do because this is the great United States of America, and we are representatives of our districts.

The one thing I learned, during my 46 years, is that each one of you represent your people, and I respect it. I may not agree with some of the things you stand for, but I respect that you were elected by your people.

I had the privilege of traveling a lot, and I still do, in Members' districts, not to campaign against them, but to find out why and how they are elected and what they stand for in that community. This House is the people's House.

I have to sort of confess to one thing that was alluded to by KEVIN. It is a fact that I was a schoolteacher to fifth grade students, and it prepared me for this job. There is some truth in that because, I have to tell you, I have timed it as a teacher. The average attention span of a fifth grader is 7 minutes, and the average attention span of most Congressmen is about 4¼, because they are so busy trying to do everything they can, and they are so busy representing their people.

John Dingell was mentioned. And, DEBBIE, God bless you for him. He was one of my dear friends. Everybody says that, but he was a dear friend.

I met him in 1964 in my hometown of Fort Yukon. He was on the Fish and Wildlife Committee. He was 9 years a Congressman. I met with him and talked to him about an issue I was interested in.

Of course, when I got elected, he came to me, and I went to see him. We had one thing in common: We loved to hunt. We hunted on weekends, because we stayed here. We fished on weekends. And we became dear friends. He is the strongest, frankly, Congressman I have ever served with.

We had one thing in common: He respected my beliefs, and I respected his. I would say, John, this is the right thing to do. And he would do it.

I think a lot of us here today have to learn that and quit watching the media. That person who represents that district, listen to what they have to say and support them. That makes this House work a lot better, frankly, than it is right now.

This is nothing new. We have to do this for this country, to retain the control of the Congress to run this Nation. If not, we will lose our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone in this room for recognizing my tenure. I want to especially thank my wife, Anne, who is up in the stand. I have been trying to get the State of Alaska to pay her because when I lost my dear Lu, I thought I was going to die. She came along, picked me up off the ground,

supported me, loved me, cherishes me, and makes me want to come to work every day to serve the great State of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone. God bless them, and God bless America.

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

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule a vote on the born-alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019.

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 172 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. 1.

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

□ 1427

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. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, 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 be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and the 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 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 will begin the process of returning the government to the people. Many provisions of H.R. 1 have been pending and ignored for years in this House. No more.

□ 1430

H.R. 1 has been the subject of hearings in five committees and 15 hours of testimony from witnesses. Throughout these hearings, we have heard our Republican friends bemoan a rushed process when, in fact, they had 8 years to consider these proposals but failed to do so.

Today, we deliver on our promise to the American people. H.R. 1 is critically important at this point in our history.

Trust in government and in many institutions has eroded because of years of putting profit before the people and letting politicians pick their voters.

Dark money has been allowed to poison our system, drowning out the voices of the very people who we were sent here to represent.

Access to the ballot box has been impeded by arbitrary obstacles that have made voting a privilege, not a right.

Without trust, our representative system suffers. Too many Americans view themselves as shut out from our democracy. Others cannot participate because of election administration procedures that fail to account for how Americans live and work in the 21st century.

Some of these barriers make it harder for certain populations, including communities of color and other underrepresented groups, to vote. This is especially the case after the Supreme Court gutted core provisions of the Voting Rights Act in Shelby County v. Holder.

Meanwhile, the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision has further empowered wealthy special interests and ushered in nearly a billion dollars in money from undisclosed sources, even though the Court affirmed the importance of disclosure by a vote of 8 to 1.

H.R. 1 reverses course and strengthens our democracy and makes it easier and more convenient for all eligible Americans to vote. It offers solutions to the dominance of big money in politics, and it ensures public officials will work in the public interest.

One of the things that has been discussed is the proposal for a freedom from influence fund that will allow for small donors to reclaim control of candidates through \$200 or less donations.

I want to make it clear that no taxpayer funds are permitted to flow into this freedom from influence fund. Instead, as was approved in our last vote, a modest additional assessment of 2.75 percent on Federal fines, penalties, and settlements for certain tax crimes and corporate malfeasance will be the sole source of funding for this freedom from influence fund. In fact, the bad guys will be funding the clean system.

This bill will lower barriers to voting for all eligible Americans. It will save costs, bolster the integrity of election administration, and, for example, it will modernize voter registration systems by enabling automatic voter registration and same-day voter registration, taking advantage of technology to ensure all Americans can register and update their voter registration status online. Automatic voter registration, alone, may bring up to 50 million new American citizens onto the rolls and, therefore, able to vote.

It makes improvements to ensure ballot access for voters with disabilities as well as our overseas and military voters.

It ensures early voting for at least 15 days and will require States to use voter-verified paper ballots. This is a commonsense safeguard to cybersecurity threats, especially after the 2016 election showed vulnerabilities in our system.

H.R. 1 will reform redistricting to ensure fairness in the process to guard against partisanship and respect communities of interest.

This legislation will shine a light on dark secret money that influences campaigns and will protect everyone's right to know who is influencing their votes and their views.

As I mentioned earlier, it provides an alternative voluntary system for candidates to finance their campaigns by empowering small dollar contributors all without taxpayer money. This will reduce candidates' reliance on wealthy special interests and open the political process to more people. This will create a government for the people.

H.R. 1 will also implement high ethical standards and boost confidence in self-government.

It has been said that we should not take these steps, but Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution provides that Congress may, by law, regulate votes in Federal elections.

It is time that we take this step. Democracy is resilient, but it requires our continual work to ensure that it lives up to its promise.

H.R. 1 is a major, comprehensive step forward, a step that we must take if we are to be true to our promise of our representative government.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleagues across the aisle that there is a role for the Federal Government to play in election infrastructure, campaign finance disclosure, ballot access transparency, and election security. However, H.R. 1 was developed to serve the special interests of Democrats and the outside organizations that support the Democratic Party and will not accomplish its alleged goal of being for the people.

The greatest threat to our Nation's election system is partisanship, and that is what we are seeing right here in H.R. 1. It misuses taxpayer dollars, takes power away from States to administer their own elections, and threatens to limit Americans' constitutional rights.

H.R. 1 proposes all groups limit free speech and imposes vague standards that disadvantage citizens who wish to advocate on behalf of any public policy issue.

Every American has a right to support causes they believe in, and that is exactly why the American Civil Liberties Union echoes my concerns. The ACLU said that there are provisions that unconstitutionally impinge on the free speech rights of American citizens and public interest organizations.

When groups that have traditionally supported the Democratic Party cannot support H.R. 1, it underscores why election reform legislation should not be developed in a partisan manner.

H.R. 1 overreaches our Constitution by taking power away from States that decide how their election should be administered, States that know their residents' election needs much better than a Federal bureaucracy does.

Congress should be partnering with States to support them in increasing voter registration instead of forcing a federally mandated one-size-fits-all approach that will be costly and ineffective.

This bill also fails to include safeguards, while implementing new voter registration and voting practices.

I cannot stress enough that Congress should absolutely be in favor of increasing access to the polls, but we do that by adding the necessary checks and balances to ensure these votes and that access are protected.

We should allow States to maintain their own voter rolls in order to process voters in a timely manner on election day, avoid unfunded mandates, and manage voter lists to avoid voting irregularities. A few voting irregularities can change the outcome of a single election, especially when you live in a competitive district like I do. Every single vote makes a difference between winning and losing.

If we pass new voter registration practices in H.R. 1 without creating safeguards to prevent voting irregularities in these practices, we risk taking away the choice of the American people. Simply, another way, H.R. 1 is taking away the voice of each American voter.

If we want to increase our election security, Congress should support States choosing their own methods and machines. Multiple points of entry are more secure than one system. Federalizing election security, as this legislation does, will not protect voters.

When H.R. 1 was introduced, it was referred to 10 committees in the House. This bill, which is now over 600 pages, will now have gone from introduction to general debate on the floor of the House with only half of those 10 committees holding a single hearing, and only one of those committees holding a markup.

The Democrats promised greater transparency in the majority, but we are not seeing that in their first major piece of legislation.

We just received the CBO score for H.R. 1, which egregiously underestimates H.R. 1's cost to the taxpayers by conveniently leaving out many of the legislation's most expensive provisions. H.R. 1's campaign match provision is what is being left out. CBO said they needed more time to develop a more comprehensive score. That was ignored.

Though my Democratic colleagues may have changed where exactly the bucket is, they are still using H.R. 1 to put more money into politicians' campaigns. H.R. 1 is creating public subsidies through the 6-to-1 government match program on small dollar campaign contributions of up to \$200. For every \$200, the Federal Government, the taxpayers, will now pay \$1,200 to a politician, to Members of Congress' campaigns.

While my colleagues across the aisle now say this will be of no cost to the taxpayer—as of a new gimmick that they developed yesterday—I would like to point out that every single House Democrat signed on to cosponsor this legislation before any changes were made to this provision.

Make no mistake, the new majority wants to put your hard-earned tax dollars into their own campaigns. While they may have changed the route to get there, that is their fundamental goal with this obvious sham campaign finance reform. They say they want to get money out of politics, but they are using this bill, H.R. 1, to funnel more in.

Provisions like this do not belong in any campaign or finance election reforms. Election reforms should be bipartisan, not serving the interests of partisan politicians.

As we move forward with the debate today, I hope my colleagues across the aisle will thoughtfully reconsider their eager support of a bill that will harm the American voter and taxpayer and

not simply vote, as we have seen throughout this not-open process, along partisan lines.

Every American's vote should be counted and protected.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the right to vote has been called protective of all other rights. Without it, you can't protect your rights. That right has been eroded in recent years.

We have seen many attempts on the State and local level to limit the right to vote for minorities, to close polling places, to limit the hours of voting, to put in phony requirements that prevent people from voting.

We must restore, as this bill will do, the protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act that guarantee the right to vote, that stop local politicians from choosing their own electorates.

We must eliminate the poison of large campaign contributions from hidden money. The dominance in our politics of large campaign contributions when someone anonymously can give \$20,000 to \$30,000—or millions of dollars—to various PACs which then funnel the money to politicians is subversive of our democracy.

It is a metastasized cancer on our democracy. And if we don't excise this cancer through this bill, historians will eventually write, I fear, that the American Republic, like the Roman Republic, had a good 250-year run with democracy but then evolved into an oligarchy, which is the direction we are headed in.

We must ban those huge campaign contributions, substitute a system of small contributions by ordinary people that will be matched so that the public, not the plutocrats, will dominate our politics and control our legislation.

We should restore our right to vote for people who committed crimes long ago and have long since paid their debts to society.

These restrictions and ex-felons voting were put in specifically to guarantee white supremacy. Read the debates in the various State conventions in the 1900s and 1910.

This bill will help strengthen Americans' faith in their government institutions and ensure that everyone has a voice in determining how our country is governed.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this landmark legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my colleague, good friend, and member on the House Administration Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for his work.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1. While my colleagues on the

other side of the aisle have deemed this bill to be “for the people,” a more proper characterization would be “for the politicians.”

Voting is a foundational right for all Americans, and the egregious provisions of this bill would jeopardize our freedoms. In particular, this legislation fails to address the issue of ballot harvesting.

As we have seen in California and my own State of North Carolina, ballot harvesting has created troubling irregularities in several elections due to the lack of oversight and opportunities for voter manipulation and intimidation.

Ballot harvesting allows political operatives with a partisan agenda to get involved in the collection and submission of votes, creating an opportunity for organizations or campaign workers to exploit voters and violate our fundamental rights.

Americans should have a choice on how they want to vote, who they want to support, and if they want to vote at all.

□ 1445

Not only would H.R. 1 manipulate the voting process, but it would also restrict our rights as Americans to donate to the campaigns of our choosing and would allow the Federal Government to use our taxpayer dollars to subsidize elections.

Aside from the proposed matching donations with a 6-to-1 ratio, H.R. 1 would create a pilot program to provide \$25 vouchers for eligible voters. In practice, that means taxpayer money from hardworking Americans could be used to finance campaigns for candidates they do not support.

If this doesn't limit free speech enough, another provision of the bill politicizes the Federal Election Commission by reducing membership from six to five. This makes a traditionally nonpartisan organization political, giving one party the power to make partisan decisions about election communications.

With the vague standards created by H.R. 1, this would affect any group wishing to advocate on behalf of any legislative issue.

In short, this legislation violates the First Amendment. Even the ACLU has problems with it. It creates an avenue for fraud and subjects voters to potential exploitation.

While my colleagues across the aisle will support this bill to subsidize their own elections and keep their party in the majority, I will stand up for our rights as Americans and vote against one of the worst bills ever, this abhorrent assault on our election system.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a pioneer and leader in clean government.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1. It is a comprehensive, once-in-a-generation blueprint for reforming our democratic

system, ranging from gerrymandering to voter suppression, and voting rights to the dominance of unaccountable big money in our politics. It is an urgent priority rightly numbered H.R. 1, and basic to everything else we need to do. If our democracy doesn't work, nothing works.

It represents a culmination of issues I have worked on during my entire time in Congress, particularly, the way moneyed interests can corrupt our politics and how they drown out the voices of everyone else.

The For the People Act will modernize our Presidential public financing system. It will establish a new public matching system for congressional races to empower small donors. It will crack down on improper super-PAC coordination with campaigns.

H.R. 1 also includes my legislation to repeal the IRS dark-money rule, and it expands my original stand-by-your-ad provision to require corporations and other groups to disclose the top funders when they run political ads over the air or on the internet.

These reforms will empower American voters and encourage more diverse candidates to run for office, and will help break the stranglehold of big money on our politics.

Let's deliver on the promises we have made to restore integrity, accountability, and transparency to our democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose H.R. 1. This is an egregious assault on the fundamental rights and freedoms of Americans.

H.R. 1, really, is a fight over liberty. This is a fight over the constitutional duties and roles of the States, one of which being the role in conducting elections.

Article I, section 4 says clearly, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

Having individual States conduct elections has been vital to preserving the integrity and security of elections across the country. But this debate really is about the Democrats' desire to centralize power here in one place, Washington, D.C.

Instead of actively giving more power to Washington bureaucrats, we should be divesting power away from the expansive Federal Government, and reserving that power for the States, because that is the way the Founding Fathers designed our Republic.

But, sadly, this bill is nothing but a top-down power grab by the Democrats using the Federal Government to micromanage the electoral process, impose limits on free speech, and further impose unconstitutional mandates.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the liberty our Founders intended. In fact, this is a

dangerous proposal that centralizes power, enhances Big Government in Washington, and takes decisionmaking power out of the hands of the States and the people.

Let's ask ourselves: Is this the proper and constitutional role of the Federal Government? And the answer to that question is, no. H.R. 1 encroaches on the liberties and powers of the Constitution reserved for the States and the people, and I oppose this type of power grab. I think that is what so infuriates so many Americans.

We take an oath here to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. We shouldn't be passing bills like H.R. 1. We should be passing bills that preserve the liberty and freedom enshrined in the Constitution.

I encourage all Members to adamantly oppose this legislation, because if you take your oath seriously—because we aren't voting for a fancy title of a bill, when you actually read the language of this legislation, you see that it undermines the Constitution and the rights of every single American across the country, under the guise of making elections safer.

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

I have to note that the last speaker failed to read the entire section. Article I, section 4 says: "The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof;" as was mentioned. And it then goes on to say, "but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. . . ." And that is what we are doing here.

Why? Because we have seen in States throughout the country efforts to prevent people from voting in Federal elections. And so a voter in one State is treated differently than in another State, and that is what we are going to change with H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the For the People Act, which includes language from my legislation with Senator CORY BOOKER, the Help Students Vote Act.

Young Americans vote at the lowest rates of any age group, and a key factor in that are the challenges of voting on a new college campus far away from home. My legislation has three provisions to address this challenge.

First, it requires every college and university to email timely voter registration information to all of its students.

Second, it requires every school to designate a campus vote coordinator to answer students' questions about voting.

Third, it authorizes grants to colleges and universities that take exemplary action to promote civic engagement.

I want to thank the many organizations supporting the legislation, in-

cluding Young Invincibles, and the Students Learn Students Vote Coalition.

By helping students register and vote, we can ensure our government better responds to the people it serves, while encouraging our next generation of leaders.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am very privileged to stand here with somebody who grew up in the same rural county as I did, in Christian County, Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), my good friend.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the Democrat politician protection act. This legislation is a radical attempt to hijack our free and fair election system, and limit the voices of the American people.

For example, in H.R. 1, Democrats are proposing the public financing of elections which would force Americans' hard-earned tax dollars to be subsidizing political campaigns they do not support, limiting constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of speech and association.

Furthermore, this one-size-fits-all Federal takeover of the election process will open the door for voting irregularities through Federal mandates on voter registration and voting practices that will be forced on the States—a massive Federal power grab.

Last time I checked, voting happens at the State level, and is the right and responsibility of the State and local governments.

They say this only affects Federal elections, but does anyone really believe that the States will have two separate systems? I am in full support of increasing voter registration participation in our election process. Unfortunately, this legislation goes far beyond increasing voter participation, and, instead, is a misguided attempt to rig our Nation's electoral systems for the benefit of the Democratic Party by telling Americans, once again, that the Federal Government and Washington bureaucrats know best.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this liberty- and freedom-limiting legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a valued Member of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill was not rushed. It is long overdue. I recently joined our colleague and civil rights icon, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, commemorating the march and the fight for the right to vote.

We can never forget how many people have risked and lost their lives for that right. Fifty-four years later, our election system is still stacked against

many Americans. Some eligible voters are still prohibited from voting by mail and can't make it to the polls.

Some eligible voters have still been unfairly purged from the rolls, and some communities still do not have enough polling locations, leading to long lines.

We need justice. We need to expand the fixes that have been proven to work in so many of our States, and that is exactly what H.R. 1 does.

If we are for the people, not just the ones we think will vote for us, then we should be for this bill.

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

Mr. Chair, I love this country. I love this country for what it is. I love this country for the principles and the ideas on which it was founded. America is not a place. It is not a government. It is not a people. It is an idea.

One of the ideas of our Founders is that the government is most effective when it is local, the closest to the people.

I want to correct something that I think my colleagues on the other side may not understand or are just not presenting to the American people. Yes, the Constitution gives Congress the ability at times to come in and modify election law, but this bill is so sweeping, it strips the States of their constitutional authority that was given to them by the Constitution by eliminating their influence in elections altogether.

The true intention of the Founders when it came to this provision in the Constitution was predominantly to ensure that the States could not render the Congress ineffective by refusing to hold elections so they would ensure that we always have a quorum here.

That was the purpose of that. We need to go back to the original intent of the Founders when they added this in the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, if you read the writings of the Founding Fathers, this is ultimately clear. I want to read to you something that James Madison said regarding the States' authority, especially when it comes to elections. He said, "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. . . . The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives and liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.

They could not be clearer that the States should be the ones setting the laws regarding elections. This would totally undermine that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend and colleague.

□ 1500

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding me the time.

It is tough to get up and speak after the Federalist Papers have been referenced because they do go to the core of who we are. So does election integrity.

I look around, and I see my friends from the other side of the aisle, along with friends on my side of the aisle, and election integrity is a shared value. So you would think that the solution to election integrity challenges would be a shared solution.

But if I go to my friends on the Republican side of the House Administration Committee, the only one of the 10 committees this bill was referred to that marked it up, I will find that not one Republican was consulted on the drafting of this language.

Mr. Chairman, you have heard my colleagues talk about the wholesale changes to election law—State election law—across this country. You would think, Mr. Chairman, that we would have talked to all 50 secretaries of state. That wouldn't be true.

Maybe you would think we would have consulted with 25 secretaries of state. It wouldn't be true. What would be true is, in the one committee that had the one markup on this bill, we consulted with one State election official.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for us to do something together. We can either take advantage of that opportunity or we can poison the well. How in the world can we promise the American people election integrity when one side is writing the rules?

It should be instructive to us all the way this bill has come to the floor, and it is yet another, Mr. Chairman, in a string of missed opportunities that we have had. I will give you just one example.

I made a motion last night in the Rules Committee to only bring this bill to the floor as it was marked up in committee. We have talked about a bill that is going to guarantee voter transparency. We don't even have legislative transparency on this bill. We couldn't get the bill brought to the floor from the one of the 10 committees that marked it up. We had manager's amendments added. We had the bill not as reported.

I offered another amendment last night. If it is so important that we legislate for the first time in American history that tax returns be released by elected officials—this bill includes let's release them at the Presidential level and let's release them at the Vice Presidential level—I offered an amendment to the rule to allow a vote on whether or not they should be considered at your level, Mr. Chairman. That amendment was denied on a partisan line.

Let's not make this a partisan issue; it is an American issue.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from

Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and Mr. SARBANES for his leadership and for allowing us to tell our stories. Let me tell you the story of Texas.

In 2017, right before a bond election in my district and surrounding areas, 4,000 people were taken off the voting rolls. In 2018, the Secretary of State's Office purged people off the voting rolls with absolutely no understanding and no notice.

H.R. 1 expands the access to the ballot box by creating voluntary automatic voter registration access across the country, ensuring that the rights of individuals who have completed felony sentences—family members, your neighbors who have done their time—have the ability to register as well, and expanding early voting. Be reminded of the 2000 election when those who had done their time, were citizens, went to the voting poll, and they were told: Oh, you cannot vote.

It ends partisan gerrymandering, but in particular, it focuses on opportunities for voting. So I am here to say those provisions are crucial to providing the American public its constitutional right to vote, and we should support that right.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, The "For the People Act of 2019," which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

I am proud to be one of 226, co-sponsors, and one of the original cosponsors, of H.R. 1, which will increase public confidence in our democracy by reducing the role of money in politics, restoring ethical standards and integrity to government, and strengthening laws to protect voting.

Specifically, the For the People Act will:

1. Make it easier, not harder, to vote by implementing automatic voter registration, requiring early voting and vote by mail, committing Congress to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and ensuring the integrity of our elections by modernizing and strengthening our voting systems and ending partisan redistricting.

2. Reform the campaign finance system by requiring all political organizations to disclose large donors, updating political advertisement laws for the digital age, establishing a public matching system for citizen-owned elections, and revamping the Federal Election Commission to ensure there's a cop on the campaign finance beat; and

3. Strengthen ethics laws to ensure that public officials work in the public interest by extending conflict of interest laws to the President and Vice President; requiring the release of their tax returns; closing loopholes that allow former members of Congress to avoid cooling-off periods for lobbying; closing the revolving door between industry and the federal government; and establishing a code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

This bill ensures that individuals who have completed felony sentences have their full

rights restored and expands early voting and simplify absentee voting; and modernize the U.S. voting system.

Mr. Chair, this legislation and this hearing is particularly timely because more than half a century after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

It is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 must be passed because many of the civil rights that I fought for as a student and young lawyer have been undermined or been rolled back by reactionary forces in recent years.

To add insult to injury, the Trump Administration issued an Executive Order establishing a so-called "Election Integrity" Commission to investigate not voter suppression, but so-called "voter fraud" in the 2016 election.

Trump and his followers have been unceasing in their efforts to perpetuate the myth of voter fraud, but it remains just that: a myth.

Between 2000 and 2014, there were 35 credible allegations of voter fraud out of more than 834 million ballots cast—that is less than 1 in 28 million votes!

An extensive study by social scientists at Dartmouth College uncovered no evidence to support Trump's hysterical and outrageous allegations of widespread voter fraud "rigging" the 2016 election.

Just for the record, Mr. Chair, the popular vote of the 2016 presidential election was:

Hillary Clinton, 65,853,516

Donald Trump, 62,884,824

Trump's deficit of 2.9 million was the largest of any Electoral College winner in history by a massive margin, and despite the allegations of the current Administration, there have been only 4 documented cases of voter fraud in the 2016 election.

The Voter Fraud Commission, like many of Trump's business schemes, was a massive scam built on countless lies that do not hold up to any level of scrutiny.

As Members of Congress, we should be devoting our time, energy, and resources addressing Russian infiltration of our election infrastructure and campaigns, along with other pressing issues.

Instead of enjoying and strengthening the protections guaranteed in the Voting Rights

Act—people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants—have been given the joyless, exhausting task of fending off the constant barrage of attacks levelled at our communities by Trump and other conspiracy theorists.

Not only are we tasked with reversing the current dismal state of voter suppression against minorities; we are forced to refute the blatant, propagandist lie of voter fraud.

To this end, I have been persistent in my efforts to protect the rights of disenfranchised communities in my district of inner-city Houston and across the nation.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have cosponsored dozens of bills, amendments, and resolutions seeking to improve voters' rights at all stages and levels of the election process.

This includes legislation aimed at:

1. Increasing voter outreach and turnout;
2. Ensuring both early and same-day registration;
3. Standardizing physical and language accessibility at polling places;
4. Expanding early voting periods;
5. Decreasing voter wait times;
6. Guaranteeing absentee ballots, especially for displaced citizens;
7. Modernizing voting technologies and strengthening our voter record systems;
8. Establishing the federal Election Day as a national holiday; and
9. Condemning and criminalizing deceptive practices, voter intimidation, and other suppression tactics;

Along with many of my CBC colleagues, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act, which became public law on July 27, 2006.

I also authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, which added the legendary Barbara Jordan to the list of civil rights trailblazers whose memories are honored in the naming of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act.

This bill strengthened the original Voting Rights Act by replacing federal voting examiners with federal voting observers—a significant enhancement that made it easier to safeguard against racially biased voter suppression tactics.

In the 114th Congress, I introduced H.R. 75, the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act of 2015, which prohibits states whose congressional districts have been redistricted after a decennial census from redrawing their district lines until the next census.

Prejudiced redistricting, or gerrymandering as it is more commonly known, has been used for decades to weaken the voting power of African Americans, Latino Americans, and other minorities since the Civil Rights Era.

Immediately after the Shelby County ruling, which lifted preclearance requirements for states with histories of discrimination seeking to change their voting laws or practices, redistricting became a favorite tool for Republicans who connived to unfairly gain 3 congressional seats in Texas.

In the 110th Congress, I was the original sponsor of H.R. 6778, the Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act of 2008, which prohibited denial of the right to vote in a federal election on the bases of an individual's status as a formerly incarcerated person.

The Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act sought to reverse discriminatory voter restrictions that disproportionately affect the African American voting population, which continues to be targeted by mass incarceration, police profiling, and a biased criminal justice system.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote but there are others, including:

1. Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting;
2. Ending Same-Day Registration;
3. Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day will not count;
4. Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration;
5. Shortened Poll Hours;
6. Lessening the standards governing voter challenges used by vigilantes, like the King Street Patriots in my city of Houston, to cause trouble at the polls;
7. "Voter Caging," to suppress the turnout of minority voters by sending non-forwardable mail to targeted populations and, once the mail is returned, using the returned mail to compile lists of voters whose eligibility is then challenged on the basis of residence under state law; and

8. Employing targeted redistricting techniques to dilute minority voting strength, notably "Cracking" (i.e., fragmenting and dispersing concentrations of minority populations); "Stacking" (combining concentrations of minority voters with greater concentrations of white populations); and "Packing" (i.e., over-concentrating minority voters in as few districts as possible).

Mr. Chair, we must not allow our democracy to slide back into the worst elements of this country's past, to stand idly by as our treasured values of democracy, progress, and equality are poisoned and dismantled.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1, the "For The People Act of 2019."

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentlewoman from Texas just brought up, but part of the responsibilities of the State are to ensure that those who have been given the right to vote are the ones voting. That is why the States—and the Supreme Court has upheld this—have not only the right, but the responsibility to ensure that the voter rolls are purged of those who have moved, who have passed away, or who have been shown as ineligible to vote.

Just a few weeks ago, I was able to write a congratulatory letter to a new immigrant to the United States. For 16 years, she worked to become a citizen of the United States, with the dream of voting. This next election she will be able to cast her vote as a citizen of the United States of America.

Part of our responsibility is to ensure that her vote matters and it isn't discredited by someone who is not eligible to vote casting a vote and diluting her

voice in this government. That is why it is more appropriate for the States, who are closer to the people, to be the ones who are setting the standards—according to our Constitution—for election.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, back home, all Texans agree the 10 most terrifying words and the biggest lie people can hear is “I’m from the Federal Government, and I’m here to help.”

On that viewpoint, H.R. 1, which is called the For the People Act, should be called the “For the Big Government Act” or, more accurately, the “Big Lie Act.”

Texas 22 does not want to have \$6 of Federal tax dollars given to subsidize small donors and match every dollar they raise. They prefer that \$6 of their money be used for new roads, deeper ports, Border Patrol, safe schools, and hurricane prevention.

Texas is being swarmed by Californians. They are coming for jobs, a low State income tax—zero—and a friendly environment for businesses. Just like we don’t want a tax on plastic straws, Texans sure as heck don’t want to follow California’s same-day registration.

I ask my colleagues, respect the Constitution, respect the 10th Amendment, respect States’ rights, and vote against this terrible bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the Democratic leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her for her leadership on this bill, H.R. 1, and I thank Mr. SARBANES for being a principal sponsor and proponent of H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as the sponsor of the Help America Vote Act in 2002, which responded to the lack of performance on our voting system in the 2000 election, hanging chads and all. This bill expands on that.

But let me, at the outset, remind those who would talk about what the Constitution says to read a portion of the Constitution.

Let me say before I do that, throughout my lifetime, early in my lifetime, I heard a lot about States’ rights. People talk about the right to vote. I was in Alabama this past weekend, and we commemorated the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge, which was led by our colleague, JOHN LEWIS. There were State troopers meeting him on the other side of the bridge that beat and almost killed JOHN LEWIS. Why? Because he was marching from Selma to Montgomery to register to vote.

I remember, as a child—not a child; I was a young man—watching Lester Maddox on television with an ax handle saying that nobody was going to integrate his premises.

I have heard a lot about States’ rights through the years. Now, what did our Founders say about States’ rights as it relates to Members of Con-

gress? “The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof”—and apparently we didn’t get to this phrase—“but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. . . .”

Why did our Founders do that? Because they wanted one nation.

Now, that was not our pledge at that point in time, but they wanted the Colonies to come together as a nation. They had been a federation, and it didn’t work so well. So they wanted one nation to come together, and at least for the Federal Congress, they reserved to the Federal Congress the right to set the rules in the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, last September, I delivered a speech outlining House Democrats’ plans to renew faith in government by enacting a series of reforms to increase transparency, accountability, and ethics reform. This week, after extensive hearings and lots of witnesses, we bring to the floor a legislative package of reforms that made good on our promises to the American people last year.

We didn’t make a secret of this. This was well-known to everybody, and they gave us the majority of this House. We are redeeming, today, that honor and that responsibility.

I want to thank, again, Representative SARBANES and the cosponsors of this bill, every single Democratic Member. I want to thank JOHN LEWIS, a giant of a man, a giant of principle, a giant who risked his very life to make sure that the protections available in this bill would be available to every American and that we would promote—not prevent—accessibility to the voting booth and that we would not confront people going over a bridge in Selma, Alabama, who only wanted to register to vote, to be turned around by State troopers ordered by Governor Wallace to do so.

This bill was driven in large part by our dynamic freshman class who were elected on a platform of making government work once again for the people.

This For the People Act will open government up in several critical ways. First, it includes real national redistricting reform. I am for that. Mr. Chairman, it may cost Maryland a seat—I get that—but it is the right thing to do to have a level playing field.

Now, we have got a number of court cases that have turned around redistricting in North Carolina, in Pennsylvania, in Texas, and in some other States as well. But I have always said that, in order to be successful, redistricting reform cannot be done on a State-by-State basis; and the Constitution, of course, says that Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations so that we have fair—they don’t have to do this for State elections. If they don’t want to do it, that

is fine. But we, under the Constitution, are the arbiters of Federal elections. It must be a uniform process across all States.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, achieves this by requiring a non-partisan redistricting commission to oversee the process in every State.

What does that mean? It means the politicians will not do it. Iowa, California, or Arizona will have a fair redistricting process.

Next, this bill includes a much-needed expansion of voting rights to protect our democracy. It would institute automatic voter registration.

In America, if you are an American citizen, you ought to have the right to vote, and government ought not make it difficult for you to exercise that right. No eligible voter should ever be turned away from his or her polling place.

It will also restore the vote to those who have paid their debt to society and should have a voice in their representative government.

This legislation builds on the important bipartisan work we did in 2002 when we passed, as I pointed out, the Help America Vote Act. It reauthorizes the Election Assistance Commission, which, very frankly, my Republican friends tried to eliminate on a number of occasions and transfer their authority to the finance commission, which oversees campaign finance—not election laws, campaign finance. It was a way to, in effect, undermine and kill, in many ways, the Election Assistance Commission designed to make sure that our elections are secure and fair. It reauthorizes the Election Assistance Commission, which is critically important to ensuring modern, accessible, and secure elections.

In addition, H.R. 1 will make campaign finance more transparent, requiring super-PACs to disclose their donors.

Again, I want to congratulate my colleague. We are very proud of JOHN SARBANES and his dad in Maryland. He has been indefatigable in his work in trying to make sure that it is the people’s interest and not the financial interests that control our elections.

□ 1515

This bill will end the era of massive amounts of dark, unaccountable money funding ads and campaigns.

The For the People Act will also impose higher ethical standards on America’s highest elected officials.

There is only one person in government who can do something on his own. It is not the Senate. It is not the House. It is not us. We need collectivity. But the President can make substantial decisions on his own and, in fact, has. He has done so over the wishes of the Congress of the United States just recently, so the people ought to know what his interests are and whether he is acting for his interests or the people’s interests.

Among other new requirements, Presidents and Vice Presidents would

be required, therefore, to release 10 years' worth of tax returns.

In such ways, H.R. 1 will make strides, Mr. Chair, in restoring the trust in government that, unfortunately, has been lost in recent years. Americans need to know that their government works for them and can be a force for good for their families, their communities, and our country.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. I don't rise because I think it is perfect, but I rise because I think it is an excellent effort to redeem the promise of America and our democracy.

It is for the people. Let us vote for the people.

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

Mr. Chair, I thank my esteemed colleague, the majority leader, for whom I have an immense amount of respect. I appreciate the words that he said and especially his participation in the commemoration of the march in Selma, in which my family has also participated.

Have we always got it right in the United States? No. Our Founders knew that we would make mistakes along the way, but they gave us the power and the ability to correct those mistakes.

The lack of civil rights in this Nation was a travesty to the people. It flew in the face of the ideas of our Founders that all men were created equal. That is why Republicans fought so hard for civil rights during the 1960s and 1970s.

I agree with the majority leader. We do have the ability, according to the Constitution, to make modifications. But H.R. 1 is not a modification. It is a sweeping takeover of the election system, leaving the States with very little authority or power over their own elections, as well as the Federal elections.

I also would like to say that I heard that this bill has had extensive hearings. I serve on the Committee on House Administration, the only committee which had a hearing on this bill. The hearing lasted 5 hours, and the only reason it lasted that long was because the Republicans submitted 28 amendments to the bill. Otherwise, this bill would have gone right in and right out of committee, with probably less than an hour of a committee hearing, and come to this floor.

It has 10 committees of jurisdiction. It has not gone before those committees, so I submit it has not followed regular order.

Especially with something of this magnitude, the American people have the right to hear, they have the right to understand, what is in this bill. They have not been afforded that opportunity.

Mr. Chair, we have 50 States, 50 State Governors, 50 secretaries of state, and I know my Governor and secretary of state have not been involved in this process. It has a drastic impact, not only upon the voting rights of the people in Georgia, but also on the budget of Georgia, the fiscal cost.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for the time, and I, too, thank the majority leader for his comments. But I don't think it should be removed from history that the Governor of Alabama at that time ran on segregation; multiple times, ran on segregation. It was the Republicans in this House, the majority percentage of Republicans, that carried the day for the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Chair, this bill, among other things, forces States to count votes cast outside of voters' assigned precincts. Just think about that. I am going to vote for you over here even though I don't live there. That is going to be great. That is what we all want, people who don't live in our neighborhoods voting for the people who decide our fates and our policies.

Mr. Chair, the For the People Act, that is what it is called, but I wonder: Which people? Is it the people here or the people out there?

It seems like it is for the people here when powerful voices on the left and the right oppose this bill, voices like the ACLU, voices like the NRA and Planned Parenthood, because, Mr. Chair, while you might want to contribute to one of those organizations because you believe in their cause, you don't want the protest to show up on your doorstep. It is bad enough that it shows up, the protest, at Planned Parenthood or the NRA or the gun show or whatever, but now the protest is going to show up at your door—at your door—because the people who are opposed to the things you believe in are going to find out you sent your 5 bucks in. They are going to come to your door and say: Well, I don't agree with you. I don't like you. And I don't think you should be spending your money on those things.

Is that what we want in America? That is what this bill does, Mr. Chair. Essentially, it is going to empower the Federal Election Commission to carry out the actions of Lois Lerner and the IRS during the last administration in an attempt to silence opposition to the politicians in the swamp, in this place, regardless of which side you are on.

I urge a "no" vote for this bill, Mr. Chair.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who has served so faithfully on the House Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I would also like to thank her, Chairman Thompson, Congressman SARBANES, and the many Democratic Members who helped craft this important legislation.

H.R. 1, Mr. Chairman, among many things, will make our elections more ethical and will make them more secure.

As a former Rhode Island secretary of state and member of the Congressional Task Force on Election Security, I absolutely believe that we must

actively address our elections systems' vulnerabilities, or our enemies certainly will.

H.R. 1 provides States with funding, guidance, and threat intelligence to secure election systems by purchasing voting machines that provide auditable paper ballots, securing voter registration databases, and training election officials.

Now, these suggestions came from the task force, and they reflect guidance we heard from leaders like Rhode Island Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea, who is implementing one of the Nation's first risk-limiting audits. They also reflect the wisdom of the cybersecurity researchers who have so much to offer in identifying vulnerabilities and helping us to close them.

Mr. Chairman, with the 2020 elections around the corner, I am proud to support this legislation, because we must act now to protect our democracy.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Ms. LOFGREN, Chairman THOMPSON, Congressman SARBANES, and the many House Democratic members who helped craft this vital legislation. The For the People Act will not only make our elections more ethical and accessible, it will also help secure them from outside interference.

As a former Secretary of State of Rhode Island and member of the Congressional Task Force on Election Security, I believe we must actively address the vulnerabilities in our election systems.

We know that Russia interfered with our 2016 elections, targeting political organizations and the election infrastructure of at least 21 states. They sought to undermine public confidence in our elections, and despite no evidence of ballot tampering, millions of Americans now question whether their votes are counted properly.

While state and local governments must retain control of elections, they cannot be expected to confront a nation state like Russia on their own. We owe it to our state partners to provide the resources they need to protect these vital systems at the heart of our democracy.

H.R. 1 ensures states have the funding, guidance, and threat intelligence they need to address the risks and vulnerabilities in their systems, whether by purchasing voting machines that provide auditable paper ballots, securing voter registration databases, or training election officials in cybersecurity best practices.

These are all suggestions that came from the Task Force, and they reflect guidance we heard from local election leaders like Rhode Island's current Secretary of State, Nellie Gorbea, who is implementing one of the first risk-limiting audits in the nation. They also reflect the wisdom of the cybersecurity research community that has so much to offer when it comes to shoring up our systems and networks.

With the 2020 elections right around the corner, I'm proud to support this legislation—it's more important than ever that we act swiftly to protect the integrity of our democracy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 44½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Georgia has 38 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I have long been a supporter of campaign finance reform. I voted for motor voter. I voted for McCain-Feingold the year in the House it was Shays-Meehan. I supported the Help America Vote Act in 2002.

There are plenty of flaws in the current system. That is for sure. And we need to fix it. But you know what? We have a Democratic House, and we have a Republican Senate, and the only way that we are reasonably going to fix this issue is with a bipartisan bill.

I am the only Republican here today who was here in 1993 when we passed the motor voter bill. This was a bill that was patterned after what Michigan has had in place for decades. When you get your driver's license, you are asked to register to vote. It works.

This bill, H.R. 1, is not bipartisan. One of our big objections is truly the taxpayer-financed campaign element of this bill.

If you do a poll today across the country, you are going to find that most voters are going to say that campaigns are too expensive; they are too negative; and, yes, they are too long.

We are going to have thousands—thousands—of candidates running for Congress. They are all going to be eligible for this match from the Treasury for any contribution under \$200, with a 6-to-1 ratio, so we are going to have more money in politics, and we are not going to have the transparency that I think all of us want.

If we are going to fix the problem, let's sit down; let's have regular order; let's have all the committees with some jurisdiction sit down and have Republicans and Democrats work together on a committee process that we can pass in a bipartisan vote that will get the attention of the Senate, and maybe we can do something about the problems today.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the one person who probably has worked harder than anyone else on this bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, last year, in the 2018 election, a powerful message was sent to this Congress that the public wants us to clean up our politics, fight corruption, unrig the system, and make sure that voting rights are protected.

I think part of the reason the message was so strong is that, for the last 8 years under a Republican Congress, there has been no progress made on any of those priorities, so there is this pent-up demand out there among the public. They want their voice back. H.R. 1 is our opportunity to give them their voice back.

The message they are sending is very simple. The first message is: Make it possible for us to get to the ballot box without running an obstacle course.

It is inconceivable, it is incomprehensible, that more than 50 years after JOHN LEWIS, our colleague, was bloodied on the Edmund Pettus Bridge protesting for voting rights, we still can't get it right in America when it comes to voting.

That is ridiculous. We need to make it more possible to register and vote in this country so that people can get to the ballot box and their voices can be heard. That is one thing they are saying to us.

The other thing they are saying to us is, when you get to Washington, if you are a lawmaker, if you serve in an office of public trust, behave yourself, abide by ethics, be accountable to the people, remember who sent you there, and be transparent. We have provisions in H.R. 1 that strengthen ethics and accountability, as we should.

The third thing they said to us, loud and clear, was, when you get to Washington, don't get tangled up in the money, don't let the special interests and the insiders call the shots on priorities in Congress, remember who sent you, and fight for us. So we have measures in here to clean up the campaign finance system, create more disclosure, transparency, so we know where that secret money is coming from, building a new system of funding campaigns in America that is not owned by the special interests and the big money.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Let's build a new system of funding campaigns in America that is not owned by the special interests and the big money and the insiders. Let's build a system that is owned by the American people, where they call the shots, where small donors can have their contributions matched so that their voice is amplified, so they are the ones who run the show, so candidates go to them and listen to what they have to say instead of hanging out with the lobbyists and the big-money crowd.

That is what this bill offers.

My colleagues on the other side keep talking about how this is going to be taxpayer money for this system. Find me the provision. There is no provision in this bill that says that any taxpayer money is going to go to this system, because it is not.

We have come up with an elegant solution where we go to the lawbreakers, the people who are leaning on our system and breaking the law, and we ask them, with a small surcharge, to contribute to this fund. That is where the match will come from.

We are going to the people who aren't playing fair with our system, and we are asking them to underwrite a clean

election system. That is how it should work.

Let's restore the voice of the people. Let's pass H.R. 1.

□ 1530

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman and the author of the bill and his comments. Are there some good ideas in this bill? Absolutely. The States already have them implemented. Early voting. Great idea. Georgia did that many years ago; even included Saturday voting.

It is improper for the Federal Government to be the arbitrator of these, to push these down upon the American people. That is something that has been reserved for the States and the States have been doing those well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, Democrats have been marketing H.R. 1 as a necessary election reform measure, but the ugly truth is that this bill is not for the people. It is for the Democratic Party.

The ugly truth is that this bill is a massive Federal overreach. The ugly truth is that this bill won't make our elections safer or more democratic. The ugly truth is that this bill would fundamentally change the principles of our election system, all at a cost to the average American taxpayer.

And this bill would infringe on the rights of our colleges and universities, where so many students go to learn and grow, outside of the influence of politics.

Instead of promoting the freedom of ideas, this bill limits the right to free speech. The ugly truth is this bill violates the U.S. Constitution, the document which makes our country so great.

Instead of calling this bill the For the People Act, it should be called the "Democrat Politician Protection Act."

This bill is nothing but a top-down power grab to take our election system, reverse it, and send it completely off course. Beyond that, this bill contains numerous provisions attempting to weaponize our institutions of higher learning, where people go to learn.

H.R. 1 forces our colleges and universities to divert resources to election-related tasks, including provisions for colleges and universities to automatically register students to vote.

Students could also establish a second residency, which is, essentially, another way of weakening the voting system and giving them, potentially, the right to vote not once, but twice. You heard that right. There are no other people in our country who get to be registered to vote in two locations. Under H.R. 1, this could be allowed.

Article I, section 4 of our Constitution gives States the right to determine their own registration and voting practices, not our Federal Government.

This bill blatantly violates our own constitutional rights as well as the rights of our higher education institutions.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMUCKER. As the Republican leader on the House Education and Labor, Higher Education and Workforce Investment Committee, we should be focusing on making colleges more affordable and helping more students complete their degrees, not subjecting them to electioneering efforts.

I cannot support a Federal overreach into places where students should be free to learn without the influence of politics. We must reject this overreach. We must speak now and stand up against this power grab before it is too late.

I will be voting against this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader for civil rights and justice in our country.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for yielding, but also for her tireless leadership on so many issues that confront our country today.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019. It is a historic bill to restore the promise of our Nation's democracy and repair our democratic institutions. H.R. 1 represents a coordinated effort to protect and promote the voting rights of all Americans.

H.R. 1 would also end the culture of corruption in Washington; reduce the role of big money in politics; and make it easier, not harder, to vote.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear. The right to vote is a sacred civil right in our Nation, but we know that there are those who want to turn the clock back on voting rights and suppress minority voters. There are those who want to undercut the power and representation of communities of color and, really, lock us out of the political process.

With this historic bill before us we say, "Enough is enough." Instead, H.R. 1 will ensure that every eligible voter has the chance to participate in our democracy.

This bill also includes important provisions to ensure clean and fair elections. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill and vote "yes" to restoring our democracy once and for all.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for something that they have accomplished with H.R. 1, and that is unity, because this bill has brought the American Civil Liberties Union, National Right to Life, The Heritage Foundation, and the U.S. Chamber in unity in opposi-

tion to this bill, something that I thought I would never see happen here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate that because I am very concerned, after two straight weeks of Democrat bills, I am going to have a 100 percent voting record with the ACLU. That is something new as we go forward here; although I think they do good work, I just didn't know we were going to agree so soon on this.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to describe the terrible policy behind the provisions of H.R. 1 in the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

It is amazing, also, that we just did this without going through, because we didn't want to mark this up in areas because we didn't want to see what was in it; because here is what is going to happen:

First, the bill creates a private cause of action for lawsuits related to the Help America Vote Act of 2002. That means the bill allows anyone to sue anybody if they don't like the way an election was conducted in a locality, State, or nationwide.

Do you all remember the lawsuit *Bush v. Gore*? In 2000, Democratic Presidential candidate Al Gore didn't like the results of the vote in Florida. If he could get the Florida results overturned, he would have had enough to win the Presidency. So he sued to get the Florida results overturned by a court. The case went all the way up to the Supreme Court which finally stopped the recount after a month of legal wrangling that made America look like its elections were determined by lawyers, not voters.

Well, guess what? We are bringing them back. Here they come in, because under this bill today, you won't just see more cases like *Gore v. Florida*. You will see all sorts of lawsuits; *Everybody v. Everybody*.

Does a candidate need 1,000 more votes to win? Then a candidate can sue in two or three counties and see if a judge will order those votes into their vote column.

Does a candidate need a few more votes? Then under this bill, they could sue in a dozen counties. Need a million votes? This bill allows a losing candidate and disgruntled activists to sue in all 50 States: *Gore v. Georgia*, *Gore v. Oklahoma*, *Gore versus any state* that it takes to gather enough judicial relief to cobble together an election victory, taking time and money away from State and local elected officials who desperately need that money to administer free and fair elections; not pay bogus legal fees.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 was enacted to precisely avoid future lawsuits like *Gore v. Florida*. Now this bill will undo all that and make matters worse in the process.

Second, this bill takes powers away from voters and gives it to convicted

criminals by denying State voters their constitutional right to limit voting by people who have been convicted of murder, violent felonies, or other serious crimes including, by the way—get this—voter fraud.

These provisions are patently unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, including liberal Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan, all held, just a few years ago, mind you, that:

Surely nothing in the Elections Clause of the Constitution lends itself to the view that voting qualifications in Federal elections are to be set by Congress.

Further, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution itself explicitly recognizes the rights of States to deny the vote for "participation in crime."

Third, this is what happens when you bypass the committee process. I spoke about this one on the floor already last week. Here we go again. The new majority doesn't like committees.

A provision in the bill, at page 99—listen to me clearly—lines 7–12 of the Committee Print, states:

No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intentionally hinder, interfere with, or prevent another from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote in an election.

That text, if read strictly, says it makes it illegal to prevent a four-year old from voting, to prevent an illegal alien from voting, and to prevent any other non-qualified person from voting. This same provision again appears in pages 102 and 103, and adds a criminal penalty of up to 5 years in prison and a \$100,000 fine.

Now here is the problem. The problem is that provision I just quoted, doesn't refer to a person's exercising the right to vote; that is voting when they have a legal right to vote. The standard term used when a statutory provision is aimed at protecting legitimate voters from voting refers to the denial or abridgment of the right to vote.

Now, listen, because this provision doesn't contain those key terms, meaning the provisions would literally make it illegal to prevent illegal voters from voting, we shouldn't be making it a crime—

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. We shouldn't be making it a crime for election officials to do their job.

Remember, we can't prevent illegal voters from voting under this bill, which makes it—they have no legal right to vote illegally.

Every illegal voter cancels the vote of a legal voter. This was recognized in the Supreme Court case, *Reynolds v. Sims* and, in that case it was said:

The right to vote can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of that franchise.

Look, an illegal vote negated the vote of a legal voter. This bill, my colleagues across the aisle, you are getting ready to vote for a bill that actually could negate legal voting.

I could go on for days. This is why committees matter. This is why this bill is bad. Why do we keep doing this and running away.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying thank you to Congressman SARBANES for his important work on leading this legislation.

I am proud that we are bringing forward H.R. 1 to restore faith in the legislative branch, because right now Congress is less popular than head lice and colonoscopies. That is because every time my constituents see a bill that is written behind closed doors, or see a government shutdown, or see floor debate that looks like the Jerry Springer Show, they need to see a restoration of faith in government.

This bill will protect voting rights, strengthen ethics rules, and reduce the role of big money politics. It will refresh our democracy; and that is why the new Democrat coalition has endorsed this bill.

Listen, we don't talk enough about it. This bill includes bipartisan provisions in support of good government. It includes a bipartisan bill that I am leading, the Restoring Integrity to America's Elections Act, which would reform the Federal Election Commission, and enable it to weed out campaign finance abuse, and hold those who skirt the rules accountable.

It includes the Honest Ads Act, my bipartisan bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield the gentleman from Washington an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KILMER. It includes the Honest Ads Act, my bipartisan bill that would shine a light on the murky world of online political advertising by requiring digital ads to meet the same disclosure requirements as print or broadcast ads.

Americans deserve to know who is paying for political ads that they see online. They deserve to know that the Nation's election watchdog is back on the beat. They deserve to have their voices heard in Congress again. That is why this bill is important. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

This is my fourth term in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I can say, without reservation or equivocation, H.R. 1 is the single worst, most unsound, unconstitutional legislation that I have seen in my 6½ years in Congress.

The bill federalizes elections in violation of basic constitutional principles,

usurping States' primary authority over the conduct of elections, including Federal elections.

The bill effectively legalizes voter fraud, and destroys the integrity of elections by degrading the accuracy of registration lists, ensuring duplicate registration and registration of ineligible voters.

The bill unconstitutionally rations core free speech protected by the First Amendment by empowering a powerful partisan bureaucracy to impose onerous legal and administrative compliance burdens and costs on candidates, citizens, civic groups, and nonprofit organizations. These provisions violate the First Amendment; they protect incumbents; and they diminish the accountability of politicians to the public.

And finally, worst of all, the bill gives welfare to politicians, coercing Americans to support candidates with whom they fundamentally disagree. This doesn't enhance democracy, the idea that we, the people establish a government based on the consent of the government. It corrupts democracy by taking away the fundamental right of the people to choose their own representatives, and giving it to a partisan election bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin once famously said:

The people who cast the votes don't decide an election; the people who count the votes do.

H.R. 1 would "Stalinize" American elections by legalizing voter fraud, giving partisan election bureaucrats the power to ration free speech, and by coercing Americans to support candidates and causes with whom they fundamentally disagree.

I urge everyone, for the sake of the First Amendment and for our Constitution, vote "no."

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

Before yielding to the gentlewoman from Michigan, I would just like to quote one of the most conservative justices, who said that "the public has an interest in knowing who is speaking about a candidate shortly before an election." That was in the Citizens United decision.

□ 1545

Now, I didn't agree with that decision, but the court posited that the solution to the dark money that they were unleashing on the country was disclosure, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIIB).

Ms. TLAIIB. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act. H.R. 1 will restore our democracy.

We need a comprehensive bill, Mr. Chairman, that takes action on what the people sent us to Congress to do: to work on their behalf and to ensure that government is truly for, by, and of the

people; and we must demand it immediately.

We know that today many people, especially those at home in my congressional district in the 13th, various communities of color across this country, continue to face voter disenfranchisement while trying to exercise their right to vote and make their voices heard. We must acknowledge this injustice and remedy it immediately.

We need to have stricter rules, Mr. Chair, rules of conflict of interest when it comes to the offices of the President, the Vice President, and the appointees, including the reaffirmation of the requirement to divest in business interests. We do that with H.R. 1.

I commend my colleagues for the additional language requiring both that language for the executive branch, trading individual stocks, and so forth.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. TLAIIB. Mr. Chair, we can't allow our democracy to be tainted. We must demand that our government is stronger, more transparent, and more accessible for all of our Americans.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), my good friend.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, let's be clear: H.R. 1 takes money from hardworking American taxpayers and puts it straight in the pockets of politicians.

Let me be abundantly clear: This bill that the Democrats have proposed provides taxpayer funding for Federal campaigns, Mr. Chair.

By voting for this bill, the Democrats are voting to take the American hardworking taxpayers' money and actually give it back to be used for their own campaigns. By voting for this bill, the Democrats are saying, "We deserve to stay elected."

This is a money grab for politicians. This unfairly benefits elected incumbents. It protects career politicians. Under the guise of campaign finance reform and dark money reform, this 600-page bill does nothing but fill the campaign coffers of people who have already been elected.

Not only that, this bill now includes a tax stuck in last night as a manager's amendment in Rules. Yes, they are wanting to tax American citizens to make sure that they get reelected and put money back in their own campaign.

Mr. Chair, if this is how the majority party believes that we are going to get transparency in Congress, it is not doing it. It is not living up to that.

I find it even interesting, because it seems to trample on our First Amendment rights to speak freely and voluntarily participate in the process that we hold as a privilege of electing our elected leaders. To top it off, Mr. Chair,

they want you and every hardworking American taxpayer to pay for it.

Now, I can see it coming up, because it is going to come very soon, and they may talk about all the wonderful virtues of this particular bill, but when they vote for it, they are actually voting to send taxpayer moneys to get me reelected. So I look for that endgame when we say: Democrats vote to give \$3.5 million to reelect the Freedom Caucus chairman.

I don't think that that is what America is all about.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, before I reserve, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 24 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 37¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I would just like to say that saying it is tax money does not make it so. We have prohibited appropriations into the freedom from influence fund. The total source of funding is a 2.75 percent assessment on people who have committed tax crimes or corporate malfeasance.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for giving me the time.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1. Last Congress, House Democrats sought to address Russia's meddling in the Presidential election. Unfortunately, the then-majority would not prioritize the issue, so Democrats formed a Congressional Task Force on Election Security, which I co-chaired.

In February of 2018, after a series of public meetings with experts in national security, cybersecurity, and election administration, the task force released a report charting a course for how we could better protect our election infrastructure.

I am pleased that H.R. 1 includes the Election Security Act, legislation I introduced to implement the task force's recommendation. Under the Election Security Act, States are provided surge funding to replace decades-old, outdated election equipment with more modern, secure technologies.

Additionally, to move the Nation off the crisis-to-crisis model we have been on, it provides grants, ongoing maintenance, and security. It also improves transparency with election infrastructure vendors and provides cybersecurity training to election officials.

Last month, at my committee's hearing on election security, some of my Republican colleagues balked at the bill's price tag. Mr. Chair, to put the bill's cost in context, the \$1.8 billion provided here to secure our elections

from the Russians and other foreign adversaries is half of what Congress provided in response to the hanging chads.

For the sake of our democracy, we cannot leave State and local election officials to fend for themselves against sophisticated adversaries like Russia. We have to help.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for yielding.

Mr. Chair, before I close, I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairwoman LOFGREN, and Mr. SARBANES for all the work they and their staffs have done to bring this important measure to the floor.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chair, today I rise in opposition to this effort to conduct a hostile takeover of our elections by Washington, D.C.

H.R. 1 is nothing less than an attempt by the majority party to federalize our election system, strip all authority from the States, and create government-funded political campaigns. All of this will increase the election system's vulnerability for fraud and restrict free speech.

The legislation we consider today will have a long-lasting, devastating impact on our elections:

H.R. 1 will create a 6-to-1 government match for all small donor contributions. This means government funds will be going to help pay for more campaigns, more TV, more radio ads. Americans will be compelled to bankroll candidates they don't support.

My sister, a staunch Republican, shouldn't have to have her hard-earned money go towards Democratic candidates. Her son, a staunch Democrat, shouldn't have his hard-earned money go towards a Republican.

If H.R. 1 is to become law, it will place limits on freedom of speech, putting vague standards on groups who wish to advocate for any legislative issue. This is why even the ACLU does not support H.R. 1. And when the ACLU doesn't support a Democratic election bill, you know it is wrong.

Our Nation was built on individuals advocating for their beliefs. It is our right to advocate the way we wish for a cause we believe in.

If a survivor of domestic violence wishes to quietly donate to a cause dedicated to fighting domestic violence, should the Federal Government be able to come in and publicize their donation? In some States who have done this recently, we have seen donors of advocacy groups be harassed and chased out of their jobs.

H.R. 1 is another example of the Democrats saying Washington knows best. Not one secretary of state was consulted in the drafting of this legis-

lation. In the Constitution, our Founding Fathers give the authority to the States to regulate their own elections.

Simply put, this is a power grab, a power grab by Democrats.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to not support this legislation.

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

Mr. Chair, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey, I would like to just address a couple of simple points.

The DISCLOSE Act really pivots off the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United. And as they said in that decision: Disclaimer and disclosure requirements impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities and do not prevent anyone from speaking.

Concern has been expressed about the ability to remain private. That is provided for in this bill. It is simple. If you don't want to be disclosed, note that your donation is not for campaign purposes, and you will not be disclosed.

Further, there is an express protection provided for any donor who fears that they may face threat of harassment or reprisal. So we have thought of this, and this was dealt with in our markup.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, the legislation on the floor today contains within it the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, a bill that I lead with our prime sponsor, Representative ANNA ESHOO from California. This legislation requires sitting Presidents as well as future Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates to release 10 years of their tax returns.

The manager's amendment is right to add disclosure of returns of any business in which the candidate is a prime owner.

These commonsense transparency measures will codify into law the precedence of Presidential candidates releasing their tax returns, a precedent that goes back to Richard Nixon.

President Trump broke with more than 40 years of this precedent when he declined to release his tax returns, despite promising to release them. He has yet to do so, and recent polls show 64 percent of Americans support their release.

Thanks to the Oversight Committee, we now have on-the-record testimony in evidence that this President may have committed crimes as President. Michael Cohen received reimbursement for illegal campaign contributions from Trump directly. If President Trump wrote these payments off as a business expense, that would constitute fraud, and his returns will show that.

In addition, The Trump Organization allegedly inflated their revenue in financial documents to obtain loans. The business' tax returns would show whether their profits were accurate or if they filed fraudulent documents.

The President's conflicts of interest and finances must be investigated.

With H.R. 1, we are setting down a marker that we expect standards of ethics and transparency for all Presidents going forward. With norms and precedents being shattered daily, Congress must codify certain norms into law. The law is on our side, 6103.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I support H.R. 1 for taking needed steps to get dark money and foreign money out of our politics; restore voting rights that are under assault in States around the country; improve our election security, as you heard the last gentleman say, BENNIE THOMPSON; and restore integrity to our democratic process.

In too many States, the clock is turning back on voting rights and election integrity. Voter suppression has become a scourge in our democracy. For anybody to deny it on this floor, they haven't been in the country.

Mr. Chair, these reforms are long overdue. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, consent of the governed is the cornerstone of our democracy. In America, the people are sovereign, and we govern through the votes that we cast. At the very core of this process are fair and free elections.

Every citizen should be free to express themselves and to vote, and no citizen should ever be muzzled or have their legitimate vote canceled out by a fraudulent one.

□ 1600

By definition, one side is always going to be disappointed with the outcome. That is why it is essential that both sides are confident that they were treated fairly.

Democracies die when one party seizes control of the elections process, eliminates the safeguards that have protected the integrity of the ballot, places restrictions on free speech, and seizes the earnings of individual citizens to promote candidates that they may abhor.

That is precisely what this bill does today. It destroys the bipartisan composition of the Federal Election Commission and places a partisan majority in control of every aspect of our Federal elections. It imposes limits on free speech, and that has earned the opposition of the American Civil Liberties Union. It matches a contribution of \$200 given to a candidate with \$1,200 taken from others who may oppose that candidate.

Worst of all, it undermines the integrity of the ballot and opens the floodgates to fraud. The purpose of registration periods is to allow parties to canvass the rolls and challenge improper registrations, while ensuring candidates know exactly who is going to be voting.

The reason we require election day voting at a polling place is to ensure voters cast their ballots in secret after they have heard the entire debate and after verifying their identity to their neighbors. This bill sweeps away these few remaining vestiges of ballot integrity.

Democracies die by suicide, and we are now face-to-face with such an instrument.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

America is not a democracy if we don't protect the right to vote. We should be expanding voter rolls and making every single American voice heard at the ballot box, and that includes currently and previously incarcerated Americans. A mistake made and paid for should not strip your constitutional rights and silence you for life.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have included those Americans in our democracy, however, I have withdrawn that amendment at this time. I will continue to work with my colleagues to fight for re-enfranchisement for these Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I close by noting that this bill represents a paradigm shift in our approach to voting rights, and it is a reflection of the priorities of Democratic leadership in this body. It is long overdue and exactly the type of legislation that went overlooked until Democrats retook this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support our democracy by voting for its passage.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the most courageous Member of Congress that I know, the man who bleeds tiger blood.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois for those kind comments. Go Tigers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill that instead of being called For the People Act should be called "For the Politicians Act." Let's take a look at some of the provisions of this bill that involve a Federal takeover of the elections process.

First of all, section 5111 of the bill will allow billions of dollars of taxpayer money to be funneled into political campaign accounts. That is your hard-earned dollars, in many cases, going to fund a candidate for office that you oppose. Think about that.

Now let's look at section 1402 of this bill, Mr. Chairman, where they allow felons to vote. Let's take, for example, a State that might have a law against felons voting, heavily debated in the State, where they are allowed that ability to set their laws enshrined by the Constitution. Here comes the Federal Government telling a State, for example, that if somebody went to Federal prison for voter fraud, they now have to let them be involved in the political process and vote, even though their own State law prohibits that person who was a felon for voter fraud.

One thing we can't even get an answer on—and there are many, unfortunately—we can't even get an answer on the cost of this bill. Many estimates are that it will be billions of dollars, but nobody can truly tell you because they continue to make changes after changes without even going through the normal committee process that should have been done.

If you look at the felons who can vote, think, for example, Mr. Chairman, a State—and many States have laws against felons who are child molesters from going into public schools. In many places, the polling location is a school. Under this bill, if someone who is convicted as a felon of molesting children and is banned by that State from going into the school, if they show up on election day, now, under this law, they have a hall pass. They can go into the school because of this new Federal law where the State said that child molester shouldn't be allowed in the school.

Again, it goes on and on, the kinds of things you can't even get clear answers on.

What would the cost be? Because they tell you the felons would be able to vote in the Federal election, but if your State law says they can't vote, then you have to have multiple ballots. If somebody shows up to vote, the State is going to have to try to figure this out at what cost to the State, not only the billions it costs the taxpayers?

This bill enshrines voter fraud in so many different places. Many States have voter integrity laws to make sure that the person who votes is the person who is the name on the roll. This says you don't even have to have an ID if the State has a voter ID law. You can show up and just sign your name. You can say this is who I am, and you can vote. The Federal law overrides the State law in this case.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Finally, I would like to talk about the constitutional infringements. And don't take it from me. Let's take groups as divergent as the ACLU and National Right to Life that all cite serious First Amendment concerns.

ACLU says provisions "unconstitutionally impinge on the free speech

rights of American citizens and public interest organizations.”

National Right to Life: Enactment of H.R. 1 “would not be a curb on corruption, but itself a type of corruption, an abuse of the lawmaking power, by which incumbent lawmakers employ the threat of criminal sanctions . . . to reduce the amount of private speech regarding the actions of the lawmakers themselves.”

This is a bad bill. It ought to be rejected.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 30¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 16½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1 because I want America to live up to its democratic principles, and that means having a government that really is for the people and not just for those with the means. This bill is about ensuring that all voters, regardless of ZIP Code, race, or party, can participate in our democracy.

I am proud that H.R. 1 includes a bill I introduced, the Same-Day Voter Registration Act, which will increase access to the ballot box across the country.

Same-day registration already exists in 17 States and the District of Columbia. In those locations, more people, not fewer, participate in elections.

I spent nearly two decades organizing to make sure New Mexicans, including those in Indian Country and in rural America, have access to our democracy.

This commonsense provision gets rid of arbitrary registration deadlines, which often fall long before the real time needed to process voter registration applications. Same-day voter registration is one of many provisions in H.R. 1 that will make elections more accessible.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this has been a long debate. I am enjoying the discussion, enjoying the debate. This is why we all came here to Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that this bill is going to tell States how to run elections, bad enough this bill is going to require taxpayers to finance the elections of politicians who created the swamp so they can get back to the swamp, but what is most egregious about this legislation is the attack on free speech.

As the whip mentioned, the ACLU has said we should vote no on this bill because it unconstitutionally burdens free speech and association rights. Let me tell you how it does it. It uses our old friend the IRS.

Remember just a few years ago the IRS systematically targeted people for their political beliefs. They went after conservatives.

Now think about your First Amendment liberties, your right to practice your faith the way you want to, the right to assemble, the right to petition your government, freedom of the press.

What is the most fundamental liberty we have under the First Amendment? Your right to speak and particularly to speak in a political fashion, a political nature. That is what the IRS went after.

This bill does this. It gets rid of the schedule B protections that are currently in law. It says the reason the protection of schedule B information is important has nothing to do with vast conspiracies on the right or left related to so-called dark money. Rather, it dates back to the Supreme Court’s 1958 decision NAACP v. Alabama. The Supreme Court formally recognized First Amendment protection of the freedom of association that prevented the NAACP from being compelled to turn over information about its members.

What this bill will do today is, when this information has been leaked, as it has already, everyday Americans will continue to receive death threats, mail containing white powder, all because someone disagrees with what they believe.

This bill should be defeated for one simple reason: It attacks our First Amendment liberties, our most sacred rights. This bill goes after it. That is why we should vote it down, and that is why I urge a “no” vote.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the House Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Congressman JOHN SARBANES, for his vision and for his tenacity in introducing this bold and historic reform package. He has given his blood, his sweat, and his tears, and I thank him.

This sweeping legislation would clean up corruption in government, fight secret money in politics, and make it easier for American citizens across our great country to vote.

I have heard this bill dismissed as a “power grab.” In fact, it is a power restoration. H.R. 1 would restore power to the American people and break the hold of special interests.

For example, title VIII includes a bill that I introduced, the Executive Branch Ethics Reform Act, which would ban senior officials from accepting bonuses and other payments from private-sector employers in exchange for their government service.

H.R. 1 would have prevented Gary Cohn, President Trump’s former economic adviser, from receiving more than \$100 million in accelerated payments from Goldman Sachs when he

left to lead the Trump administration’s efforts to slash corporate taxes.

Title VIII also includes another bill that I introduced, the Transition Team Ethics Improvement Act. This legislation would require Presidential transition teams to disclose to Congress the team members they submit to receive security clearances and which team members receive security clearances.

This legislation also would require transition teams to have ethics plans in place and to publicly disclose those plans.

H.R. 1 gives people the power to freely exercise their right to vote. I have said quite often that when my mother died, at 92 years old, her last words were not, “Elijah, I love you.” This former sharecropper, her last words were: Elijah, don’t let them take away our right to vote.

I believe that we should be doing everything in our power to make it easier, not harder, for American citizens to exercise their constitutional right.

Unfortunately, some oppose our efforts. They think we should make voting more difficult by cutting back on early voting, eliminating polling places, and taking other steps to reduce the number of people who do vote.

□ 1615

In some cases, they have even engaged in illegal efforts to suppress the vote and target minority communities. Just look at what happened in North Carolina.

In 2013, State legislators requested data broken down by race on how residents engaged in a number of voting practices. They then used that data to enact legislation that restricted voting and voter registration in five different ways that disproportionately affected African Americans.

You do not have to take my word. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals found that this legislation was enacted with discriminatory intent. In fact, the Fourth Circuit said that in North Carolina legislation targeted African Americans with—they said this—“almost surgical precision.”

We are better than that.

In Georgia, we saw actions just last year by officials to remove people from the voter rolls and prevent them from registering in the first place. H.R. 1 would establish procedures to automatically register people to vote, extend early voting, absentee voting, and give additional funding to States to maintain polling sites so that they can do their job.

This legislation would help make it easier for hardworking Americans to find the time to vote by making election day a Federal holiday and encouraging the private sector to follow suit.

Federal court after Federal court, there are ongoing efforts to stop people from voting. So I will fight until my death to make sure that every citizen, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Independent, Green Party, or whatever, has the right to vote.

The American people gave this Congress a mandate to restore our democracy, and we will clean it up.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen from Florida (Mr. POSEY), my good friend.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the opportunity to speak about H.R. 1.

You have heard it called the “Welfare for Politicians Act”; you have heard it called the “Democrat Politician Protection Act”; and you have heard it called a very partisan proposal to hijack elections. I think it may be all those things.

Historically, elections are based on three principles: number one is fairness to everybody who votes, number two is that every vote counts, and number three is that every voter should have the assurance or the confidence that their vote was counted equally and was not compromised in one way or the other. This bill does none of those things. If it did, and if it was at all fair, it would have bipartisan support.

In 2000, after the contentious election between Bush and Gore, I was chairman of the elections committee in the Florida Senate and charged with reforming the election laws.

Working with the minority leader at the time, Steve Geller, we did some historic things. We pioneered the provisional ballot. We pioneered early voting. We got rid of punch cards and went to precinct-based optical scanners that they said would cost Republicans 100,000 votes statewide. It seems like the Republicans knew how to vote and the other side didn’t.

We did those things because it was fair and it was the right thing to do. And as a result, for the past 19 years, our elections have worked very well down there, except for two counties, very highly partisan counties who didn’t follow the rules.

The measure of credibility for election bills is whether or not you have bipartisan support. Our legislation passed nearly unanimously, if not unanimously. Here, this is very one-sided. It is not fair. If it were fair, you would have a lot of support from this side.

And so I am for the other side to try and consider fairness a little bit in this process so we don’t go from one regime to another, back and forth with election law that is not stable, is not good for the voters, is not good for the United States of America.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for yielding.

There is a reason that this bill is H.R. 1. It shows that we are not there yet in building a more perfect democracy. Nothing illustrates that better than H.R. 1’s findings on D.C. statehood. These findings document the District’s long adherence to all the qualifications for statehood.

Since the founding of the Republic, serving in all the Nation’s wars, paying Federal income taxes—in fact, leading the country, per capita, in Federal income taxes paid today—if anything, H.R. 1’s findings show that the District is overqualified for statehood—witness the \$2.8 billion surplus and its population larger than that of two States.

Yesterday marked 200 cosponsors for our D.C. statehood bill. Today, passage of H.R. 1 would set a historic milestone, marking the first vote for the necessity for D.C. statehood in the 218 years the District has been the capital of the Nation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, it is with great pleasure I get a chance to introduce my good friend, whom I have known for a very long time from Illinois.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), and I would like to ask him to throw his papers in the air and hit them when he is done with his speech, too.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the papers will remain on the table.

Mr. Chair, Speaker PELOSI said she wants to get money out of politics. She said she wants free speech. But this sham puts more money into politics. It doesn’t offer free speech; it offers forced speech.

In fact, for every dollar contributed to a candidate, the American taxpayer will be forced to contribute 6.

Now, let me say that again. For every dollar that is contributed to a candidate, an American taxpayer will be forced to contribute 6.

You heard it right, a 6-to-1 match, whether you support a candidate or not, whether you support their positions on life, the Second Amendment, immigration, taxes, or anything else—6 to 1.

The bill would also require same-day registration, nationwide. States already have the right to determine for themselves if they want same-day registration. My home State of Illinois has it. But with it, can come challenges in ensuring the accuracy of a voter’s registration information.

I believe that every single legitimate vote needs to be counted—every single legitimate vote—but it must be a single vote. And we are not just talking about one State. Multiply that by 50.

Without proper safeguards, my colleagues are leaving the States less capable of managing their voter systems. That is a big problem. This is a bad bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge the House to vote “no.”

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the prime author of this bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for all her hard work on this bill.

I am concerned that there is a collective delirium that seems to have infected part of this Chamber. I keep

hearing our colleagues on the other side say that the public financing system, the 6-to-1 matching system that we want to set up, is taxpayer funded.

Hear this: It is not taxpayer funded. It is not taxpayer funded. It is not taxpayer funded.

It is lawbreaker funded.

We are setting up a fund, called the freedom from influence fund, because we don’t want the big money and the special interests to exercise influence in our campaigns anymore.

The freedom from influence fund will be filled with dollars that come from putting a surcharge, an assessment, on people who break the law: corporations who have engaged in criminal activity or are subject to civil penalties. Corporate malfeasance, that is where the dollars will come from. The people who are breaking the law, they are going to fund the freedom from influence account that will be there to match small donations.

Now, let me tell you why it is so important that small donors be the ones that have the power.

If you are a candidate and you have to raise money for your campaign, right now, in order to raise the money you need, you have to go to the deep pocket and the PACs and the lobbyists.

And here is what happens: You start to think like the company you keep. So if you are hanging around with those folks because that is where you are raising your money, you are going to start putting their priorities first, not the public’s priorities.

But if we have a 6-to-1 matching system funded by lawbreakers, not taxpayers—

The ACTING CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, if we have a matching system that gives power to small donors, now the candidate is going to say: If I want to raise money from my campaign and power my campaign, I am going to go spend time with real people in my district. I am going to go to a house party where somebody can give \$25 or \$50, and then that 6-to-1 match will come in and I can power my campaign.

So instead of hanging out with the lobbyists on K Street or with the big money donors or with the PACs and super-PACs, I am going to spend time with people in my district. They are going to tell me what their priorities are, and then I am going to go to Washington and I am going to fight for them.

That is why we are creating this system: to take power away from the PACs and the big money and the insiders who are calling the shots now and give it back to the people. That is why this bill is called the For the People Act.

So let’s restore their voice, give them back the power that they deserve, and give them their rightful ownership of their own democracy.

Mr. Chair, let's support H.R. 1.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, it is great to have the author of the bill here on the floor.

I guess if I had a chance to ask a question, it would be why, then, was this new corporate malfeasance fund put in the manager's amendment that was given to me 30 minutes before our Rules testimony last night?

There are many concerns with this bill, and a lot of those concerns hinge upon this 6-to-1 matching program that, in the end, is a new mandatory spending program that will have to be funded, have to be funded by the taxpayers to make up the difference if corporate money that is now going to be used—that we can't take right now as congressional candidates—is going to be used to fill the coffers of the campaigns that this author talked about.

I had no idea that the Democrats' solution to getting corporate money out of politics was to put more corporate money into campaign coffers of every Member of Congress. It doesn't make sense to me, which is why this bill doesn't make sense to me.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for yielding me time.

Let me just tell you that this really is a monstrosity of a bill, the "Democratic Politician Protection Act."

You see, H.R. 1 was referred to 10 committees, but only one marked it up; 100 pages of this bill fell within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. We had a hearing but we didn't get to mark it up, which I think was designed—who knows why it was designed, but we couldn't expose all the flaws of this bill.

Let me talk about two of them right now, because these both are patterned after the Arizona law, oddly enough.

The Independent Arizona Redistricting Commission in Arizona, passed by the voters, upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and guess what. We are not going to qualify under this bill.

That redistricting commission produced, actually, a Democratic majority, so we have a blue majority in the house now. But I tell you what, the registration numbers all were for the red, but the IRC in Arizona changed that.

But guess what. Under this bill, it is not good enough. It is going to be taken out of the hands of the State and put in the hands of the Federal Government.

□ 1630

That is a violation of the Constitution and the spirit of electoral law and redistricting throughout the country.

Let me talk about this, having heard now that this is going to be not from taxpayers but from lawbreakers who are going to fund this.

Arizona has something called the Citizens Clean Elections Commission. I

was there when that came out, funded ostensibly by lawbreakers who, oddly enough, are taxpayers. They are taxpayers. And guess what else? Arizona's courts have said they are taxpayers and that the whole scheme was problematic.

That is what is happening with this particular bill. It is rife with problems throughout, but these two problems really are dilatory to this bill. I urge Members to vote "no."

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1 is yet another case of Democrats attempting a power grab from the States with no regard for the Constitution and States' powers. The bill completely disregards the fact that most States have successfully adopted their own process for a fair and honest and constitutional election.

Thirty-eight States, including my home State of Alabama, have already implemented some type of online voter registration, most with safeguards to protect against fraud. Each State is different and has unique circumstances and challenges that only the State and local legislators can effectively address.

For instance, in Alabama, where we require voter identification, our election officials recognize the rural nature of the State and have taken steps to ensure that every person has a form of ID, which is required to vote.

Alabama accepts seven different types of ID, including a student or employee ID. They can get a voter ID card for free. The State even goes so far as to have a mobile ID unit that will pick people up and take them to an ID center at no expense.

That is why a Federal judge recently threw out a lawsuit against the ID law because, in the judge's words: There is no person who is qualified to register to vote who cannot get a photo ID.

One of the most important requirements for eligibility to vote is citizenship. H.R. 1 requires States to maintain online voter registration with no safeguards. They can simply upload an electronic signature without any validation through a DMV database.

Many officials from States that have implemented online voter registration will tell you that a huge obstacle is cybersecurity. Any time parts of the process are connected to the internet, it opens it up to hacking attempts.

My Democratic colleagues have spent the better part of 2 years alleging there was Russian influence on the 2016 election. Now they want to invite China to the party? What about Iran and North Korea?

Just this week, FBI Director Wray was asked if China's digital threat was overblown. He responded: There is nothing like it.

Voter fraud and registration fraud are real threats to elections.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the Texas Attorney General recently indicted four people as part of a vote fraud ring funded by the Texas Democratic Party. Under the new automatic registration scheme in California, they admitted to registering 25,000 ineligible voters, including noncitizens. This bill even allows felons to register to vote, even those who are felons for voter fraud.

Each State is unique, with their own circumstances and challenges. Elections are a State matter, not a Federal matter. We should continue to allow the States to act on their own and implement policies that work best for their State rather than cede the fundamental base of our liberty: our right to choose our leaders in honest and fair elections.

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

Mr. Chair, I just want to make a couple of observations and perhaps corrections.

It has been alleged that somehow the assessment on tax crimes and corporate malfeasance has been transformed into taxpayer money—I think that is clearly incorrect—but that if the money is insufficient, then the taxpayers would be on the hook.

When we marked up the bill in the House Administration Committee, we outlined how the money would be reduced if there were not enough money in the fund; and in section 5101(f)(3), it talks about mandatory reductions of payments in the voucher program. In 541(d)(2), it talks about mandatory reductions in the congressional program and Presidential and so on, if there were insufficient funds.

So there is no way under the terms of this bill that the taxpayers could ever be on the hook for these funds, and I think it is important to know that.

I want to talk a little bit about the concern about free speech.

I am an advocate of free speech. I think we all are and honor our Constitution here in the House of Representatives. But the ACLU has a storied history of litigating constitutional issues. They have done good work, but we have differed on our approach to campaign finance law, particularly on how to shine a light on secret, dark money in elections.

The ACLU has opposed applying disclosure laws to organizations spending money on electioneering communications, which are paid ads that mention candidates in the days leading up to the election.

As we have mentioned earlier, the Court, in Citizens United, said the public has an interest in knowing who is speaking about a candidate before an election and pointed out that disclosure does not prevent speech. I think that is one of the reasons why we have

gotten a marvelous letter from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, which I include in the RECORD.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2019.

Re NAACP strong support for H.R. 1, legislation to greatly improve and expand the democratic voting process

Hon. U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I would like to urge you, in the strongest terms possible to support through passage H.R. 1 and to oppose any weakening amendments. This legislation will expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the discriminatory influence of big money in politics, prevent voter fraud, and strengthen ethics rules and accountability for public servants. H.R. 1 is supported and celebrated by the NAACP: since our founding in 1909, free and unfettered access to the ballot for all eligible Americans, and the assurance that our vote has been counted, has been a critical driver behind all that we do.

H.R. 1 represents a coordinated effort to protect and promote the voting rights of all Americans. This vital legislation includes many of the tools the NAACP has identified throughout our nation as improving voter turn-out and successful voter participation: it includes provisions to establish on-line and automatic voter registration. H.R. 1 would require early voting in all states; voting would have to start at least 15 days before an election, including weekends. H.R. 1 would require same-day voter registration on election-day and during early voting. Under a provision in H.R. 1, states would be prohibited from restricting an individuals' ability to vote by mail. H.R. 1 would require that "provisional ballots" be counted and provides assistance to states and localities in improving the provisional ballot process. The measure would prohibit voter caging, voter deception and voter intimidation. H.R. 1 also promotes voter registration via the internet and establishes a strict code of ethics for all federally elected and appointed officials, including the President, the Vice President, his cabinet, and every Member of Congress, so we are not constantly distracted by the "scandal of the day."

H.R. 1 would also re-enfranchise ex-felony offenders who have served their sentence and have been released from prison. Because voting is such an integral part of being a productive member of American society, the NAACP has advocated strongly to allow felons who are no longer incarcerated to reintegrate themselves into society and vote in federal elections.

H.R. 1 also begins to fix the damage done to the crucial 1965 Voting Rights Act by the US Supreme Court decision in *Shelby v. Holder*. The legislation specifically states that Congress is committed to reversing the effects of the 2013 Supreme Court decision which effectively invalidated a requirement that certain states and jurisdictions receive federal preclearance on changes to voting procedures. Prior to the *Shelby* decision preclearance was required for states and local jurisdictions that had a history of voter discrimination.

The measure would state that Congress should respond by modernizing the electoral system to improve access to the ballot, enhance voting integrity and security, ensure greater accountability, and restore protections for voters. Finally, but no less importantly, H.R. 1 contains strong provisions to

bring about genuine campaign finance reform measures which will withstand the scrutiny of the Courts.

The NAACP strongly supports H.R. 1. This is not a partisan issue: the right to vote should be supported by all Americans who believe in democracy. We should be making voting and involvement in the democratic process easier, not throwing up barriers which may seem insurmountable to whole groups of eligible voters. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP
Washington Bureau
and Senior Vice
President for Policy
and Advocacy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I will not read the entire letter, but it does say this:

"Dear Representative,

"On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest, and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I would like to urge you, in the strongest terms possible, to support through passage H.R. 1 and to oppose any weakening amendments."

It goes on to say: "This legislation will expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the discriminatory influence of big money in politics, prevent voter fraud, and strengthen ethics rules and accountability for public servants. H.R. 1 is supported and celebrated by the NAACP."

I would urge us to support this bill and listen to the advice that we have received from the NAACP on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, my colleague, Chairperson LOFGREN, mentioned the NAACP, because the next gentleman that I am going to introduce, he and I both share Springfield, Illinois, which is known, after the 1908 race riots, to be somewhat of the birthplace of the NAACP.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman RODNEY DAVIS, my good friend, for his strong leadership on this bill and his strong leadership on the Committee on House Administration for leading the way on this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today strongly opposed to H.R. 1. Among the numerous, egregious provisions of H.R. 1, I am here to shed light on one proposal that has increased vulnerabilities in our election system in our home State of Illinois.

Under H.R. 1, Democrats are proposing a blanket, nationwide mandate for States to adopt same-day registration practices with no safeguards. Once again, my colleagues across the aisle are advocating a Big Government solution, but, in fact, they are threatening the integrity of our elections at every level of government.

Coming from Illinois where same-day registration and other lax election laws

have been passed by our Democrat-controlled legislature, uncertainty has followed. The practice of same-day registration has caused confusion for our election administrators and has opened the door to fraud.

Under same-day registration in Illinois, an individual can arrive at their polling place with a copy of their utility bill and cast a full ballot without being fully verified thanks to same-day registration.

Election officials are having difficulty verifying residents in a timely manner, particularly on college campuses where students have been told that they can use a receipt from Jimmy John's sub shop to confirm their voting domicile.

Under H.R. 1, these vulnerabilities and problems will be seen across the country and exacerbated by provisions that will allow individuals to use sworn statements in place of government IDs when registering to vote.

H.R. 1 fails to address issues our States and others have seen with same-day registration. We need stricter standards for same-day registration, but H.R. 1 fails to provide any sufficient enforcement mechanisms to verify voter registration.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, furthermore, H.R. 1 fails to deter bad actors from taking advantage of the system by not criminalizing fraudulent registrations.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans want more registered voters. We want more Americans to fulfill their civic duty, but we can't simply push legislation that jeopardizes the integrity of our election process and potentially undermines our democracy.

H.R. 1 unconstitutionally mandates a one-size-fits-all Federal approach to voter registration, fails to adequately address vulnerabilities in our registration system, weaponizes the Federal Election Commission, and, as the left-leaning ACLU says, infringes on Americans' free speech right.

I strongly urge a "no" vote.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House, representing San Francisco.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I commend her and congratulate her on her success in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House.

I want to salute our colleague from Maryland, Congressman JOHN SARBANES, for being a relentless and persistent advocate, for honoring the Constitution of the United States and giving people confidence that their voice and their vote count as much as anyone's in this country.

That is what H.R. 1 is about: giving people confidence that we can do what we say without the influence of big,

dark, special interest money weighing in on the process.

Our Constitution, Mr. Chairman, as you know, begins, “We the people,” a beautiful statement of purpose for our Nation. “We the people.”

Our Founders envisioned a government that would work for the people, serving the people’s interests, fighting for their aspirations, hopes, and dreams.

We have a responsibility to honor that vision of our Founders, honoring our oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States, honoring the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform for the sacrifices that they make for our freedom and freedom throughout the world, and worthy of the aspirations of our children. We can only do this if we have a government that is committed to transparency, to as much bipartisanship as possible, and to being unifying for our country.

In the election, the American people voted for just that. They voted for a Congress that would restore transparency, bipartisanship, and unity and be unifying in Washington, D.C., so that the government would again—I can’t say it enough—work for the people.

On day one, reflecting the priorities of our outstanding freshman class, our new Democratic majority honored the people’s trust by introducing H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

Again, let me salute Congressman JOHN SARBANES, the chair of our Democracy Reform Task Force, who was the godfather of this bill.

Today, we are proud to be bringing this transformative legislation to the floor of the House. H.R. 1—and it is H.R. 1 because it is of primary importance—restores the people’s faith that government will work for the people and not the special interests.

We are ending the dominance of big, dark, special interest money in politics.

We are ensuring clean, fair elections with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, our hero, with his Voter Empowerment Act, to increase access to the ballot box.

Democrats or Republicans or people who are Independent, who do not register with a party, should want everyone to be able to vote without obstacles. This legislation will remove obstacles to participation. Whether obstacles of closing polling places in certain neighborhoods, obstacles of reducing hours that those polling places are open, reducing the number of days for early voting, and the rest, it will reduce those obstacles.

□ 1645

We also are protecting the sacred right to vote through Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL’S H.R. 4, which is an off-spring of this legislation, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, to secure, again, and restore the Voting Rights Act. It is part of H.R. 1, but it will be

taken up separately because of the need to establish the constitutional basis in an ironclad way as we go forward.

I am so pleased, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee for reinstating the House Administration Subcommittee on Elections led by Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE which began its out-of-Washington hearings in Brownsville, Texas. I was just in Texas, and people were delighted that Chairwoman FUDGE’S subcommittee came there to hear the stories of voter suppression that exists throughout the country, especially among people who may have a last name that may sound foreign to some and questionable therefore to them, but who are American citizens eligible to vote.

We are cleaning up corruption and ensuring that public officials again work for the people’s interests. You can’t say it enough, Mr. Chairman.

We must pass this legislation so we can break the grip of special interests. We talk about obstacles to participation and suppression of the vote, and we talk about what we talked about earlier, whether it is voting, number of polling places, number of hours, number of days, degree of identification that is required in some areas more so than in others and different surnames and the rest, but one of the biggest suppressors of the vote is the suffocation of the airwaves by big, dark special interest money. There are some people in our country—I hope none of them in this body—who think that the only way to win an election is to suppress the vote one way or another, and bombarding and suffocating the airwaves with information that is not factual, by disrupting elections and by putting out messages in the social media that are misleading, the resources that make all of this possible are as much a voter suppressor as anything you can name.

So that is why when we put forth our For the People agenda; one, to lower healthcare costs by reducing the cost of prescription drugs; secondly, to increase paychecks, lower healthcare costs, bigger paychecks by building the infrastructure of America in a green way, people had confidence that we could do that because H.R. 1, which was essential to our For the People agenda, would, again, diminish the role of big, special interest money and increase the voice of every person in our country, including increase the impact of small donor participation in elections.

When we put power back in the hands of the American people, as this legislation does, we can make much more progress on hard issues facing our Nation, and the American people know that. It removes a great deal of skepticism that they have in politics and government. It instills confidence that their voice will be heard, that their cause will be addressed, and that their interests will be served.

Again, lowering healthcare costs by reducing the cost of prescription drugs,

people’s voices will be heard, a big issue in re-election; increasing paychecks by rebuilding the infrastructure of America in a bold, green and modern way; safeguarding consumer protections, workers’ rights and the rights of the LGBTQ community; and addressing the concerns of our beautiful Dreamers in legislation that we will take up and launch next week; protecting clean air and clean water, confronting the climate crisis, and so much more will be taken up.

Let me add that a bill that we passed last week—which was historic in the House—finally passing a bill for commonsense background checks for gun violence prevention, again, defies the big money in that arena.

There should be nothing partisan or political about empowering the American people and making sure that government works for them. Our Founders provided a vision for our country. They wrote a constitution making us the freest people in the world, a model for the rest of the world that enabled people—oh, thank God they made it amendable so that we could ever expand power, voting rights, and the rest.

What is exciting about this Congress, which has over 100 women in it for the first time, is that in the course of this Congress, we will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of women having the right to vote. But the right to vote must be accompanied by removing obstacles to that participation, and that is what we are doing today.

How do we answer our Founders if one day we are meeting them in the next life?

How do we say to them: I did everything in my power to suppress the vote?

Or do we say: Honoring your vision, we removed every obstacle for those who are legitimately eligible to vote to do so and to have their vote counted as cast?

To honor the oath we take and to honor the people’s trust, I strongly urge a bipartisan vote for this bill, for the people.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I am ready to close.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would like to wrap up, I will also wrap up.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. But before I do, Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SCHRADER). The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and that is not nearly enough to talk about all the bad provisions in this bill once again.

There are so many provisions in this bill that many of my colleagues graciously came down to the floor to talk about them. As a matter of fact, I have with me a file of letters from groups

like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the ACLU, the National Right to Life, and all others that have been outspoken in their opposition to this behemoth partisan piece of legislation.

Let me remind everybody once again: we Republicans—there are only three of us on the House Administration Committee—were not consulted at all by anyone who wrote this bill, nor by any of the groups who were pointed out at the press conference announcing this piece of legislation that they helped to write this bill. Make no bones about it, this shell game, this nebulous freedom from influence or whatever fund you want to call it, the CBO estimates they don't even have enough information on it. They are estimating the taxpayers will be on the hook for at least \$1 billion, and that goes in addition to the over \$2 billion that the rest of the bill is going to cost the taxpayers of this country.

Now, it is interesting, I just read a tweet—I never met the gentleman, Dan McLaughlin, but it is a pretty good explanation of what I think this bill is. His tweet says: “Professional politicians do unethical things that they've written the rules to allow.”

This bill has written the rules to allow Members of Congress to enrich their own campaign coffers that will eventually be on the backs of government and the taxpayers. This is not why we should be here.

I am for the American voter. I support that every eligible voter have easier ways to register to vote and get easier access to the polls. What I am not for is for Washington, D.C., taking over elections and enriching the campaign coffers of the people who sit in this room.

I know what difficult elections look like. It is the worst of partisan politics, and it is personal to me. I know what it looks like when people take well-intentioned laws and use them to their political advantage. I don't want that to happen, and I believe H.R. 1 will allow that to happen.

We have had disagreements. I respect the fact that my colleagues have come here to debate this bill, but this is the furthest thing from a bipartisan bill. I can't say it enough how opposed to this bill I am.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill for many reasons. We have seen all over the United States efforts to prevent Americans from being able to vote, from moving polling places out of a jurisdiction without any public transportation so voters can't get there, to reducing early voting, to voter ID requirements that have a disparate result and disadvantage young people. For example, in Texas you can show your hunting license but not your

University of Texas ID. I think there is a rationale behind that.

We have had enough. We believe that American citizens ought to be able to vote and that we should do everything in Federal elections as the Constitution provides to allow those American citizens to vote.

That is why this bill provides for at least 15 days of early voting for Federal elections, no-excuse absentee ballots, that provisional ballots are treated uniformly so a voter in one State is treated the same way as a voter in another State when they are voting for the House of Representatives. We want to improve access for voters with disabilities and for overseas and military voters.

We know that we are vulnerable to hacking. We have voting machines that are using software that is no longer even updated. They are vulnerable to hacking. We have got to have paper ballots that are subject to a recount.

Much has been said about elements of this, but one of the things that I think is very important is the Federal congressional redistricting provisions. If there is one thing that makes Americans upset it is politicians manipulating the districts so that even if they don't get the votes, they get to win the seats. That is gerrymandering. This bill does away with it for the House of Representatives.

It requires all States to establish independent redistricting commissions for the purpose of developing and enacting congressional redistricting plans. It exempts States that meet the minimum requirements, including the State of Arizona, contrary to one of the comments made earlier here today.

There has been a lot of discussion about money, but I will include in the RECORD the preliminary report we have received from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

The estimate of the proposed 2.75 percent special assessment on criminal penalties and civil penalties is that it would raise \$1.948 billion between 2019 and 2029 and that it would reduce the deficit by \$83 million because people would be deterred by the additional penalty. That is from the Joint Committee on Taxation. I didn't make that up.

So this bill has a lot of sound provisions in it. It discloses big money so that there is transparency, as the court in Citizens United suggested that we do. It empowers small donors so the big money guys don't own the government. It reforms the ethics process for the President, the Congress, and for the judiciary.

I am sorry to say that some candidates win only when they suppress the vote, and we have seen that happen across the United States. We are not going to allow that to happen. Every American has a right to vote, to have

their vote counted and let the chips fall where they may. That is what H.R. 1 will do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, The “For the People Act of 2019,” which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

I am proud to be one of 226, co-sponsors, and one of the original cosponsors, of H.R. 1, which will increase public confidence in our democracy by reducing the role of money in politics, restoring ethical standards and integrity to government, and strengthening laws to protect voting.

Specifically, the For the People Act will:

1. Make it easier, not harder, to vote by implementing automatic voter registration, requiring early voting and vote by mail, committing Congress to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and ensuring the integrity of our elections by modernizing and strengthening our voting systems and ending partisan redistricting.

2. Reform the campaign finance system by requiring all political organizations to disclose large donors, updating political advertisement laws for the digital age, establishing a public matching system for citizen-owned elections, and revamping the Federal Election Commission to ensure there's a cop on the campaign finance beat; and

3. Strengthen ethics laws to ensure that public officials work in the public interest by extending conflict of interest laws to the President and Vice President; requiring the release of their tax returns; closing loopholes that allow former members of Congress to avoid cooling-off periods for lobbying; closing the revolving door between industry and the federal government; and establishing a code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

This bill ensures that individuals who have completed felony sentences have their full rights restored and expands early voting and simplify absentee voting; and modernize the U.S. voting system.

Mr. Chair, this legislation and this hearing is particularly timely because more than half a century after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting

restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

It is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 must be passed because many of the civil rights that I fought for as a student and young lawyer have been undermined or been rolled back by reactionary forces in recent years.

To add insult to injury, the Trump Administration issued an Executive Order establishing a so-called “Election Integrity” Commission to investigate not voter suppression, but so-called “voter fraud” in the 2016 election.

Trump and his followers have been unceasing in their efforts to perpetuate the myth of voter fraud, but it remains just that: a myth.

Between 2000 and 2014, there were 35 credible allegations of voter fraud out of more than 834 million ballots cast—that is less than 1 in 28 million votes.

An extensive study by social scientists at Dartmouth College uncovered no evidence to support Trump’s hysterical and outrageous allegations of widespread voter fraud “rigging” the 2016 election.

Just for the record, Mr. Chair, the popular vote of the 2016 presidential election was:

Hillary Clinton, 65,853,516.

Donald Trump, 62,884,824.

Trump’s deficit of 2.9 million was the largest of any Electoral College winner in history by a massive margin, and despite the allegations of the current Administration, there have been only 4 documented cases of voter fraud in the 2016 election.

The Voter Fraud Commission, like many of Trump’s business schemes, was a massive scam built on countless lies that do not hold up to any level of scrutiny.

As Members of Congress, we should be devoting our time, energy, and resources addressing Russian infiltration of our election infrastructure and campaigns, along with other pressing issues.

Instead of enjoying and strengthening the protections guaranteed in the Voting Rights Act—people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants—have been given the joyless, exhausting task of fending off the constant barrage of attacks levelled at our communities by Trump and other conspiracy theorists.

Not only are we tasked with reversing the current dismal state of voter suppression against minorities; we are forced to refute the blatant, propagandist lie of voter fraud.

To this end, I have been persistent in my efforts to protect the rights of disenfranchised communities in my district of inner-city Houston and across the nation.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have cosponsored dozens of bills, amendments,

and resolutions seeking to improve voters’ rights at all stages and levels of the election process.

This includes legislation aimed at:

1. Increasing voter outreach and turnout;
2. Ensuring both early and same-day registration;
3. Standardizing physical and language accessibility at polling places;
4. Expanding early voting periods;
5. Decreasing voter wait times;
6. Guaranteeing absentee ballots, especially for displaced citizens;
7. Modernizing voting technologies and strengthening our voter record systems;
8. Establishing the federal Election Day as a national holiday; and
9. Condemning and criminalizing deceptive practices, voter intimidation, and other suppression tactics;

Along with many of my CBC colleagues, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act, which became public law on July 27, 2006.

I also authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, which added the legendary Barbara Jordan to the list of civil rights trailblazers whose memories are honored in the naming of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act.

This bill strengthened the original Voting Rights Act by replacing federal voting examiners with federal voting observers a significant enhancement that made it easier to safeguard against racially biased voter suppression tactics.

In the 114th Congress, I introduced H.R. 75, the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act of 2015, which prohibits states whose congressional districts have been redistricted after a decennial census from redrawing their district lines until the next census.

Prejudiced redistricting, or gerrymandering as it is more commonly known, has been used for decades to weaken the voting power of African Americans, Latino Americans, and other minorities since the Civil Rights Era.

Immediately after the Shelby County ruling, which lifted preclearance requirements for states with histories of discrimination seeking to change their voting laws or practices, redistricting became a favorite tool for Republicans who connived to unfairly gain 3 congressional seats in Texas.

In the 110th Congress, I was the original sponsor of H.R. 6778, the Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act of 2008, which prohibited denial of the right to vote in a federal election on the basis of an individual’s status as a formerly incarcerated person.

The Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act sought to reverse discriminatory voter restrictions that disproportionately affect the African American voting population, which continues to be targeted by mass incarceration, police profiling, and a biased criminal justice system.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws be-

cause we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote but there are others, including:

1. Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting;
2. Ending Same-Day Registration;
3. Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day will not count;
4. Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration;
5. Shortened Poll Hours;
6. Lessening the standards governing voter challenges used by vigilantes, like the King Street Patriots in my city of Houston, to cause trouble at the polls;

7. “Voter Caging,” to suppress the turnout of minority voters by sending non-forwardable mail to targeted populations and, once the mail is returned, using the returned mail to compile lists of voters whose eligibility is then challenged on the basis of residence under state law; and

8. Employing targeted redistricting techniques to dilute minority voting strength, notably “Cracking” (i.e., fragmenting and dispersing concentrations of minority populations); “Stacking” (combining concentrations of minority voters with greater concentrations of white populations); and “Packing” (i.e., over-concentrating minority voters in as few districts as possible).

Mr. Chair, we must not allow our democracy to slide back into the worst elements of this country’s past, to stand idly by as our treasured values of democracy, progress, and equality are poisoned and dismantled.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1, the “For The People Act of 2019.”

The Acting 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, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-7, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-16, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1

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 “For the People Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into 3 divisions as follows:

- (1) Division A—Voting.
- (2) Division B—Campaign Finance.
- (3) Division C—Ethics.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

DIVISION A—ELECTION ACCESS

TITLE I—ELECTION ACCESS

Sec. 1000. Short title; statement of policy.

Subtitle A—Voter Registration Modernization

Sec. 1000A. Short title.

PART 1—PROMOTING INTERNET REGISTRATION

Sec. 1001. Requiring availability of Internet for voter registration.

Sec. 1002. Use of Internet to update registration information.

Sec. 1003. Provision of election information by electronic mail to individuals registered to vote.

Sec. 1004. Clarification of requirement regarding necessary information to show eligibility to vote.

Sec. 1005. Effective date.

PART 2—AUTOMATIC VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1011. Short title; findings and purpose.

Sec. 1012. Automatic registration of eligible individuals.

Sec. 1013. Contributing agency assistance in registration.

Sec. 1014. One-time contributing agency assistance in registration of eligible voters in existing records.

Sec. 1015. Voter protection and security in automatic registration.

Sec. 1016. Registration portability and correction.

Sec. 1017. Payments and grants.

Sec. 1018. Treatment of exempt States.

Sec. 1019. Miscellaneous provisions.

Sec. 1020. Definitions.

Sec. 1021. Effective date.

PART 3—SAME DAY VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1031. Same day registration.

PART 4—CONDITIONS ON REMOVAL ON BASIS OF INTERSTATE CROSS-CHECKS

Sec. 1041. Conditions on removal of registrants from official list of eligible voters on basis of interstate cross-checks.

PART 5—OTHER INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1051. Annual reports on voter registration statistics.

PART 6—AVAILABILITY OF HAVA REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS

Sec. 1061. Availability of requirements payments under HAVA to cover costs of compliance with new requirements.

PART 7—PROHIBITING INTERFERENCE WITH VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1071. Prohibiting hindering, interfering with, or preventing voter registration.

Sec. 1072. Establishment of best practices.

Subtitle B—Access to Voting for Individuals With Disabilities

Sec. 1101. Requirements for States to promote access to voter registration and voting for individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 1102. Expansion and reauthorization of grant program to assure voting access for individuals with disabilities.

Subtitle C—Prohibiting Voter Caging

Sec. 1201. Voter caging and other questionable challenges prohibited.

Sec. 1202. Development and adoption of best practices for preventing voter caging.

Subtitle D—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

Sec. 1301. Short title.

Sec. 1302. Prohibition on deceptive practices in Federal elections.

Sec. 1303. Corrective action.

Sec. 1304. Reports to Congress.

Subtitle E—Democracy Restoration

Sec. 1401. Short title.

Sec. 1402. Rights of citizens.

Sec. 1403. Enforcement.

Sec. 1404. Notification of restoration of voting rights.

Sec. 1405. Definitions.

Sec. 1406. Relation to other laws.

Sec. 1407. Federal prison funds.

Sec. 1408. Effective date.

Subtitle F—Promoting Accuracy, Integrity, and Security Through Voter-Verified Permanent Paper Ballot

Sec. 1501. Short title.

Sec. 1502. Paper ballot and manual counting requirements.

Sec. 1503. Accessibility and ballot verification for individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 1504. Durability and readability requirements for ballots.

Sec. 1505. Effective date for new requirements.

Subtitle G—Provisional Ballots

Sec. 1601. Requirements for counting provisional ballots; establishment of uniform and nondiscriminatory standards.

Subtitle H—Early Voting

Sec. 1611. Early voting.

Subtitle I—Voting by Mail

Sec. 1621. Voting by Mail.

Subtitle J—Absent Uniformed Services Voters and Overseas Voters

Sec. 1701. Pre-election reports on availability and transmission of absentee ballots.

Sec. 1702. Enforcement.

Sec. 1703. Revisions to 45-day absentee ballot transmission rule.

Sec. 1704. Use of single absentee ballot application for subsequent elections.

Sec. 1705. Effective date.

Subtitle K—Poll Worker Recruitment and Training

Sec. 1801. Grants to States for poll worker recruitment and training.

Sec. 1802. State defined.

Subtitle L—Enhancement of Enforcement

Sec. 1811. Enhancement of enforcement of Help America Vote Act of 2002.

Subtitle M—Federal Election Integrity

Sec. 1821. Prohibition on campaign activities by chief State election administration officials.

Subtitle N—Promoting Voter Access Through Election Administration Improvements

PART 1—PROMOTING VOTER ACCESS

Sec. 1901. Treatment of institutions of higher education.

Sec. 1902. Minimum notification requirements for voters affected by polling place changes.

Sec. 1903. Election Day holiday.

Sec. 1904. Permitting use of sworn written statement to meet identification requirements for voting.

Sec. 1905. Postage-free ballots.

Sec. 1906. Reimbursement for costs incurred by States in establishing program to track and confirm receipt of absentee ballots.

Sec. 1907. Voter information response systems and hotline.

PART 2—IMPROVEMENTS IN OPERATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Sec. 1911. Reauthorization of Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1913. Requiring states to participate in post-general election surveys.

Sec. 1914. Reports by National Institute of Standards and Technology on use of funds transferred from Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1915. Recommendations to improve operations of Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1916. Repeal of exemption of Election Assistance Commission from certain government contracting requirements.

PART 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 1921. Application of laws to Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands.

Sec. 1922. No effect on other laws.

Subtitle O—Severability

Sec. 1931. Severability.

TITLE II—ELECTION INTEGRITY

Subtitle A—Findings Reaffirming Commitment of Congress to Restore the Voting Rights Act

Sec. 2001. Findings reaffirming commitment of Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act.

Subtitle B—Findings Relating to Native American Voting Rights

Sec. 2101. Findings relating to Native American voting rights.

Subtitle C—Findings Relating to District of Columbia Statehood

Sec. 2201. Findings relating to District of Columbia statehood.

Subtitle D—Findings Relating to Territorial Voting Rights

Sec. 2301. Findings relating to territorial voting rights.

Subtitle E—Redistricting Reform

Sec. 2400. Short title; finding of constitutional authority.

PART 1—REQUIREMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Sec. 2401. Requiring congressional redistricting to be conducted through plan of independent State commission.

Sec. 2402. Ban on mid-decade redistricting.

PART 2—INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

Sec. 2411. Independent redistricting commission.

Sec. 2412. Establishment of selection pool of individuals eligible to serve as members of commission.

Sec. 2413. Criteria for redistricting plan by independent commission; public notice and input.

Sec. 2414. Establishment of related entities.

PART 3—ROLE OF COURTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLANS

Sec. 2421. Enactment of plan developed by 3-judge court.

Sec. 2422. Special rule for redistricting conducted under order of Federal court.

PART 4—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 2431. Payments to States for carrying out redistricting.

- Sec. 2432. Civil enforcement.
 Sec. 2433. State apportionment notice defined.
 Sec. 2434. No effect on elections for State and local office.
 Sec. 2435. Effective date.
 Subtitle F—Saving Eligible Voters From Voter Purging
 Sec. 2501. Short title.
 Sec. 2502. Conditions for removal of voters from list of registered voters.
 Subtitle G—No Effect on Authority of States to Provide Greater Opportunities for Voting
 Sec. 2601. No effect on authority of States to provide greater opportunities for voting.
 Subtitle H—Severability
 Sec. 2701. Severability.
 TITLE III—ELECTION SECURITY
 Sec. 3000. Short title; sense of Congress.
 Subtitle A—Financial Support for Election Infrastructure
 PART 1—VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENT GRANTS
 Sec. 3001. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.
 Sec. 3002. Coordination of voting system security activities with use of requirements payments and election administration requirements under Help America Vote Act of 2002.
 Sec. 3003. Incorporation of definitions.
 PART 2—GRANTS FOR RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS
 Sec. 3011. Grants to States for conducting risk-limiting audits of results of elections.
 Sec. 3012. GAO analysis of effects of audits.
 PART 3—ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM
 Sec. 3021. Election infrastructure innovation grant program.
 Subtitle B—Security Measures
 Sec. 3101. Election infrastructure designation.
 Sec. 3102. Timely threat information.
 Sec. 3103. Security clearance assistance for election officials.
 Sec. 3104. Security risk and vulnerability assessments.
 Sec. 3105. Annual reports.
 Subtitle C—Enhancing Protections for United States Democratic Institutions
 Sec. 3201. National strategy to protect United States democratic institutions.
 Sec. 3202. National Commission to Protect United States Democratic Institutions.
 Subtitle D—Promoting Cybersecurity Through Improvements in Election Administration
 Sec. 3301. Testing of existing voting systems to ensure compliance with election cybersecurity guidelines and other guidelines.
 Sec. 3302. Treatment of electronic poll books as part of voting systems.
 Sec. 3303. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.
 Sec. 3304. Streamlining collection of election information.
 Subtitle E—Preventing Election Hacking
 Sec. 3401. Short title.
 Sec. 3402. Election Security Bug Bounty Program.
 Sec. 3403. Definitions.
 Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions
 Sec. 3501. Definitions.
 Sec. 3502. Initial report on adequacy of resources available for implementation.
 Subtitle G—Severability
 Sec. 3601. Severability.
 DIVISION B—CAMPAIGN FINANCE
 TITLE IV—CAMPAIGN FINANCE TRANSPARENCY
 Subtitle A—Findings Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy
 Sec. 4001. Findings relating to illicit money undermining our democracy.
 Subtitle B—DISCLOSE Act
 Sec. 4100. Short title.
 PART 1—REGULATION OF CERTAIN POLITICAL SPENDING
 Sec. 4101. Application of ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations, limited liability corporations, and partnerships that are foreign-controlled, foreign-influenced, and foreign-owned.
 Sec. 4102. Clarification of application of foreign money ban to certain disbursements and activities.
 PART 2—REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS
 Sec. 4111. Reporting of campaign-related disbursements.
 Sec. 4112. Application of foreign money ban to disbursements for campaign-related disbursements consisting of covered transfers.
 Sec. 4113. Effective date.
 PART 3—OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS
 Sec. 4121. Petition for certiorari.
 Sec. 4122. Judicial review of actions related to campaign finance laws.
 Subtitle C—Honest Ads
 Sec. 4201. Short title.
 Sec. 4202. Purpose.
 Sec. 4203. Findings.
 Sec. 4204. Sense of Congress.
 Sec. 4205. Expansion of definition of public communication.
 Sec. 4206. Expansion of definition of electioneering communication.
 Sec. 4207. Application of disclaimer statements to online communications.
 Sec. 4208. Political record requirements for online platforms.
 Sec. 4209. Preventing contributions, expenditures, independent expenditures, and disbursements for electioneering communications by foreign nationals in the form of online advertising.
 Subtitle D—Stand By Every Ad
 Sec. 4301. Short title.
 Sec. 4302. Stand By Every Ad.
 Sec. 4303. Disclaimer requirements for communications made through prerecorded telephone calls.
 Sec. 4304. No expansion of persons subject to disclaimer requirements on Internet communications.
 Sec. 4305. Effective date.
 Subtitle E—Secret Money Transparency
 Sec. 4401. Repeal of restriction of use of funds by Internal Revenue Service to bring transparency to political activity of certain nonprofit organizations.
 Subtitle F—Shareholder Right-to-Know
 Sec. 4501. Repeal of restriction on use of funds by Securities and Exchange Commission to ensure shareholders of corporations have knowledge of corporation political activity.
 Subtitle G—Disclosure of Political Spending by Government Contractors
 Sec. 4601. Repeal of restriction on use of funds to require disclosure of political spending by government contractors.
 Subtitle H—Limitation and Disclosure Requirements for Presidential Inaugural Committees
 Sec. 4701. Short title.
 Sec. 4702. Limitations and disclosure of certain donations to, and disbursements by, Inaugural Committees.
 Subtitle I—Severability
 Sec. 4801. Severability.
 TITLE V—CAMPAIGN FINANCE EMPOWERMENT
 Subtitle A—Findings Relating to *Citizens United* Decision
 Sec. 5001. Findings relating to *Citizens United* decision.
 Subtitle B—Congressional Elections
 Sec. 5100. Short title.
 PART 1—MY VOICE VOUCHER PILOT PROGRAM
 Sec. 5101. Establishment of pilot program.
 Sec. 5102. Voucher program described.
 Sec. 5103. Reports.
 Sec. 5104. Definitions.
 PART 2—SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS
 Sec. 5111. Benefits and eligibility requirements for candidates.
 Sec. 5112. Contributions and expenditures by multicandidate and political party committees on behalf of participating candidates.
 Sec. 5113. Prohibiting use of contributions by participating candidates for purposes other than campaign for election.
 Sec. 5114. Effective date.
 Subtitle C—Presidential Elections
 Sec. 5200. Short title.
 PART 1—PRIMARY ELECTIONS
 Sec. 5201. Increase in and modifications to matching payments.
 Sec. 5202. Eligibility requirements for matching payments.
 Sec. 5203. Repeal of expenditure limitations.
 Sec. 5204. Period of availability of matching payments.
 Sec. 5205. Examination and audits of matchable contributions.
 Sec. 5206. Modification to limitation on contributions for Presidential primary candidates.
 Sec. 5207. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.
 PART 2—GENERAL ELECTIONS
 Sec. 5211. Modification of eligibility requirements for public financing.
 Sec. 5212. Repeal of expenditure limitations and use of qualified campaign contributions.
 Sec. 5213. Matching payments and other modifications to payment amounts.
 Sec. 5214. Increase in limit on coordinated party expenditures.
 Sec. 5215. Establishment of uniform date for release of payments.
 Sec. 5216. Amounts in Presidential Election Campaign Fund.
 Sec. 5217. Use of general election payments for general election legal and accounting compliance.
 Sec. 5218. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.
 PART 3—EFFECTIVE DATE
 Sec. 5221. Effective date.
 Subtitle D—Personal Use Services as Authorized Campaign Expenditures
 Sec. 5301. Short title; findings; purpose.

Sec. 5302. Treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as authorized campaign expenditure.
 Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 5401. Severability.
 TITLE VI—CAMPAIGN FINANCE OVERSIGHT

Subtitle A—Restoring Integrity to America's Elections

Sec. 6001. Short title.
 Sec. 6002. Membership of Federal Election Commission.
 Sec. 6003. Assignment of powers to Chair of Federal Election Commission.
 Sec. 6004. Revision to enforcement process.
 Sec. 6005. Permitting appearance at hearings on requests for advisory opinions by persons opposing the requests.
 Sec. 6006. Permanent extension of administrative penalty authority.
 Sec. 6007. Restrictions on ex parte communications.
 Sec. 6008. Effective date; transition.
 Subtitle B—Stopping Super PAC-Candidate Coordination

Sec. 6101. Short title.
 Sec. 6102. Clarification of treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates.
 Sec. 6103. Clarification of ban on fundraising for super PACs by Federal candidates and officeholders.
 Subtitle C—Severability

Sec. 6201. Severability.
 DIVISION C—ETHICS

TITLE VII—ETHICAL STANDARDS

Subtitle A—Supreme Court Ethics

Sec. 7001. Code of conduct for Federal judges.
 Subtitle B—Foreign Agents Registration

Sec. 7101. Establishment of FARA investigation and enforcement unit within Department of Justice.
 Sec. 7102. Authority to impose civil money penalties.
 Sec. 7103. Disclosure of transactions involving things of financial value conferred on officeholders.
 Sec. 7104. Ensuring online access to registration statements.
 Subtitle C—Lobbying Disclosure Reform

Sec. 7201. Expanding scope of individuals and activities subject to requirements of Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.
 Subtitle D—Recusal of Presidential Appointees

Sec. 7301. Recusal of appointees.
 Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 7401. Severability.
 TITLE VIII—ETHICS REFORMS FOR THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Subtitle A—Executive Branch Conflict of Interest

Sec. 8001. Short title.
 Sec. 8002. Restrictions on private sector payment for government service.
 Sec. 8003. Requirements relating to slowing the revolving door.
 Sec. 8004. Prohibition of procurement officers accepting employment from government contractors.
 Sec. 8005. Revolving door restrictions on employees moving into the private sector.
 Subtitle B—Presidential Conflicts of Interest

Sec. 8011. Short title.
 Sec. 8012. Divestiture of personal financial interests of the President and Vice President that pose a potential conflict of interest.

Sec. 8013. Initial financial disclosure.
 Sec. 8014. Contracts by the President or Vice President.
 Subtitle C—White House Ethics Transparency

Sec. 8021. Short title.
 Sec. 8022. Procedure for waivers and authorizations relating to ethics requirements.
 Subtitle D—Executive Branch Ethics Enforcement

Sec. 8031. Short title.
 Sec. 8032. Reauthorization of the Office of Government Ethics.
 Sec. 8033. Tenure of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.
 Sec. 8034. Duties of Director of the Office of Government Ethics.
 Sec. 8035. Agency Ethics Officials Training and Duties.
 Subtitle E—Conflicts From Political Fundraising

Sec. 8041. Short title.
 Sec. 8042. Disclosure of certain types of contributions.
 Subtitle F—Transition Team Ethics

Sec. 8051. Short title.
 Sec. 8052. Presidential transition ethics programs.
 Subtitle G—Ethics Pledge For Senior Executive Branch Employees

Sec. 8061. Short title.
 Sec. 8062. Ethics pledge requirement for senior executive branch employees.
 Subtitle H—Severability

Sec. 8071. Severability.
 TITLE IX—CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS REFORM

Subtitle A—Requiring Members of Congress to Reimburse Treasury for Amounts Paid as Settlements and Awards Under Congressional Accountability Act of 1995

Sec. 9001. Requiring Members of Congress to reimburse Treasury for amounts paid as settlements and awards under Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 in all cases of employment discrimination acts by Members.
 Subtitle B—Conflicts of Interests

Sec. 9101. Prohibiting Members of House of Representatives from serving on boards of for-profit entities.
 Sec. 9102. Conflict of interest rules for Members of Congress and congressional staff.
 Sec. 9103. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
 Subtitle C—Campaign Finance and Lobbying Disclosure

Sec. 9201. Short title.
 Sec. 9202. Requiring disclosure in certain reports filed with Federal Election Commission of persons who are registered lobbyists.
 Sec. 9203. Effective date.
 Subtitle D—Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports

Sec. 9301. Short title.
 Sec. 9302. Definitions.
 Sec. 9303. Establishment of online portal for congressionally mandated reports.
 Sec. 9304. Federal agency responsibilities.
 Sec. 9305. Removing and altering reports.
 Sec. 9306. Relationship to the Freedom of Information Act.
 Sec. 9307. Implementation.
 Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 9401. Severability.
 TITLE X—PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 10001. Presidential and Vice Presidential tax transparency.

DIVISION A—ELECTION ACCESS

TITLE I—ELECTION ACCESS

Sec. 1000. Short title; statement of policy.
 Subtitle A—Voter Registration Modernization

Sec. 1000A. Short title.
 PART 1—PROMOTING INTERNET REGISTRATION

Sec. 1001. Requiring availability of Internet for voter registration.
 Sec. 1002. Use of Internet to update registration information.
 Sec. 1003. Provision of election information by electronic mail to individuals registered to vote.
 Sec. 1004. Clarification of requirement regarding necessary information to show eligibility to vote.
 Sec. 1005. Effective date.
 PART 2—AUTOMATIC VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1011. Short title; findings and purpose.
 Sec. 1012. Automatic registration of eligible individuals.
 Sec. 1013. Contributing agency assistance in registration.
 Sec. 1014. One-time contributing agency assistance in registration of eligible voters in existing records.
 Sec. 1015. Voter protection and security in automatic registration.
 Sec. 1016. Registration portability and correction.
 Sec. 1017. Payments and grants.
 Sec. 1018. Treatment of exempt States.
 Sec. 1019. Miscellaneous provisions.
 Sec. 1020. Definitions.
 Sec. 1021. Effective date.
 PART 3—SAME DAY VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1031. Same day registration.
 PART 4—CONDITIONS ON REMOVAL ON BASIS OF INTERSTATE CROSS-CHECKS

Sec. 1041. Conditions on removal of registrants from official list of eligible voters on basis of interstate cross-checks.
 PART 5—OTHER INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1051. Annual reports on voter registration statistics.
 PART 6—AVAILABILITY OF HAVA REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS

Sec. 1061. Availability of requirements payments under HAVA to cover costs of compliance with new requirements.
 PART 7—PROHIBITING INTERFERENCE WITH VOTER REGISTRATION

Sec. 1071. Prohibiting hindering, interfering with, or preventing voter registration.
 Sec. 1072. Establishment of best practices.
 Subtitle B—Access to Voting for Individuals With Disabilities

Sec. 1101. Requirements for States to promote access to voter registration and voting for individuals with disabilities.
 Sec. 1102. Expansion and reauthorization of grant program to assure voting access for individuals with disabilities.
 Subtitle C—Prohibiting Voter Caging

Sec. 1201. Voter caging and other questionable challenges prohibited.
 Sec. 1202. Development and adoption of best practices for preventing voter caging.
 Subtitle D—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

Sec. 1301. Short title.
 Sec. 1302. Prohibition on deceptive practices in Federal elections.
 Sec. 1303. Corrective action.
 Sec. 1304. Reports to Congress.

Subtitle E—Democracy Restoration

Sec. 1401. Short title.

Sec. 1402. Rights of citizens.

Sec. 1403. Enforcement.

Sec. 1404. Notification of restoration of voting rights.

Sec. 1405. Definitions.

Sec. 1406. Relation to other laws.

Sec. 1407. Federal prison funds.

Sec. 1408. Effective date.

Subtitle F—Promoting Accuracy, Integrity, and Security Through Voter-Verified Permanent Paper Ballot

Sec. 1501. Short title.

Sec. 1502. Paper ballot and manual counting requirements.

Sec. 1503. Accessibility and ballot verification for individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 1504. Durability and readability requirements for ballots.

Sec. 1505. Effective date for new requirements.

Subtitle G—Provisional Ballots

Sec. 1601. Requirements for counting provisional ballots; establishment of uniform and nondiscriminatory standards.

Subtitle H—Early Voting

Sec. 1611. Early voting.

Subtitle I—Voting by Mail

Sec. 1621. Voting by Mail.

Subtitle J—Absent Uniformed Services Voters and Overseas Voters

Sec. 1701. Pre-election reports on availability and transmission of absentee ballots.

Sec. 1702. Enforcement.

Sec. 1703. Revisions to 45-day absentee ballot transmission rule.

Sec. 1704. Use of single absentee ballot application for subsequent elections.

Sec. 1705. Effective date.

Subtitle K—Poll Worker Recruitment and Training

Sec. 1801. Grants to States for poll worker recruitment and training.

Sec. 1802. State defined.

Subtitle L—Enhancement of Enforcement

Sec. 1811. Enhancement of enforcement of Help America Vote Act of 2002.

Subtitle M—Federal Election Integrity

Sec. 1821. Prohibition on campaign activities by chief State election administration officials.

Subtitle N—Promoting Voter Access Through Election Administration Improvements

PART 1—PROMOTING VOTER ACCESS

Sec. 1901. Treatment of institutions of higher education.

Sec. 1902. Minimum notification requirements for voters affected by polling place changes.

Sec. 1903. Election Day holiday.

Sec. 1904. Permitting use of sworn written statement to meet identification requirements for voting.

Sec. 1905. Postage-free ballots.

Sec. 1906. Reimbursement for costs incurred by States in establishing program to track and confirm receipt of absentee ballots.

Sec. 1907. Voter information response systems and hotline.

PART 2—IMPROVEMENTS IN OPERATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Sec. 1911. Reauthorization of Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1913. Requiring states to participate in post-general election surveys.

Sec. 1914. Reports by National Institute of Standards and Technology on use of funds transferred from Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1915. Recommendations to improve operations of Election Assistance Commission.

Sec. 1916. Repeal of exemption of Election Assistance Commission from certain government contracting requirements.

PART 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 1921. Application of laws to Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands.

Sec. 1922. No effect on other laws.

Subtitle O—Severability

Sec. 1931. Severability.

SEC. 1000. SHORT TITLE; STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “Voter Empowerment Act of 2019”.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) all eligible citizens of the United States should access and exercise their constitutional right to vote in a free, fair, and timely manner; and

(2) the integrity, security, and accountability of the voting process must be vigilantly protected, maintained, and enhanced in order to protect and preserve electoral and participatory democracy in the United States.

Subtitle A—Voter Registration Modernization

SEC. 1000A. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Voter Registration Modernization Act of 2019”.

PART 1—PROMOTING INTERNET REGISTRATION

SEC. 1001. REQUIRING AVAILABILITY OF INTERNET FOR VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) REQUIRING AVAILABILITY OF INTERNET FOR REGISTRATION.—The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

“SEC. 6A. INTERNET REGISTRATION.

“(a) REQUIRING AVAILABILITY OF INTERNET FOR ONLINE REGISTRATION.—

“(1) AVAILABILITY OF ONLINE REGISTRATION AND CORRECTION OF EXISTING REGISTRATION INFORMATION.—Each State, acting through the chief State election official, shall ensure that the following services are available to the public at any time on the official public websites of the appropriate State and local election officials in the State, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as the services provided by voter registration agencies under section 7(a):

“(A) Online application for voter registration.

“(B) Online assistance to applicants in applying to register to vote.

“(C) Online completion and submission by applicants of the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2), including assistance with providing a signature as required under subsection (c).

“(D) Online receipt of completed voter registration applications.

“(b) ACCEPTANCE OF COMPLETED APPLICATIONS.—A State shall accept an online voter registration application provided by an individual under this section, and ensure that the individual is registered to vote in the State, if—

“(1) the individual meets the same voter registration requirements applicable to individuals who register to vote by mail in accordance with section 6(a)(1) using the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2); and

“(2) the individual meets the requirements of subsection (c) to provide a signature in electronic form (but only in the case of applications submitted during or after the sec-

ond year in which this section is in effect in the State).

“(c) SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, an individual meets the requirements of this subsection as follows:

“(A) In the case of an individual who has a signature on file with a State agency, including the State motor vehicle authority, that is required to provide voter registration services under this Act or any other law, the individual consents to the transfer of that electronic signature.

“(B) If subparagraph (A) does not apply, the individual submits with the application an electronic copy of the individual’s handwritten signature through electronic means.

“(C) If subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B) do not apply, the individual executes a computerized mark in the signature field on an online voter registration application, in accordance with reasonable security measures established by the State, but only if the State accepts such mark from the individual.

“(2) TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS UNABLE TO MEET REQUIREMENT.—If an individual is unable to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), the State shall—

“(A) permit the individual to complete all other elements of the online voter registration application;

“(B) permit the individual to provide a signature at the time the individual requests a ballot in an election (whether the individual requests the ballot at a polling place or requests the ballot by mail); and

“(C) if the individual carries out the steps described in subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B), ensure that the individual is registered to vote in the State.

“(3) NOTICE.—The State shall ensure that individuals applying to register to vote online are notified of the requirements of paragraph (1) and of the treatment of individuals unable to meet such requirements, as described in paragraph (2).

“(d) CONFIRMATION AND DISPOSITION.—

“(1) CONFIRMATION OF RECEIPT.—Upon the online submission of a completed voter registration application by an individual under this section, the appropriate State or local election official shall send the individual a notice confirming the State’s receipt of the application and providing instructions on how the individual may check the status of the application.

“(2) NOTICE OF DISPOSITION.—Not later than 7 days after the appropriate State or local election official has approved or rejected an application submitted by an individual under this section, the official shall send the individual a notice of the disposition of the application.

“(3) METHOD OF NOTIFICATION.—The appropriate State or local election official shall send the notices required under this subsection by regular mail, and, in the case of an individual who has provided the official with an electronic mail address, by both electronic mail and regular mail.

“(e) PROVISION OF SERVICES IN NON-PARTISAN MANNER.—The services made available under subsection (a) shall be provided in a manner that ensures that, consistent with section 7(a)(5)—

“(1) the online application does not seek to influence an applicant’s political preference or party registration; and

“(2) there is no display on the website promoting any political preference or party allegiance, except that nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit an applicant from registering to vote as a member of a political party.

“(f) PROTECTION OF SECURITY OF INFORMATION.—In meeting the requirements of this section, the State shall establish appropriate technological security measures to prevent

to the greatest extent practicable any unauthorized access to information provided by individuals using the services made available under subsection (a).

“(g) ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES.—A State shall ensure that the services made available under this section are made available to individuals with disabilities to the same extent as services are made available to all other individuals.

“(h) USE OF ADDITIONAL TELEPHONE-BASED SYSTEM.—A State shall make the services made available online under subsection (a) available through the use of an automated telephone-based system, subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under this section to the services made available online, in addition to making the services available online in accordance with the requirements of this section.

“(i) NONDISCRIMINATION AMONG REGISTERED VOTERS USING MAIL AND ONLINE REGISTRATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Help America Vote Act of 2002, or any other Federal, State, or local law governing the treatment of registered voters in the State or the administration of elections for public office in the State, a State shall treat a registered voter who registered to vote online in accordance with this section in the same manner as the State treats a registered voter who registered to vote by mail.”

(b) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS USING ONLINE REGISTRATION.—

(1) TREATMENT AS INDIVIDUALS REGISTERING TO VOTE BY MAIL FOR PURPOSES OF FIRST-TIME VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 303(b)(1)(A) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “by mail” and inserting “by mail or online under section 6A of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993”.

(2) REQUIRING SIGNATURE FOR FIRST-TIME VOTERS IN JURISDICTION.—Section 303(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS FOR FIRST-TIME VOTERS USING ONLINE REGISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall, in a uniform and nondiscriminatory manner, require an individual to meet the requirements of subparagraph (B) if—

“(i) the individual registered to vote in the State online under section 6A of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993; and

“(ii) the individual has not previously voted in an election for Federal office in the State.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—An individual meets the requirements of this subparagraph if—

“(i) in the case of an individual who votes in person, the individual provides the appropriate State or local election official with a handwritten signature; or

“(ii) in the case of an individual who votes by mail, the individual submits with the ballot a handwritten signature.

“(C) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply in the case of an individual who is—

“(i) entitled to vote by absentee ballot under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302 et seq.);

“(ii) provided the right to vote otherwise than in person under section 3(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20102(b)(2)(B)(ii)); or

“(iii) entitled to vote otherwise than in person under any other Federal law.”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 303(d)(2)(A) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “Each State” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b)(5), each State”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TIMING OF REGISTRATION.—Section 8(a)(1) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) in the case of online registration through the official public website of an election official under section 6A, if the valid voter registration application is submitted online not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election (as determined by treating the date on which the application is sent electronically as the date on which it is submitted); and”.

(2) INFORMING APPLICANTS OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND PENALTIES.—Section 8(a)(5) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(5)) is amended by striking “and 7” and inserting “6A, and 7”.

SEC. 1002. USE OF INTERNET TO UPDATE REGISTRATION INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) UPDATES TO INFORMATION CONTAINED ON COMPUTERIZED STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION LIST.—Section 303(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) USE OF INTERNET BY REGISTERED VOTERS TO UPDATE INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate State or local election official shall ensure that any registered voter on the computerized list may at any time update the voter's registration information, including the voter's address and electronic mail address, online through the official public website of the election official responsible for the maintenance of the list, so long as the voter attests to the contents of the update by providing a signature in electronic form in the same manner required under section 6A(c) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

“(B) PROCESSING OF UPDATED INFORMATION BY ELECTION OFFICIALS.—If a registered voter updates registration information under subparagraph (A), the appropriate State or local election official shall—

“(i) revise any information on the computerized list to reflect the update made by the voter; and

“(ii) if the updated registration information affects the voter's eligibility to vote in an election for Federal office, ensure that the information is processed with respect to the election if the voter updates the information not later than the lesser of 7 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election.

“(C) CONFIRMATION AND DISPOSITION.—

“(i) CONFIRMATION OF RECEIPT.—Upon the online submission of updated registration information by an individual under this paragraph, the appropriate State or local election official shall send the individual a notice confirming the State's receipt of the updated information and providing instructions on how the individual may check the status of the update.

“(ii) NOTICE OF DISPOSITION.—Not later than 7 days after the appropriate State or local election official has accepted or rejected updated information submitted by an individual under this paragraph, the official shall send the individual a notice of the disposition of the update.

“(iii) METHOD OF NOTIFICATION.—The appropriate State or local election official shall send the notices required under this subparagraph by regular mail, and, in the case of an individual who has requested that the State

provide voter registration and voting information through electronic mail, by both electronic mail and regular mail.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 303(d)(1)(A) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(d)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraph (B) and subsection (a)(6)”.

(b) ABILITY OF REGISTRANT TO USE ONLINE UPDATE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON RESIDENCE.—Section 8(d)(2)(A) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(d)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting after “return the card” the following: “or update the registrant's information on the computerized Statewide voter registration list using the online method provided under section 303(a)(6) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “returned,” and inserting the following: “returned or if the registrant does not update the registrant's information on the computerized Statewide voter registration list using such online method.”

SEC. 1003. PROVISION OF ELECTION INFORMATION BY ELECTRONIC MAIL TO INDIVIDUALS REGISTERED TO VOTE.

(a) INCLUDING OPTION ON VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATION TO PROVIDE E-MAIL ADDRESS AND RECEIVE INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(b) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20508(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(5) shall include a space for the applicant to provide (at the applicant's option) an electronic mail address, together with a statement that, if the applicant so requests, instead of using regular mail the appropriate State and local election officials shall provide to the applicant, through electronic mail sent to that address, the same voting information (as defined in section 302(b)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002) which the officials would provide to the applicant through regular mail.”

(2) PROHIBITING USE FOR PURPOSES UNRELATED TO OFFICIAL DUTIES OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.—Section 9 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20508) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITING USE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESSES FOR OTHER THAN OFFICIAL PURPOSES.—The chief State election official shall ensure that any electronic mail address provided by an applicant under subsection (b)(5) is used only for purposes of carrying out official duties of election officials and is not transmitted by any State or local election official (or any agent of such an official, including a contractor) to any person who does not require the address to carry out such official duties and who is not under the direct supervision and control of a State or local election official.”

(b) REQUIRING PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ELECTION OFFICIALS.—Section 302(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) PROVISION OF OTHER INFORMATION BY ELECTRONIC MAIL.—If an individual who is a registered voter has provided the State or local election official with an electronic mail address for the purpose of receiving voting information (as described in section 9(b)(5) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993), the appropriate State or local election official, through electronic mail transmitted not later than 7 days before the

date of the election for Federal office involved, shall provide the individual with information on how to obtain the following information by electronic means:

“(A) The name and address of the polling place at which the individual is assigned to vote in the election.

“(B) The hours of operation for the polling place.

“(C) A description of any identification or other information the individual may be required to present at the polling place.”.

SEC. 1004. CLARIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT REGARDING NECESSARY INFORMATION TO SHOW ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE.

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

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

“(j) **REQUIREMENT FOR STATE TO REGISTER APPLICANTS PROVIDING NECESSARY INFORMATION TO SHOW ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE.**—For purposes meeting the requirement of subsection (a)(1) that an eligible applicant is registered to vote in an election for Federal office within the deadlines required under such subsection, the State shall consider an applicant to have provided a ‘valid voter registration form’ if—

“(1) the applicant has substantially completed the application form and attested to the statement required by section 9(b)(2); and

“(2) in the case of an applicant who registers to vote online in accordance with section 6A, the applicant provides a signature in accordance with subsection (c) of such section.”.

SEC. 1005. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this part (other than the amendments made by section 1004) shall take effect January 1, 2020.

(b) **WAIVER.**—Subject to the approval of the Election Assistance Commission, if a State certifies to the Election Assistance Commission that the State will not meet the deadline referred to in subsection (a) because of extraordinary circumstances and includes in the certification the reasons for the failure to meet the deadline, subsection (a) shall apply to the State as if the reference in such subsection to “January 1, 2020” were a reference to “January 1, 2022”.

PART 2—AUTOMATIC VOTER REGISTRATION

SEC. 1011. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This part may be cited as the “Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2019”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) the right to vote is a fundamental right of citizens of the United States;

(B) it is the responsibility of the State and Federal Governments to ensure that every eligible citizen is registered to vote;

(C) existing voter registration systems can be inaccurate, costly, inaccessible and confusing, with damaging effects on voter participation in elections and disproportionate impacts on young people, persons with disabilities, and racial and ethnic minorities; and

(D) voter registration systems must be updated with 21st Century technologies and procedures to maintain their security.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this part—

(A) to establish that it is the responsibility of government at every level to ensure that all eligible citizens are registered to vote;

(B) to enable the State and Federal Governments to register all eligible citizens to

vote with accurate, cost-efficient, and up-to-date procedures;

(C) to modernize voter registration and list maintenance procedures with electronic and Internet capabilities; and

(D) to protect and enhance the integrity, accuracy, efficiency, and accessibility of the electoral process for all eligible citizens.

SEC. 1012. AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION OF ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **REQUIRING STATES TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION SYSTEM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The chief State election official of each State shall establish and operate a system of automatic registration for the registration of eligible individuals to vote for elections for Federal office in the State, in accordance with the provisions of this part.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—The term “automatic registration” means a system that registers an individual to vote in elections for Federal office in a State, if eligible, by electronically transferring the information necessary for registration from government agencies to election officials of the State so that, unless the individual affirmatively declines to be registered, the individual will be registered to vote in such elections.

(b) **REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BASED ON NEW AGENCY RECORDS.**—The chief State election official shall—

(1) not later than 15 days after a contributing agency has transmitted information with respect to an individual pursuant to section 1013, ensure that the individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State if the individual is eligible to be registered to vote in such elections; and

(2) not later than 120 days after a contributing agency has transmitted such information with respect to the individual, send written notice to the individual, in addition to other means of notice established by this part, of the individual’s voter registration status.

(c) **ONE-TIME REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BASED ON EXISTING CONTRIBUTING AGENCY RECORDS.**—The chief State election official shall—

(1) identify all individuals whose information is transmitted by a contributing agency pursuant to section 1014 and who are eligible to be, but are not currently, registered to vote in that State;

(2) promptly send each such individual written notice, in addition to other means of notice established by this part, which shall not identify the contributing agency that transmitted the information but shall include—

(A) an explanation that voter registration is voluntary, but if the individual does not decline registration, the individual will be registered to vote;

(B) a statement offering the opportunity to decline voter registration through means consistent with the requirements of this part;

(C) in the case of a State in which affiliation or enrollment with a political party is required in order to participate in an election to select the party’s candidate in an election for Federal office, a statement offering the individual the opportunity to affiliate or enroll with a political party or to decline to affiliate or enroll with a political party, through means consistent with the requirements of this part;

(D) the substantive qualifications of an elector in the State as listed in the mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office prescribed pursuant to section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the consequences of false registration, and a statement that the indi-

vidual should decline to register if the individual does not meet all those qualifications;

(E) instructions for correcting any erroneous information; and

(F) instructions for providing any additional information which is listed in the mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office prescribed pursuant to section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993;

(3) ensure that each such individual who is eligible to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State is promptly registered to vote not later than 45 days after the official sends the individual the written notice under paragraph (2), unless, during the 30-day period which begins on the date the election official sends the individual such written notice, the individual declines registration in writing, through a communication made over the Internet, or by an officially-logged telephone communication; and

(4) send written notice to each such individual, in addition to other means of notice established by this part, of the individual’s voter registration status.

(d) **TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.**—A State may not refuse to treat an individual as an eligible individual for purposes of this part on the grounds that the individual is less than 18 years of age at the time a contributing agency receives information with respect to the individual, so long as the individual is at least 16 years of age at such time.

(e) **CONTRIBUTING AGENCY DEFINED.**—In this part, the term “contributing agency” means, with respect to a State, an agency listed in section 1013(e).

SEC. 1013. CONTRIBUTING AGENCY ASSISTANCE IN REGISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with this part, each contributing agency in a State shall assist the State’s chief election official in registering to vote all eligible individuals served by that agency.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES.**—

(1) **INSTRUCTIONS ON AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION.**—With each application for service or assistance, and with each related recertification, renewal, or change of address, or, in the case of an institution of higher education, with each registration of a student for enrollment in a course of study, each contributing agency that (in the normal course of its operations) requests individuals to affirm United States citizenship (either directly or as part of the overall application for service or assistance) shall inform each such individual who is a citizen of the United States of the following:

(A) Unless that individual declines to register to vote, or is found ineligible to vote, the individual will be registered to vote or, if applicable, the individual’s registration will be updated.

(B) The substantive qualifications of an elector in the State as listed in the mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office prescribed pursuant to section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the consequences of false registration, and the individual should decline to register if the individual does not meet all those qualifications.

(C) In the case of a State in which affiliation or enrollment with a political party is required in order to participate in an election to select the party’s candidate in an election for Federal office, the requirement that the individual must affiliate or enroll with a political party in order to participate in such an election.

(D) Voter registration is voluntary, and neither registering nor declining to register

to vote will in any way affect the availability of services or benefits, nor be used for other purposes.

(2) **OPPORTUNITY TO DECLINE REGISTRATION REQUIRED.**—Each contributing agency shall ensure that each application for service or assistance, and each related recertification, renewal, or change of address, or, in the case of an institution of higher education, each registration of a student for enrollment in a course of study, cannot be completed until the individual is given the opportunity to decline to be registered to vote.

(3) **INFORMATION TRANSMITTAL.**—Upon the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the contributing agency informs the individual of the information described in paragraph (1), each contributing agency shall electronically transmit to the appropriate State election official, in a format compatible with the statewide voter database maintained under section 303 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083), the following information, unless during such 30-day period the individual declined to be registered to vote:

(A) The individual's given name(s) and surname(s).

(B) The individual's date of birth.

(C) The individual's residential address.

(D) Information showing that the individual is a citizen of the United States.

(E) The date on which information pertaining to that individual was collected or last updated.

(F) If available, the individual's signature in electronic form.

(G) Information regarding the individual's affiliation or enrollment with a political party, if the individual provides such information.

(H) Any additional information listed in the mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office prescribed pursuant to section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, including any valid driver's license number or the last 4 digits of the individual's social security number, if the individual provided such information.

(c) **ALTERNATE PROCEDURE FOR CERTAIN CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES.**—With each application for service or assistance, and with each related recertification, renewal, or change of address, any contributing agency that in the normal course of its operations does not request individuals applying for service or assistance to affirm United States citizenship (either directly or as part of the overall application for service or assistance) shall—

(1) complete the requirements of section 7(a)(6) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506(a)(6));

(2) ensure that each applicant's transaction with the agency cannot be completed until the applicant has indicated whether the applicant wishes to register to vote or declines to register to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State; and

(3) for each individual who wishes to register to vote, transmit that individual's information in accordance with subsection (b)(3).

(d) **REQUIRED AVAILABILITY OF AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION OPPORTUNITY WITH EACH APPLICATION FOR SERVICE OR ASSISTANCE.**—Each contributing agency shall offer each individual, with each application for service or assistance, and with each related recertification, renewal, or change of address, or in the case of an institution of higher education, with each registration of a student for enrollment in a course of study, the opportunity to register to vote as prescribed by this section without regard to whether the individual previously declined a registration opportunity.

(e) **CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES.**—

(1) **STATE AGENCIES.**—In each State, each of the following agencies shall be treated as a contributing agency:

(A) Each agency in a State that is required by Federal law to provide voter registration services, including the State motor vehicle authority and other voter registration agencies under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

(B) Each agency in a State that administers a program pursuant to title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.), title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), or the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

(C) Each State agency primarily responsible for regulating the private possession of firearms.

(D) Each State agency primarily responsible for maintaining identifying information for students enrolled at public secondary schools, including, where applicable, the State agency responsible for maintaining the education data system described in section 6201(e)(2) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871(e)(2)).

(E) In the case of a State in which an individual disenfranchised by a criminal conviction may become eligible to vote upon completion of a criminal sentence or any part thereof, or upon formal restoration of rights, the State agency responsible for administering that sentence, or part thereof, or that restoration of rights.

(F) Any other agency of the State which is designated by the State as a contributing agency.

(2) **FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—In each State, each of the following agencies of the Federal government shall be treated as a contributing agency with respect to individuals who are residents of that State (except as provided in subparagraph (C)):

(A) The Social Security Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Defense Manpower Data Center of the Department of Defense, the Employee and Training Administration of the Department of Labor, and the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(B) The Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, but only with respect to individuals who have completed the naturalization process.

(C) In the case of an individual who is a resident of a State in which an individual disenfranchised by a criminal conviction under Federal law may become eligible to vote upon completion of a criminal sentence or any part thereof, or upon formal restoration of rights, the Federal agency responsible for administering that sentence or part thereof (without regard to whether the agency is located in the same State in which the individual is a resident), but only with respect to individuals who have completed the criminal sentence or any part thereof.

(D) Any other agency of the Federal government which the State designates as a contributing agency, but only if the State and the head of the agency determine that the agency collects information sufficient to carry out the responsibilities of a contributing agency under this section.

(3) **SPECIAL RULE FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—

(A) **SPECIAL RULE.**—For purposes of this part, each institution of higher education described in subparagraph (B) shall be treated as a contributing agency in the State in which it is located, except that—

(i) the institution shall be treated as a contributing agency only if, in its normal course of operations, the institution requests each student registering for enrollment in a course of study, including enrollment in a program of distance education, as defined in

section 103(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(7)), to affirm whether or not the student is a United States citizen; and

(ii) if the institution is treated as a contributing agency in a State pursuant to clause (i), the institution shall serve as a contributing agency only with respect to students, including students enrolled in a program of distance education, as defined in section 103(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(7)), who reside in the State.

(B) **INSTITUTIONS DESCRIBED.**—An institution described in this subparagraph is an institution of higher education which has a program participation agreement in effect with the Secretary of Education under section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094) and which is located in a State to which section 4(b) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503(b)) does not apply.

(4) **PUBLICATION.**—Not later than 180 days prior to the date of each election for Federal office held in the State, the chief State election official shall publish on the public website of the official an updated list of all contributing agencies in that State.

(5) **PUBLIC EDUCATION.**—The chief State election official of each State, in collaboration with each contributing agency, shall take appropriate measures to educate the public about voter registration under this section.

SEC. 1014. ONE-TIME CONTRIBUTING AGENCY ASSISTANCE IN REGISTRATION OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS IN EXISTING RECORDS.

(a) **INITIAL TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION.**—For each individual already listed in a contributing agency's records as of the date of enactment of this Act, and for whom the agency has the information listed in section 1013(b)(3), the agency shall promptly transmit that information to the appropriate State election official in accordance with section 1013(b)(3) not later than the effective date described in section 1011(a).

(b) **TRANSITION.**—For each individual listed in a contributing agency's records as of the effective date described in section 1011(a) (but who was not listed in a contributing agency's records as of the date of enactment of this Act), and for whom the agency has the information listed in section 1013(b)(3), the Agency shall promptly transmit that information to the appropriate State election official in accordance with section 1013(b)(3) not later than 6 months after the effective date described in section 1011(a).

SEC. 1015. VOTER PROTECTION AND SECURITY IN AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION.

(a) **PROTECTIONS FOR ERRORS IN REGISTRATION.**—An individual shall not be prosecuted under any Federal or State law, adversely affected in any civil adjudication concerning immigration status or naturalization, or subject to an allegation in any legal proceeding that the individual is not a citizen of the United States on any of the following grounds:

(1) The individual notified an election office of the individual's automatic registration to vote under this part.

(2) The individual is not eligible to vote in elections for Federal office but was automatically registered to vote under this part.

(3) The individual was automatically registered to vote under this part at an incorrect address.

(4) The individual declined the opportunity to register to vote or did not make an affirmation of citizenship, including through automatic registration, under this part.

(b) **LIMITS ON USE OF AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION.**—The automatic registration of any individual or the fact that an individual declined the opportunity to register to vote or

did not make an affirmation of citizenship (including through automatic registration) under this part may not be used as evidence against that individual in any State or Federal law enforcement proceeding, and an individual's lack of knowledge or willfulness of such registration may be demonstrated by the individual's testimony alone.

(c) **PROTECTION OF ELECTION INTEGRITY.**—Nothing in subsections (a) or (b) may be construed to prohibit or restrict any action under color of law against an individual who—

(1) knowingly and willfully makes a false statement to effectuate or perpetuate automatic voter registration by any individual; or

(2) casts a ballot knowingly and willfully in violation of State law or the laws of the United States.

(d) **CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES' PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this part authorizes a contributing agency to collect, retain, transmit, or publicly disclose any of the following:

(1) An individual's decision to decline to register to vote or not to register to vote.

(2) An individual's decision not to affirm his or her citizenship.

(3) Any information that a contributing agency transmits pursuant to section 1013(b)(3), except in pursuing the agency's ordinary course of business.

(e) **ELECTION OFFICIALS' PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE PROHIBITED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), with respect to any individual for whom any State election official receives information from a contributing agency, the State election officials shall not publicly disclose any of the following:

(i) The identity of the contributing agency.

(ii) Any information not necessary to voter registration.

(iii) Any voter information otherwise shielded from disclosure under State law or section 8(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)).

(iv) Any portion of the individual's social security number.

(v) Any portion of the individual's motor vehicle driver's license number.

(vi) The individual's signature.

(vii) The individual's telephone number.

(viii) The individual's email address.

(B) **SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS REGISTERED TO VOTE.**—With respect to any individual for whom any State election official receives information from a contributing agency and who, on the basis of such information, is registered to vote in the State under this part, the State election officials shall not publicly disclose any of the following:

(i) The identity of the contributing agency.

(ii) Any information not necessary to voter registration.

(iii) Any voter information otherwise shielded from disclosure under State law or section 8(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)).

(iv) Any portion of the individual's social security number.

(v) Any portion of the individual's motor vehicle driver's license number.

(vi) The individual's signature.

(2) **VOTER RECORD CHANGES.**—Each State shall maintain for at least 2 years and shall make available for public inspection (and, where available, photocopying at a reasonable cost), including in electronic form and through electronic methods, all records of changes to voter records, including removals, the reasons for removals, and updates.

(3) **DATABASE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall, after pro-

viding the public with notice and the opportunity to comment—

(A) establish standards governing the comparison of data for voter registration list maintenance purposes, identifying as part of such standards the specific data elements, the matching rules used, and how a State may use the data to determine and deem that an individual is ineligible under State law to vote in an election, or to deem a record to be a duplicate or outdated;

(B) ensure that the standards developed pursuant to this paragraph are uniform and nondiscriminatory and are applied in a uniform and nondiscriminatory manner; and

(C) not later than 45 days after the deadline for public notice and comment, publish the standards developed pursuant to this paragraph on the Director's website and make those standards available in written form upon request.

(4) **SECURITY POLICY.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall, after providing the public with notice and the opportunity to comment, publish privacy and security standards for voter registration information not later than 45 days after the deadline for public notice and comment. The standards shall require the chief State election official of each State to adopt a policy that shall specify—

(A) each class of users who shall have authorized access to the computerized statewide voter registration list, specifying for each class the permission and levels of access to be granted, and setting forth other safeguards to protect the privacy, security, and accuracy of the information on the list; and

(B) security safeguards to protect personal information transmitted through the information transmittal processes of section 1013 or section 1014, the online system used pursuant to section 1017, any telephone interface, the maintenance of the voter registration database, and any audit procedure to track access to the system.

(5) **STATE COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—

(A) **CERTIFICATION.**—The chief executive officer of the State shall annually file with the Election Assistance Commission a statement certifying to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology that the State is in compliance with the standards referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4). A State may meet the requirement of the previous sentence by filing with the Commission a statement which reads as follows: “_____ hereby certifies that it is in compliance with the standards referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1015(e) of the Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2019.” (with the blank to be filled in with the name of the State involved).

(B) **PUBLICATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—The chief State election official of a State shall publish on the official's website the policies and procedures established under this section, and shall make those policies and procedures available in written form upon public request.

(C) **FUNDING DEPENDENT ON CERTIFICATION.**—If a State does not timely file the certification required under this paragraph, it shall not receive any payment under this part for the upcoming fiscal year.

(D) **COMPLIANCE OF STATES THAT REQUIRE CHANGES TO STATE LAW.**—In the case of a State that requires State legislation to carry out an activity covered by any certification submitted under this paragraph, for a period of not more than 2 years the State shall be permitted to make the certification notwithstanding that the legislation has not been enacted at the time the certification is submitted, and such State shall submit an addi-

tional certification once such legislation is enacted.

(f) **RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF INFORMATION.**—No person acting under color of law may discriminate against any individual based on, or use for any purpose other than voter registration, election administration, or enforcement relating to election crimes, any of the following:

(1) Voter registration records.

(2) An individual's declaration to register to vote or complete an affirmation of citizenship under section 1013(b).

(3) An individual's voter registration status.

(g) **PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.**—Information collected under this part shall not be used for commercial purposes. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the transmission, exchange, or dissemination of information for political purposes, including the support of campaigns for election for Federal, State, or local public office or the activities of political committees (including committees of political parties) under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

SEC. 1016. REGISTRATION PORTABILITY AND CORRECTION.

(a) **CORRECTING REGISTRATION INFORMATION AT POLLING PLACE.**—Notwithstanding section 302(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082(a)), if an individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in a State, the appropriate election official at the polling place for any such election (including a location used as a polling place on a date other than the date of the election) shall permit the individual to—

(1) update the individual's address for purposes of the records of the election official;

(2) correct any incorrect information relating to the individual, including the individual's name and political party affiliation, in the records of the election official; and

(3) cast a ballot in the election on the basis of the updated address or corrected information, and to have the ballot treated as a regular ballot and not as a provisional ballot under section 302(a) of such Act.

(b) **UPDATES TO COMPUTERIZED STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS.**—If an election official at the polling place receives an updated address or corrected information from an individual under subsection (a), the official shall ensure that the address or information is promptly entered into the computerized Statewide voter registration list in accordance with section 303(a)(1)(A)(vi) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(1)(A)(vi)).

SEC. 1017. PAYMENTS AND GRANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Election Assistance Commission shall make grants to each eligible State to assist the State in implementing the requirements of this part (or, in the case of an exempt State, in implementing its existing automatic voter registration program).

(b) **ELIGIBILITY; APPLICATION.**—A State is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the activities the State will carry out with the grant;

(2) an assurance that the State shall carry out such activities without partisan bias and without promoting any particular point of view regarding any issue; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) **AMOUNT OF GRANT; PRIORITIES.**—The Commission shall determine the amount of a grant made to an eligible State under this

section. In determining the amounts of the grants, the Commission shall give priority to providing funds for those activities which are most likely to accelerate compliance with the requirements of this part (or, in the case of an exempt State, which are most likely to enhance the ability of the State to automatically register individuals to vote through its existing automatic voter registration program), including—

(1) investments supporting electronic information transfer, including electronic collection and transfer of signatures, between contributing agencies and the appropriate State election officials;

(2) updates to online or electronic voter registration systems already operating as of the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) introduction of online voter registration systems in jurisdictions in which those systems did not previously exist; and

(4) public education on the availability of new methods of registering to vote, updating registration, and correcting registration.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(A) \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

(B) such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year.

(2) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authority of this subsection shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

SEC. 1018. TREATMENT OF EXEMPT STATES.

(a) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this part does not apply with respect to an exempt State.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The following provisions of this part apply with respect to an exempt State:

(1) section 1016 (relating to registration portability and correction).

(2) section 1017 (relating to payments and grants).

(3) Section 1019(e) (relating to enforcement).

(4) Section 1019(f) (relating to relation to other laws).

SEC. 1019. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) ACCESSIBILITY OF REGISTRATION SERVICES.—Each contributing agency shall ensure that the services it provides under this part are made available to individuals with disabilities to the same extent as services are made available to all other individuals.

(b) TRANSMISSION THROUGH SECURE THIRD PARTY PERMITTED.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent a contributing agency from contracting with a third party to assist the agency in meeting the information transmittal requirements of this part, so long as the data transmittal complies with the applicable requirements of this part, including the privacy and security provisions of section 1015.

(c) NONPARTISAN, NONDISCRIMINATORY PROVISION OF SERVICES.—The services made available by contributing agencies under this part and by the State under sections 1015 and 1016 shall be made in a manner consistent with paragraphs (4), (5), and (6)(C) of section 7(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506(a)).

(d) NOTICES.—Each State may send notices under this part via electronic mail if the individual has provided an electronic mail address and consented to electronic mail communications for election-related materials. All notices sent pursuant to this part that require a response must offer the individual notified the opportunity to respond at no cost to the individual.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 11 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20510), relating to civil enforcement

and the availability of private rights of action, shall apply with respect to this part in the same manner as such section applies to such Act.

(f) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Except as provided, nothing in this part may be construed to authorize or require conduct prohibited under, or to supersede, restrict, or limit the application of any of the following:

(1) The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

(2) The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

(3) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.).

(4) The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.).

SEC. 1020. DEFINITIONS.

In this part, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “chief State election official” means, with respect to a State, the individual designated by the State under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509) to be responsible for coordination of the State’s responsibilities under such Act.

(2) The term “Commission” means the Election Assistance Commission.

(3) The term “exempt State” means a State which, under law which is in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, operates an automatic voter registration program under which an individual is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State if the individual provides the motor vehicle authority of the State (or, in the case of a State in which an individual is automatically registered to vote at the time the individual applies for benefits or services with a Permanent Dividend Fund of the State, provides the appropriate official of such Fund) with such identifying information as the State may require.

(4) The term “State” means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 1021. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this part and the amendments made by this part shall apply with respect to a State beginning January 1, 2021.

(b) WAIVER.—Subject to the approval of the Commission, if a State certifies to the Commission that the State will not meet the deadline referred to in subsection (a) because of extraordinary circumstances and includes in the certification the reasons for the failure to meet the deadline, subsection (a) shall apply to the State as if the reference in such subsection to “January 1, 2021” were a reference to “January 1, 2023”.

PART 3—SAME DAY VOTER REGISTRATION

SEC. 1031. SAME DAY REGISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 304 and 305 as sections 305 and 306; and

(2) by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 304. SAME DAY REGISTRATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) REGISTRATION.—Each State shall permit any eligible individual on the day of a Federal election and on any day when voting, including early voting, is permitted for a Federal election—

“(A) to register to vote in such election at the polling place using a form that meets the requirements under section 9(b) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (or, if the individual is already registered to vote, to revise any of the individual’s voter registration information); and

“(B) to cast a vote in such election.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply to a State in which, under a State law in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this section, there is no voter registration requirement for individuals in the State with respect to elections for Federal office.

“(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means, with respect to any election for Federal office, an individual who is otherwise qualified to vote in that election.

“(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State shall be required to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) for the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2020 and for any subsequent election for Federal office.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking “sections 301, 302, and 303” and inserting “sub-title A of title III”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 304 and 305 as relating to sections 305 and 306; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 304. Same day registration.”

PART 4—CONDITIONS ON REMOVAL ON BASIS OF INTERSTATE CROSS-CHECKS

SEC. 1041. CONDITIONS ON REMOVAL OF REGISTRANTS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS ON BASIS OF INTERSTATE CROSS-CHECKS.

(a) MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR REMOVAL UNDER CROSS-CHECK.—Section 8(c)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) To the extent that the program carried out by a State under subparagraph (A) to systematically remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters uses information obtained in an interstate cross-check, in addition to any other conditions imposed under this Act on the authority of the State to remove the name of the voter from such a list, the State may not remove the name of the voter from such a list unless—

“(i) the State obtained the voter’s full name (including the voter’s middle name, if any) and date of birth, and the last 4 digits of the voter’s social security number, in the interstate cross-check; or

“(ii) the State obtained documentation from the ERIC system that the voter is no longer a resident of the State.

“(C) In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘interstate cross-check’ means the transmission of information from an election official in one State to an election official of another State; and

“(ii) the term ‘ERIC system’ means the system operated by the Electronic Registration Information Center to share voter registration information and voter identification information among participating States.”

(b) REQUIRING COMPLETION OF CROSS-CHECKS NOT LATER THAN 6 MONTHS PRIOR TO ELECTION.—Subparagraph (A) of section 8(c)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)) is amended by striking “not later than 90 days” and inserting the following: “not later than 90 days (or, in the case of a program in which the State uses interstate cross-checks, not later than 6 months)”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 8(c)(2) of such Act (52

U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “Subparagraph (A)” and inserting “This paragraph”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections held on or after the expiration of the 6-month period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

PART 5—OTHER INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE VOTER REGISTRATION

SEC. 1051. ANNUAL REPORTS ON VOTER REGISTRATION STATISTICS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the end of each year, each State shall submit to the Election Assistance Commission and Congress a report containing the following categories of information for the year:

(1) The number of individuals who were registered under part 2.

(2) The number of voter registration application forms completed by individuals that were transmitted by motor vehicle authorities in the State (pursuant to section 5(d) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993) and voter registration agencies in the State (as designated under section 7 of such Act) to the chief State election official of the State, broken down by each such authority and agency.

(3) The number of such individuals whose voter registration application forms were accepted and who were registered to vote in the State and the number of such individuals whose forms were rejected and who were not registered to vote in the State, broken down by each such authority and agency.

(4) The number of change of address forms and other forms of information indicating that an individual’s identifying information has been changed that were transmitted by such motor vehicle authorities and voter registration agencies to the chief State election official of the State, broken down by each such authority and agency and the type of form transmitted.

(5) The number of individuals on the Statewide computerized voter registration list (as established and maintained under section 303 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002) whose voter registration information was revised by the chief State election official as a result of the forms transmitted to the official by such motor vehicle authorities and voter registration agencies (as described in paragraph (3)), broken down by each such authority and agency and the type of form transmitted.

(6) The number of individuals who requested the chief State election official to revise voter registration information on such list, and the number of individuals whose information was revised as a result of such a request.

(b) **BREAKDOWN OF INFORMATION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY OF INDIVIDUALS.**—In preparing the report under this section, the State shall, for each category of information described in subsection (a), include a breakdown by race and ethnicity of the individuals whose information is included in the category, to the extent that information on the race and ethnicity of such individuals is available to the State.

(c) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**—In preparing and submitting a report under this section, the chief State election official shall ensure that no information regarding the identification of any individual is revealed.

(d) **STATE DEFINED.**—In this section, a “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, but does not include any State in which, under a State law

in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, there is no voter registration requirement for individuals in the State with respect to elections for Federal office.

PART 6—AVAILABILITY OF HAVA REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS

SEC. 1061. AVAILABILITY OF REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS UNDER HAVA TO COVER COSTS OF COMPLIANCE WITH NEW REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 251(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “as otherwise provided in this subsection”; and

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

“(4) **CERTAIN VOTER REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.**—A State may use a requirements payment to carry out any of the requirements of the Voter Registration Modernization Act of 2019, including the requirements of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 which are imposed pursuant to the amendments made to such Act by the Voter Registration Modernization Act of 2019.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 254(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21004(a)(1)) is amended by striking “section 251(a)(2)” and inserting “section 251(b)(2)”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year.

PART 7—PROHIBITING INTERFERENCE WITH VOTER REGISTRATION

SEC. 1071. PROHIBITING HINDERING, INTERFERING WITH, OR PREVENTING VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 612. **Hindering, interfering with, or preventing registering to vote**

“(a) **PROHIBITION.**—It shall be unlawful for any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, to corruptly hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from registering to vote or to corruptly hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from aiding another person in registering to vote.

“(b) **ATTEMPT.**—Any person who attempts to commit any offense described in subsection (a) shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense that the person attempted to commit.

“(c) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“612. Hindering, interfering with, or preventing registering to vote.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no person may be found to have violated section 612 of title 18, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), on the basis of any act occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1072. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) **BEST PRACTICES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall develop and publish recommendations for best practices for States to use to deter and prevent violations of section 612 of title 18, United States Code (as added by section

1071), and section 12 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20511) (relating to the unlawful interference with registering to vote, or voting, or attempting to register to vote or vote), including practices to provide for the posting of relevant information at polling places and voter registration agencies under such Act, the training of poll workers and election officials, and relevant educational materials. For purposes of this subsection, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) **INCLUSION IN VOTER INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 302(b)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(G) information relating to the prohibitions of section 612 of title 18, United States Code, and section 12 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20511) (relating to the unlawful interference with registering to vote, or voting, or attempting to register to vote or vote), including information on how individuals may report allegations of violations of such prohibitions.”

Subtitle B—Access to Voting for Individuals With Disabilities

SEC. 1101. REQUIREMENTS FOR STATES TO PROMOTE ACCESS TO VOTER REGISTRATION AND VOTING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1031(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 305 and 306 as sections 306 and 307; and

(2) by inserting after section 304 the following new section:

“**SEC. 305. ACCESS TO VOTER REGISTRATION AND VOTING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.**

“(a) **TREATMENT OF APPLICATIONS AND BALLOTS.**—Each State shall—

“(1) permit individuals with disabilities to use absentee registration procedures and to vote by absentee ballot in elections for Federal office;

“(2) accept and process, with respect to any election for Federal office, any otherwise valid voter registration application and absentee ballot application from an individual with a disability if the application is received by the appropriate State election official within the deadline for the election which is applicable under Federal law;

“(3) in addition to any other method of registering to vote or applying for an absentee ballot in the State, establish procedures—

“(A) for individuals with disabilities to request by mail and electronically voter registration applications and absentee ballot applications with respect to elections for Federal office in accordance with subsection (c);

“(B) for States to send by mail and electronically (in accordance with the preferred method of transmission designated by the individual under subparagraph (C)) voter registration applications and absentee ballot applications requested under subparagraph (A) in accordance with subsection (c); and

“(C) by which such an individual can designate whether the individual prefers that such voter registration application or absentee ballot application be transmitted by mail or electronically;

“(4) in addition to any other method of transmitting blank absentee ballots in the State, establish procedures for transmitting by mail and electronically blank absentee ballots to individuals with disabilities with respect to elections for Federal office in accordance with subsection (d);

“(5) transmit a validly requested absentee ballot to an individual with a disability—

“(A) except as provided in subsection (e), in the case in which the request is received at least 45 days before an election for Federal office, not later than 45 days before the election; and

“(B) in the case in which the request is received less than 45 days before an election for Federal office—

“(i) in accordance with State law; and

“(ii) if practicable and as determined appropriate by the State, in a manner that expedites the transmission of such absentee ballot; and

“(6) if the State declares or otherwise holds a runoff election for Federal office, establish a written plan that provides absentee ballots are made available to individuals with disabilities in a manner that gives them sufficient time to vote in the runoff election.

“(b) DESIGNATION OF SINGLE STATE OFFICE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON REGISTRATION AND ABSENTEE BALLOT PROCEDURES FOR ALL DISABLED VOTERS IN STATE.—Each State shall designate a single office which shall be responsible for providing information regarding voter registration procedures and absentee ballot procedures to be used by individuals with disabilities with respect to elections for Federal office to all individuals with disabilities who wish to register to vote or vote in any jurisdiction in the State.

“(c) DESIGNATION OF MEANS OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES TO REQUEST AND FOR STATES TO SEND VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES RELATED TO VOTING INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall, in addition to the designation of a single State office under subsection (b), designate not less than 1 means of electronic communication—

“(A) for use by individuals with disabilities who wish to register to vote or vote in any jurisdiction in the State to request voter registration applications and absentee ballot applications under subsection (a)(3);

“(B) for use by States to send voter registration applications and absentee ballot applications requested under such subsection; and

“(C) for the purpose of providing related voting, balloting, and election information to individuals with disabilities.

“(2) CLARIFICATION REGARDING PROVISION OF MULTIPLE MEANS OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION.—A State may, in addition to the means of electronic communication so designated, provide multiple means of electronic communication to individuals with disabilities, including a means of electronic communication for the appropriate jurisdiction of the State.

“(3) INCLUSION OF DESIGNATED MEANS OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION WITH INFORMATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS THAT ACCOMPANY BALLOTING MATERIALS.—Each State shall include a means of electronic communication so designated with all informational and instructional materials that accompany balloting materials sent by the State to individuals with disabilities.

“(4) TRANSMISSION IF NO PREFERENCE INDICATED.—In the case where an individual with a disability does not designate a preference under subsection (a)(3)(C), the State shall transmit the voter registration application or absentee ballot application by any delivery method allowable in accordance with ap-

plicable State law, or if there is no applicable State law, by mail.

“(d) TRANSMISSION OF BLANK ABSENTEE BALLOTS BY MAIL AND ELECTRONICALLY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish procedures—

“(A) to securely transmit blank absentee ballots by mail and electronically (in accordance with the preferred method of transmission designated by the individual with a disability under subparagraph (B)) to individuals with disabilities for an election for Federal office; and

“(B) by which the individual with a disability can designate whether the individual prefers that such blank absentee ballot be transmitted by mail or electronically.

“(2) TRANSMISSION IF NO PREFERENCE INDICATED.—In the case where an individual with a disability does not designate a preference under paragraph (1)(B), the State shall transmit the ballot by any delivery method allowable in accordance with applicable State law, or if there is no applicable State law, by mail.

“(3) APPLICATION OF METHODS TO TRACK DELIVERY TO AND RETURN OF BALLOT BY INDIVIDUAL REQUESTING BALLOT.—Under the procedures established under paragraph (1), the State shall apply such methods as the State considers appropriate, such as assigning a unique identifier to the ballot, to ensure that if an individual with a disability requests the State to transmit a blank absentee ballot to the individual in accordance with this subsection, the voted absentee ballot which is returned by the individual is the same blank absentee ballot which the State transmitted to the individual.

“(e) HARDSHIP EXEMPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the chief State election official determines that the State is unable to meet the requirement under subsection (a)(5)(A) with respect to an election for Federal office due to an undue hardship described in paragraph (2)(B), the chief State election official shall request that the Attorney General grant a waiver to the State of the application of such subsection. Such request shall include—

“(A) a recognition that the purpose of such subsection is to individuals with disabilities enough time to vote in an election for Federal office;

“(B) an explanation of the hardship that indicates why the State is unable to transmit such individuals an absentee ballot in accordance with such subsection;

“(C) the number of days prior to the election for Federal office that the State requires absentee ballots be transmitted to such individuals; and

“(D) a comprehensive plan to ensure that such individuals are able to receive absentee ballots which they have requested and submit marked absentee ballots to the appropriate State election official in time to have that ballot counted in the election for Federal office, which includes—

“(i) the steps the State will undertake to ensure that such individuals have time to receive, mark, and submit their ballots in time to have those ballots counted in the election;

“(ii) why the plan provides such individuals sufficient time to vote as a substitute for the requirements under such subsection; and

“(iii) the underlying factual information which explains how the plan provides such sufficient time to vote as a substitute for such requirements.

“(2) APPROVAL OF WAIVER REQUEST.—The Attorney General shall approve a waiver request under paragraph (1) if the Attorney General determines each of the following requirements are met:

“(A) The comprehensive plan under subparagraph (D) of such paragraph provides in-

dividuals with disabilities sufficient time to receive absentee ballots they have requested and submit marked absentee ballots to the appropriate State election official in time to have that ballot counted in the election for Federal office.

“(B) One or more of the following issues creates an undue hardship for the State:

“(i) The State's primary election date prohibits the State from complying with subsection (a)(5)(A).

“(ii) The State has suffered a delay in generating ballots due to a legal contest.

“(iii) The State Constitution prohibits the State from complying with such subsection.

“(3) TIMING OF WAIVER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), a State that requests a waiver under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Attorney General the written waiver request not later than 90 days before the election for Federal office with respect to which the request is submitted. The Attorney General shall approve or deny the waiver request not later than 65 days before such election.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—If a State requests a waiver under paragraph (1) as the result of an undue hardship described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), the State shall submit to the Attorney General the written waiver request as soon as practicable. The Attorney General shall approve or deny the waiver request not later than 5 business days after the date on which the request is received.

“(4) APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—A waiver approved under paragraph (2) shall only apply with respect to the election for Federal office for which the request was submitted. For each subsequent election for Federal office, the Attorney General shall only approve a waiver if the State has submitted a request under paragraph (1) with respect to such election.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to allow the marking or casting of ballots over the internet.

“(g) INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY DEFINED.—In this section, an ‘individual with a disability’ means an individual with an impairment that substantially limits any major life activities and who is otherwise qualified to vote in elections for Federal office.

“(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held on or after January 1, 2020.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 311(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21101(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(4) in the case of the recommendations with respect to section 305, January 1, 2020.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1031(c), is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 305 and 306 as relating to sections 306 and 307; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 304 the following new item:

“Sec. 305. Access to voter registration and voting for individuals with disabilities.”

SEC. 1102. EXPANSION AND REAUTHORIZATION OF GRANT PROGRAM TO ASSURE VOTING ACCESS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) PURPOSES OF PAYMENTS.—Section 261(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21021(b)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) making absentee voting and voting at home accessible to individuals with the full range of disabilities (including impairments involving vision, hearing, mobility, or dexterity) through the implementation of accessible absentee voting systems that work in conjunction with assistive technologies for which individuals have access at their homes, independent living centers, or other facilities;

“(2) making polling places, including the path of travel, entrances, exits, and voting areas of each polling facility, accessible to individuals with disabilities, including the blind and visually impaired, in a manner that provides the same opportunity for access and participation (including privacy and independence) as for other voters; and

“(3) providing solutions to problems of access to voting and elections for individuals with disabilities that are universally designed and provide the same opportunities for individuals with and without disabilities.”

(b) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 264(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21024(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) For fiscal year 2020 and each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.”

(c) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 264 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21024) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “Any amounts” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), any amounts”; and

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

“(c) RETURN AND TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—

“(1) DEADLINE FOR OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE.—In the case of any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authority of subsection (a) for a payment to a State or unit of local government for fiscal year 2020 or any succeeding fiscal year, any portion of such amounts which have not been obligated or expended by the State or unit of local government prior to the expiration of the 4-year period which begins on the date the State or unit of local government first received the amounts shall be transferred to the Commission.

“(2) REALLOCATION OF TRANSFERRED AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall use the amounts transferred under paragraph (1) to make payments on a pro rata basis to each covered payment recipient described in subparagraph (B), which may obligate and expend such payment for the purposes described in section 261(b) during the 1-year period which begins on the date of receipt.

“(B) COVERED PAYMENT RECIPIENTS DESCRIBED.—In subparagraph (A), a ‘covered payment recipient’ is a State or unit of local government with respect to which—

“(i) amounts were appropriated pursuant to the authority of subsection (a); and

“(ii) no amounts were transferred to the Commission under paragraph (1).”

SEC. 1103. PILOT PROGRAMS FOR ENABLING INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES TO REGISTER TO VOTE PRIVATELY AND INDEPENDENTLY AT RESIDENCES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter referred to as the “Commission”) shall, subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, make grants to eligible States to conduct pilot programs under which individuals with disabilities may use electronic means (including the Internet and telephones utilizing assistive devices) to register to vote and to request and receive absentee ballots in a manner which permits such individuals to do so privately and independently at their own residences.

(b) REPORTS—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State receiving a grant for a year under this section shall submit a

report to the Commission on the pilot programs the State carried out with the grant with respect to elections for public office held in the State during the year.

(2) DEADLINE.—A State shall submit a report under paragraph (1) not later than 90 days after the last election for public office held in the State during the year.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—A State is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing such information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(d) TIMING.—The Commission shall make the first grants under this section for pilot programs which will be in effect with respect to elections for Federal office held in 2020, or, at the option of a State, with respect to other elections for public office held in the State in 2020.

(e) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Subtitle C—Prohibiting Voter Caging

SEC. 1201. VOTER CAGING AND OTHER QUESTIONABLE CHALLENGES PROHIBITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 1071(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 613. Voter caging and other questionable challenges

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘voter caging document’ means—

“(A) a nonforwardable document that is returned to the sender or a third party as undelivered or undeliverable despite an attempt to deliver such document to the address of a registered voter or applicant; or

“(B) any document with instructions to an addressee that the document be returned to the sender or a third party but is not so returned, despite an attempt to deliver such document to the address of a registered voter or applicant, unless at least two Federal election cycles have passed since the date of the attempted delivery;

“(2) the term ‘voter caging list’ means a list of individuals compiled from voter caging documents; and

“(3) the term ‘unverified match list’ means a list produced by matching the information of registered voters or applicants for voter registration to a list of individuals who are ineligible to vote in the registrar’s jurisdiction, by virtue of death, conviction, change of address, or otherwise; unless one of the pieces of information matched includes a signature, photograph, or unique identifying number ensuring that the information from each source refers to the same individual.

“(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST VOTER CAGING.—No State or local election official shall prevent an individual from registering or voting in any election for Federal office, or permit in connection with any election for Federal office a formal challenge under State law to an individual’s registration status or eligibility to vote, if the basis for such decision is evidence consisting of—

“(1) a voter caging document or voter caging list;

“(2) an unverified match list;

“(3) an error or omission on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material to an individual’s eligibility to vote under section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (52 U.S.C. 10101(a)(2)(B)); or

“(4) any other evidence so designated for purposes of this section by the Election Assistance Commission,

except that the election official may use such evidence if it is corroborated by independent evidence of the individual’s ineligibility to register or vote.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR CHALLENGES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN ELECTION OFFICIALS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR CHALLENGES.—No person, other than a State or local election official, shall submit a formal challenge to an individual’s eligibility to register to vote in an election for Federal office or to vote in an election for Federal office unless that challenge is supported by personal knowledge regarding the grounds for ineligibility which is—

“(A) documented in writing; and

“(B) subject to an oath or attestation under penalty of perjury that the challenger has a good faith factual basis to believe that the individual who is the subject of the challenge is ineligible to register to vote or vote in that election, except a challenge which is based on the race, ethnicity, or national origin of the individual who is the subject of the challenge may not be considered to have a good faith factual basis for purposes of this paragraph.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON CHALLENGES ON OR NEAR DATE OF ELECTION.—No person, other than a State or local election official, shall be permitted—

“(A) to challenge an individual’s eligibility to vote in an election for Federal office on Election Day, or

“(B) to challenge an individual’s eligibility to register to vote in an election for Federal office or to vote in an election for Federal office less than 10 days before the election unless the individual registered to vote less than 20 days before the election.

“(d) PENALTIES FOR KNOWING MISCONDUCT.—Whoever knowingly challenges the eligibility of one or more individuals to register or vote or knowingly causes the eligibility of such individuals to be challenged in violation of this section with the intent that one or more eligible voters be disqualified, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, for each such violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense.

“(e) NO EFFECT ON RELATED LAWS.—Nothing in this section is intended to override the protections of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.) or to affect the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 1071(b), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“613. Voter caging and other questionable challenges.”

SEC. 1202. DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF BEST PRACTICES FOR PREVENTING VOTER CAGING.

(a) BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall develop and publish for the use of States recommendations for best practices to deter and prevent violations of section 613 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 1201(a), including practices to provide for the posting of relevant information at polling places and voter registration agencies, the training of poll workers and election officials, and relevant educational measures. For purposes of this subsection, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) INCLUSION IN VOTING INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 302(b)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082(b)(2)), as amended by section 1072(b), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (F);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (G) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(H) information relating to the prohibition against voter caging and other questionable challenges (as set forth in section 613 of title 18, United States Code), including information on how individuals may report allegations of violations of such prohibition.”.

Subtitle D—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019”.

SEC. 1302. 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, 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.”.

(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”; and

(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. 1303. 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 1302(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. 1304. 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 1302(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 1302(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 E—Democracy Restoration

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Democracy Restoration Act of 2019”.

SEC. 1402. RIGHTS OF CITIZENS.

The right of an individual who is a citizen of the United States to vote in any election for Federal office shall not be denied or abridged because that individual has been convicted of a criminal offense unless such individual is serving a felony sentence in a correctional institution or facility at the time of the election.

SEC. 1403. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, in a civil action, obtain such declaratory or injunctive relief as is necessary to remedy a violation of this subtitle.

(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A person who is aggrieved by a violation of this subtitle may provide written notice of the violation to the chief election official of the State involved.

(2) RELIEF.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if the violation is not corrected within 90 days after receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), or within 20 days after receipt of the notice if the violation occurred within 120 days before the date of an election for Federal office, the aggrieved person may, in a civil action, obtain declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the violation.

(3) EXCEPTION.—If the violation occurred within 30 days before the date of an election for Federal office, the aggrieved person need not provide notice to the chief election official of the State under paragraph (1) before bringing a civil action to obtain declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the violation.

SEC. 1404. NOTIFICATION OF RESTORATION OF VOTING RIGHTS.

(a) STATE NOTIFICATION.—

(1) NOTIFICATION.—On the date determined under paragraph (2), each State shall notify in writing any individual who has been convicted of a criminal offense under the law of that State that such individual has the right to vote in an election for Federal office pursuant to the Democracy Restoration Act of 2019 and may register to vote in any such election.

(2) DATE OF NOTIFICATION.—

(A) FELONY CONVICTION.—In the case of such an individual who has been convicted of a felony, the notification required under paragraph (1) shall be given on the date on which the individual—

(i) is sentenced to serve only a term of probation; or

(ii) is released from the custody of that State (other than to the custody of another

State or the Federal Government to serve a term of imprisonment for a felony conviction).

(B) MISDEMEANOR CONVICTION.—In the case of such an individual who has been convicted of a misdemeanor, the notification required under paragraph (1) shall be given on the date on which such individual is sentenced by a State court.

(b) FEDERAL NOTIFICATION.—

(1) NOTIFICATION.—Any individual who has been convicted of a criminal offense under Federal law shall be notified in accordance with paragraph (2) that such individual has the right to vote in an election for Federal office pursuant to the Democracy Restoration Act of 2019 and may register to vote in any such election.

(2) DATE OF NOTIFICATION.—

(A) FELONY CONVICTION.—In the case of such an individual who has been convicted of a felony, the notification required under paragraph (1) shall be given—

(i) in the case of an individual who is sentenced to serve only a term of probation, by the Assistant Director for the Office of Probation and Pretrial Services of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on the date on which the individual is sentenced; or

(ii) in the case of any individual committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, during the period beginning on the date that is 6 months before such individual is released and ending on the date such individual is released from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

(B) MISDEMEANOR CONVICTION.—In the case of such an individual who has been convicted of a misdemeanor, the notification required under paragraph (1) shall be given on the date on which such individual is sentenced by a court established by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 1405. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION OR FACILITY.—The term “correctional institution or facility” means any prison, penitentiary, jail, or other institution or facility for the confinement of individuals convicted of criminal offenses, whether publicly or privately operated, except that such term does not include any residential community treatment center (or similar public or private facility).

(2) ELECTION.—The term “election” means—

(A) a general, special, primary, or runoff election;

(B) a convention or caucus of a political party held to nominate a candidate;

(C) a primary election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party; or

(D) a primary election held for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President.

(3) FEDERAL OFFICE.—The term “Federal office” means the office of President or Vice President of the United States, or of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States.

(4) PROBATION.—The term “probation” means probation, imposed by a Federal, State, or local court, with or without a condition on the individual involved concerning—

(A) the individual’s freedom of movement;

(B) the payment of damages by the individual;

(C) periodic reporting by the individual to an officer of the court; or

(D) supervision of the individual by an officer of the court.

SEC. 1406. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) STATE LAWS RELATING TO VOTING RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subtitle be construed to prohibit the States from enacting any State law which affords the right to vote in any election for Federal office on terms less restrictive than those established by this subtitle.

(b) CERTAIN FEDERAL ACTS.—The rights and remedies established by this subtitle are in addition to all other rights and remedies provided by law, and neither rights and remedies established by this Act shall supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) or the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.).

SEC. 1407. FEDERAL PRISON FUNDS.

No State, unit of local government, or other person may receive or use, to construct or otherwise improve a prison, jail, or other place of incarceration, any Federal funds unless that person has in effect a program under which each individual incarcerated in that person's jurisdiction who is a citizen of the United States is notified, upon release from such incarceration, of that individual's rights under section 1402.

SEC. 1408. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle shall apply to citizens of the United States voting in any election for Federal office held after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle F—Promoting Accuracy, Integrity, and Security Through Voter-Verified Permanent Paper Ballot**SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the "Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019".

SEC. 1502. PAPER BALLOT AND MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) VOTER-VERIFIED PAPER BALLOTS.—

“(i) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—(I) The voting system shall require the use of an individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot of the voter's vote that shall be marked and made available for inspection and verification by the voter before the voter's vote is cast and counted, and which shall be counted by hand or read by an optical character recognition device or other counting device. For purposes of this subclause, the term ‘individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot’ means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or a paper ballot marked through the use of a nontabulating ballot marking device or system, so long as the voter shall have the option to mark his or her ballot by hand.

“(II) The voting system shall provide the voter with an opportunity to correct any error on the paper ballot before the permanent voter-verified paper ballot is preserved in accordance with clause (ii).

“(III) The voting system shall not preserve the voter-verified paper ballots in any manner that makes it possible, at any time after the ballot has been cast, to associate a voter with the record of the voter's vote without the voter's consent.

“(ii) PRESERVATION AS OFFICIAL RECORD.—The individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot used in accordance with clause (i) shall constitute the official ballot and shall be preserved and used as the official ballot for purposes of any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office in which the voting system is used.

“(iii) MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOUNTS AND AUDITS.—(I) Each paper ballot

used pursuant to clause (i) shall be suitable for a manual audit, and shall be counted by hand in any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office.

“(II) In the event of any inconsistencies or irregularities between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to clause (i), and subject to subparagraph (B), the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots shall be the true and correct record of the votes cast.

“(iv) APPLICATION TO ALL BALLOTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph shall apply to all ballots cast in elections for Federal office, including ballots cast by absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and other absentee voters.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR TREATMENT OF DISPUTES WHEN PAPER BALLOTS HAVE BEEN SHOWN TO BE COMPROMISED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the event that—

“(I) there is any inconsistency between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) with respect to any election for Federal office; and

“(II) it is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence (as determined in accordance with the applicable standards in the jurisdiction involved) in any recount, audit, or contest of the result of the election that the paper ballots have been compromised (by damage or mischief or otherwise) and that a sufficient number of the ballots have been so compromised that the result of the election could be changed,

the determination of the appropriate remedy with respect to the election shall be made in accordance with applicable State law, except that the electronic tally shall not be used as the exclusive basis for determining the official certified result.

“(ii) RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BALLOTS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH VOTING MACHINE.—For purposes of clause (i), only the paper ballots deemed compromised, if any, shall be considered in the calculation of whether or not the result of the election could be changed due to the compromised paper ballots.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT CLARIFYING APPLICABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY.—Section 301(a)(4) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(4)) is amended by inserting “(including the paper ballots required to be used under paragraph (2))” after “voting system”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 301(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(3) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “counted” each place it appears and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(4) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

SEC. 1503. ACCESSIBILITY AND BALLOT VERIFICATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a)(3)(B) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B)(i) ensure that individuals with disabilities and others are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with privacy

and independence, in a manner that produces a voter-verified paper ballot as for other voters;

“(ii) satisfy the requirement of subparagraph (A) through the use of at least one voting system equipped for individuals with disabilities, including nonvisual and enhanced visual accessibility for the blind and visually impaired, and nonmanual and enhanced manual accessibility for the mobility and dexterity impaired, at each polling place; and

“(iii) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) and paragraph (2)(A) by using a system that—

“(I) allows the voter to privately and independently verify the permanent paper ballot through the presentation, in accessible form, of the printed or marked vote selections from the same printed or marked information that would be used for any vote counting or auditing; and

“(II) allows the voter to privately and independently verify and cast the permanent paper ballot without requiring the voter to manually handle the paper ballot;”.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT OF STUDY, TESTING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.—

(1) STUDY AND REPORTING.—Subtitle C of title II of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 247 as section 248; and

(B) by inserting after section 246 the following new section:

“SEC. 247. STUDY AND REPORT ON ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.

“(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make grants to not fewer than 3 eligible entities to study, test, and develop accessible paper ballot voting, verification, and casting mechanisms and devices and best practices to enhance the accessibility of paper ballot voting and verification mechanisms for individuals with disabilities, for voters whose primary language is not English, and for voters with difficulties in literacy, including best practices for the mechanisms themselves and the processes through which the mechanisms are used.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An entity is eligible to receive a grant under this part if it submits to the Director (at such time and in such form as the Director may require) an application containing—

“(1) certifications that the entity shall specifically investigate enhanced methods or devices, including non-electronic devices, that will assist such individuals and voters in marking voter-verified paper ballots and presenting or transmitting the information printed or marked on such ballots back to such individuals and voters, and casting such ballots;

“(2) a certification that the entity shall complete the activities carried out with the grant not later than December 31, 2020; and

“(3) such other information and certifications as the Director may require.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF TECHNOLOGY.—Any technology developed with the grants made under this section shall be treated as nonproprietary and shall be made available to the public, including to manufacturers of voting systems.

“(d) COORDINATION WITH GRANTS FOR TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS.—The Director shall carry out this section so that the activities carried out with the grants made under subsection (a) are coordinated with the research conducted under the grant program carried out by the Commission under section 271, to the extent that the Director and Commission determine necessary to provide for the advancement of accessible voting technology.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to

carry out subsection (a) \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating the item relating to section 247 as relating to section 248; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 246 the following new item:

“Sec. 247. Study and report on accessible paper ballot verification mechanisms.”.

(C) CLARIFICATION OF ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS UNDER VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDANCE.—In adopting any voluntary guidance under subtitle B of title III of the Help America Vote Act with respect to the accessibility of the paper ballot verification requirements for individuals with disabilities, the Election Assistance Commission shall include and apply the same accessibility standards applicable under the voluntary guidance adopted for accessible voting systems under such subtitle.

(d) PERMITTING USE OF FUNDS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT ACTIONS TO ENFORCE ELECTION-RELATED DISABILITY ACCESS.—Section 292(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21062(a)) is amended by striking “; except that” and all that follows and inserting a period.

SEC. 1504. DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—

“(A) DURABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—All voter-verified paper ballots required to be used under this Act shall be marked or printed on durable paper.

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this Act, paper is ‘durable’ if it is capable of withstanding multiple counts and recounts by hand without compromising the fundamental integrity of the ballots, and capable of retaining the information marked or printed on them for the full duration of a retention and preservation period of 22 months.

“(B) READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS MARKED BY BALLOT MARKING DEVICE.—All voter-verified paper ballots completed by the voter through the use of a ballot marking device shall be clearly readable by the voter without assistance (other than eyeglasses or other personal vision enhancing devices) and by an optical character recognition device or other device equipped for individuals with disabilities.”.

SEC. 1505. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR NEW REQUIREMENTS.

Section 301(d) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section on and after January 1, 2006.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the requirements of this section which are first imposed on a State and jurisdiction pursuant to the amendments made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019 shall apply with respect to voting systems used for any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

“(B) DELAY FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN PAPER RECORD PRINTERS OR CERTAIN SYSTEMS USING OR PRODUCING VOTER-VERIFIABLE PAPER RECORDS IN 2018.—

“(i) DELAY.—In the case of a jurisdiction described in clause (ii), subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to ‘2020’ were a reference to ‘2022’, but only with respect to the following requirements of this section:

“(I) Paragraph (2)(A)(i)(I) of subsection (a) (relating to the use of voter-verified paper ballots).

“(II) Paragraph (3)(B)(ii)(I) and (II) of subsection (a) (relating to access to verification from and casting of the durable paper ballot).

“(III) Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) (relating to durability and readability requirements for ballots).

“(ii) JURISDICTIONS DESCRIBED.—A jurisdiction described in this clause is a jurisdiction—

“(I) which used voter verifiable paper record printers attached to direct recording electronic voting machines, or which used other voting systems that used or produced paper records of the vote verifiable by voters but that are not in compliance with paragraphs (2)(A)(i)(I), (3)(B)(iii)(I) and (II), and (7) of subsection (a) (as amended or added by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019), for the administration of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2018; and

“(II) which will continue to use such printers or systems for the administration of elections for Federal office held in years before 2022.

“(iii) MANDATORY AVAILABILITY OF PAPER BALLOTS AT POLLING PLACES USING GRANDFATHERED PRINTERS AND SYSTEMS.—

“(I) REQUIRING BALLOTS TO BE OFFERED AND PROVIDED.—The appropriate election official at each polling place that uses a printer or system described in clause (ii)(I) for the administration of elections for Federal office shall offer each individual who is eligible to cast a vote in the election at the polling place the opportunity to cast the vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot which the individual may mark by hand and which is not produced by the direct recording electronic voting machine or other such system. The official shall provide the individual with the ballot and the supplies necessary to mark the ballot, and shall ensure (to the greatest extent practicable) that the waiting period for the individual to cast a vote is the lesser of 30 minutes or the average waiting period for an individual who does not agree to cast the vote using such a paper ballot under this clause.

“(II) TREATMENT OF BALLOT.—Any paper ballot which is cast by an individual under this clause shall be counted and otherwise treated as a regular ballot for all purposes (including by incorporating it into the final unofficial vote count (as defined by the State) for the precinct) and not as a provisional ballot, unless the individual casting the ballot would have otherwise been required to cast a provisional ballot.

“(III) POSTING OF NOTICE.—The appropriate election official shall ensure there is prominently displayed at each polling place a notice that describes the obligation of the official to offer individuals the opportunity to cast votes using a pre-printed blank paper ballot.

“(IV) TRAINING OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.—The chief State election official shall ensure that election officials at polling places in the State are aware of the requirements of this clause, including the requirement to display a notice under subclause (III), and are aware that it is a violation of the requirements of this title for an election official to fail to offer an individual the opportunity to cast a vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot.

“(V) PERIOD OF APPLICABILITY.—The requirements of this clause apply only during the period in which the delay is in effect under clause (i).

“(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN NONTABULATING BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—In the case of a jurisdiction which uses a nontabulating ballot marking device which automatically deposits the ballot into a privacy sleeve, subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to ‘any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year’ were a reference to ‘elections for Federal office occurring held in 2022 or each succeeding year’, but only with respect to paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(II) of subsection (a) (relating to nonmanual casting of the durable paper ballot).”.

Subtitle G—Provisional Ballots

SEC. 1601. REQUIREMENTS FOR COUNTING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS; ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) STATEWIDE COUNTING OF PROVISIONAL BALLOTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), notwithstanding the precinct or polling place at which a provisional ballot is cast within the State, the appropriate election official shall count each vote on such ballot for each election in which the individual who cast such ballot is eligible to vote.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.

“(e) UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the requirements of this section, each State shall establish uniform and nondiscriminatory standards for the issuance, handling, and counting of provisional ballots.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 302(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21082(f)), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking “Each State” and inserting “Except as provided in subsections (d)(2) and (e)(2), each State”.

Subtitle H—Early Voting

SEC. 1611. EARLY VOTING.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1031(a) and section 1101(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 306 and 307 as sections 307 and 308; and

(2) by inserting after section 305 the following new section:

“SEC. 306. EARLY VOTING.

“(a) REQUIRING VOTING PRIOR TO DATE OF ELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall allow individuals to vote in an election for Federal office during an early voting period which occurs prior to the date of the election, in the same manner as voting is allowed on such date.

“(2) LENGTH OF PERIOD.—The early voting period required under this subsection with respect to an election shall consist of a period of consecutive days (including weekends) which begins on the 15th day before the date of the election (or, at the option of the State, on a day prior to the 15th day before the date of the election) and ends on the date of the election.

“(b) MINIMUM EARLY VOTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each polling place which allows voting during an early voting period under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) allow such voting for no less than 4 hours on each day, except that the polling place may allow such voting for fewer than 4 hours on Sundays; and

“(2) have uniform hours each day for which such voting occurs.

“(c) LOCATION OF POLLING PLACES NEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.—To the greatest extent practicable, a State shall ensure that each polling place which allows voting during an early voting period under subsection (a) is located within walking distance of a stop on a public transportation route.

“(d) STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall issue standards for the administration of voting prior to the day scheduled for a Federal election. Such standards shall include the nondiscriminatory geographic placement of polling places at which such voting occurs.

“(2) DEVIATION.—The standards described in paragraph (1) shall permit States, upon providing adequate public notice, to deviate from any requirement in the case of unforeseen circumstances such as a natural disaster, terrorist attack, or a change in voter turnout.

“(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 311(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21101(b)), as amended by section 1101(b), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(5) in the case of the recommendations with respect to section 306, June 30, 2020.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1031(c) and section 1101(d), is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 306 and 307 as relating to sections 307 and 308; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 305 the following new item:

“Sec. 306. Early voting.”

Subtitle I—Voting by Mail

SEC. 1621. VOTING BY MAIL.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1031(a), section 1101(a), and section 1611(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 307 and 308 as sections 308 and 309; and

(2) by inserting after section 306 the following new section:

“SEC. 307. PROMOTING ABILITY OF VOTERS TO VOTE BY MAIL.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual in a State is eligible to cast a vote in an election for Federal office, the State may not impose any additional conditions or requirements on the eligibility of the individual to cast the vote in such election by absentee ballot by mail, except as required under subsection (b) and except to the extent that the State imposes a deadline for requesting the ballot and related voting materials from the appropriate State or local election official and for returning the ballot to the appropriate State or local election official.

“(b) REQUIRING SIGNATURE VERIFICATION.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—A State may not accept and process an absentee ballot submitted by any individual with respect to an

election for Federal office unless the State verifies the identification of the individual by comparing the individual’s signature on the absentee ballot with the individual’s signature on the official list of registered voters in the State, in accordance with such procedures as the State may adopt (subject to the requirements of paragraph (2)).

“(2) DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE DISCREPANCY.—If an individual submits an absentee ballot and the appropriate State or local election official determines that a discrepancy exists between the signature on such ballot and the signature of such individual on the official list of registered voters in the State, such election official, prior to making a final determination as to the validity of such ballot, shall make a good faith effort to immediately notify such individual by mail, telephone, and (if available) electronic mail that—

“(i) a discrepancy exists between the signature on such ballot and the signature of such individual on the official list of registered voters in the State;

“(ii) such individual may provide the official with information to cure such discrepancy, either in person, by telephone, or by electronic methods; and

“(iii) if such discrepancy is not cured prior to the expiration of the 7-day period which begins on the date of the election, such ballot will not be counted.

“(B) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—An election official may not make a determination that a discrepancy exists between the signature on an absentee ballot and the signature of the individual who submits the ballot on the official list of registered voters in the State unless—

“(i) at least 2 election officials make the determination; and

“(ii) each official who makes the determination has received training in procedures used to verify signatures.

“(C) DEADLINE FOR PROVIDING BALLOTING MATERIALS.—If an individual requests to vote by absentee ballot in an election for Federal office, the appropriate State or local election official shall ensure that the ballot and related voting materials are received by the individual—

“(1) not later than 2 weeks before the date of the election; or

“(2) in the case of a State which imposes a deadline for requesting an absentee ballot and related voting materials which is less than 2 weeks before the date of the election, as expeditiously as possible before the date of the election.

“(d) ACCESSIBILITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Consistent with section 305, the State shall ensure that all absentee ballots and related voting materials in elections for Federal office are accessible to individuals with disabilities in a manner that provides the same opportunity for access and participation (including with privacy and independence) as for other voters.

“(e) PAYMENT OF POSTAGE ON BALLOTS.—Consistent with regulations of the United States Postal Service, the State or the unit of local government responsible for the administration of an election for Federal office shall prepay the postage on any ballot in the election which is cast by mail.

“(f) UNIFORM DEADLINE FOR ACCEPTANCE OF MAILED BALLOTS.—If a ballot submitted by an individual by mail with respect to an election for Federal office in a State is postmarked on or before the date of the election, the State may not refuse to accept or process the ballot on the grounds that the individual did not meet a deadline for returning the ballot to the appropriate State or local election official.

“(g) NO EFFECT ON BALLOTS SUBMITTED BY ABSENT MILITARY AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—

Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the treatment of any ballot submitted by an individual who is entitled to vote by absentee ballot under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

“(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 311(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21101(b)), as amended by section 1101(b) and section 1611(b), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(6) in the case of the recommendations with respect to section 307, June 30, 2020.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1031(c), section 1101(d), and section 1611(c), is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 307 and 308 as relating to sections 308 and 309; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 306 the following new item:

“Sec. 307. Promoting ability of voters to vote by mail.”

(d) DEVELOPMENT OF BIOMETRIC VERIFICATION.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—The National Institute of Standards, in consultation with the Election Assistance Commission, shall develop standards for the use of biometric methods which could be used voluntarily in place of the signature verification requirements of section 307(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a)) for purposes of verifying the identification of an individual voting by absentee ballot in elections for Federal office.

(2) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The National Institute of Standards shall solicit comments from the public in the development of standards under paragraph (1).

(3) DEADLINE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Standards shall publish the standards developed under paragraph (1).

Subtitle J—Absent Uniformed Services Voters and Overseas Voters

SEC. 1701. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON AVAILABILITY AND TRANSMISSION OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.

Section 102(c) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) REPORTS ON AVAILABILITY, TRANSMISSION, AND RECEIPT OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.—

“(1) PRE-ELECTION REPORT ON ABSENTEE BALLOT AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 55 days before any regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, each State shall submit a report to the Attorney General, the Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the ‘Commission’), and the Presidential Designee, and make that report publicly available that same day, certifying that absentee ballots for the election are or will be available for transmission to absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters by not later than 45 days before the election. The report shall be in a form prescribed jointly by the Attorney General and the Commission and shall require the State to certify specific information about ballot availability from each unit of local government which will administer the election.

“(2) PRE-ELECTION REPORT ON ABSENTEE BALLOT TRANSMISSION.—Not later than 43 days before any regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, each State shall submit a report to the Attorney General, the Commission, and the Presidential Designee, and make that report publicly available that same day, certifying whether all absentee ballots have been transmitted by not later than 45 days before the election to all qualified absent uniformed services and overseas voters whose requests were received at least 45 days before the election. The report shall be in a form prescribed jointly by the Attorney General and the Commission, and shall require the State to certify specific information about ballot transmission, including the total numbers of ballot requests received and ballots transmitted, from each unit of local government which will administer the election.

“(3) POST-ELECTION REPORT ON NUMBER OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS TRANSMITTED AND RECEIVED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, each State and unit of local government which administered the election shall (through the State, in the case of a unit of local government) submit a report to the Attorney General, the Commission, and the Presidential Designee on the combined number of absentee ballots transmitted to absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters for the election and the combined number of such ballots which were returned by such voters and cast in the election, and shall make such report available to the general public that same day.”.

SEC. 1702. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF CIVIL PENALTIES AND PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION.—Section 105 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20307) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 105. ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) ACTION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring civil action in an appropriate district court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out this title.

“(2) PENALTY.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), if the court finds that the State violated any provision of this title, it may, to vindicate the public interest, assess a civil penalty against the State—

“(A) in an amount not to exceed \$110,000 for each such violation, in the case of a first violation; or

“(B) in an amount not to exceed \$220,000 for each such violation, for any subsequent violation.

“(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on any civil action brought under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

“(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—A person who is aggrieved by a State’s violation of this title may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out this title.

“(c) STATE AS ONLY NECESSARY DEFENDANT.—In any action brought under this section, the only necessary party defendant is the State, and it shall not be a defense to any such action that a local election official or a unit of local government is not named as a defendant, notwithstanding that a State has exercised the authority described in section 576 of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act to delegate to another jurisdiction in the State any duty or responsibility which is the subject of an action brought under this section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect

to violations alleged to have occurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1703. REVISIONS TO 45-DAY ABSENTEE BALLOT TRANSMISSION RULE.

(a) REPEAL OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(a)(8)(A) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20302(a)(8)(A)) is amended by striking “except as provided in subsection (g)”.

(b) REQUIRING USE OF EXPRESS DELIVERY IN CASE OF FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENT.—Section 102 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20302), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) REQUIRING USE OF EXPRESS DELIVERY IN CASE OF FAILURE TO TRANSMIT BALLOTS WITHIN DEADLINES.—

“(1) TRANSMISSION OF BALLOT BY EXPRESS DELIVERY.—If a State fails to meet the requirement of subsection (a)(8)(A) to transmit a validly requested absentee ballot to an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter not later than 45 days before the election (in the case in which the request is received at least 45 days before the election)—

“(A) the State shall transmit the ballot to the voter by express delivery; or

“(B) in the case of a voter who has designated that absentee ballots be transmitted electronically in accordance with subsection (f)(1), the State shall transmit the ballot to the voter electronically.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TRANSMISSION FEWER THAN 40 DAYS BEFORE THE ELECTION.—If, in carrying out paragraph (1), a State transmits an absentee ballot to an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter fewer than 40 days before the election, the State shall enable the ballot to be returned by the voter by express delivery, except that in the case of an absentee ballot of an absent uniformed services voter for a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the State may satisfy the requirement of this paragraph by notifying the voter of the procedures for the collection and delivery of such ballots under section 103A.

“(3) PAYMENT FOR USE OF EXPRESS DELIVERY.—The State shall be responsible for the payment of the costs associated with the use of express delivery for the transmittal of ballots under this subsection.”.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF WEEK-ENDS.—Section 102(a)(8)(A) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20302(a)(8)(A)) is amended by striking “the election;” and inserting the following: “the election (or, if the 45th day preceding the election is a weekend or legal public holiday, not later than the most recent weekday which precedes such 45th day and which is not a legal public holiday, but only if the request is received by at least such most recent weekday);”.

SEC. 1704. USE OF SINGLE ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION FOR SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 104 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20306) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 104. USE OF SINGLE APPLICATION FOR SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If a State accepts and processes an official post card form (prescribed under section 101) submitted by an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter for simultaneous voter registration and absentee ballot application (in accordance with section 102(a)(4)) and the voter requests that the application be considered an application for an absentee ballot for each subsequent election for Federal office held in

the State through the next regularly scheduled general election for Federal office (including any runoff elections which may occur as a result of the outcome of such general election), the State shall provide an absentee ballot to the voter for each such subsequent election.

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR VOTERS CHANGING REGISTRATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a voter registered to vote in a State for any election held after the voter notifies the State that the voter no longer wishes to be registered to vote in the State or after the State determines that the voter has registered to vote in another State or is otherwise no longer eligible to vote in the State.

“(c) PROHIBITION OF REFUSAL OF APPLICATION ON GROUNDS OF EARLY SUBMISSION.—A State may not refuse to accept or to process, with respect to any election for Federal office, any otherwise valid voter registration application or absentee ballot application (including the postcard form prescribed under section 101) submitted by an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter on the grounds that the voter submitted the application before the first date on which the State otherwise accepts or processes such applications for that election which are submitted by absentee voters who are not members of the uniformed services or overseas citizens.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to voter registration and absentee ballot applications which are submitted to a State or local election official on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1705. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2020.

Subtitle K—Poll Worker Recruitment and Training

SEC. 1801. GRANTS TO STATES FOR POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) GRANTS BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter referred to as the “Commission”) shall, subject to the availability of appropriations provided to carry out this section, make a grant to each eligible State for recruiting and training individuals to serve as poll workers on dates of elections for public office.

(2) USE OF COMMISSION MATERIALS.—In carrying out activities with a grant provided under this section, the recipient of the grant shall use the manual prepared by the Commission on successful practices for poll worker recruiting, training and retention as an interactive training tool, and shall develop training programs with the participation and input of experts in adult learning.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) APPLICATION.—Each State that desires to receive a payment under this section shall submit an application for the payment to the Commission at such time and in such manner and containing such information as the Commission shall require.

(2) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

(B) provide assurances that the funds provided under this section will be used to supplement and not supplant other funds used to carry out the activities;

(C) provide assurances that the State will furnish the Commission with information on the number of individuals who served as poll workers after recruitment and training with the funds provided under this section; and

(D) provide such additional information and certifications as the Commission determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a grant made to a State under this section shall be equal to the product of—

(A) the aggregate amount made available for grants to States under this section; and

(B) the voting age population percentage for the State.

(2) VOTING AGE POPULATION PERCENTAGE DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the “voting age population percentage” for a State is the quotient of—

(A) the voting age population of the State (as determined on the basis of the most recent information available from the Bureau of the Census); and

(B) the total voting age population of all States (as determined on the basis of the most recent information available from the Bureau of the Census).

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REPORTS BY RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the final grant is made under this section, each recipient of a grant shall submit a report to the Commission on the activities conducted with the funds provided by the grant.

(2) REPORTS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the final grant is made under this section, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress on the grants made under this section and the activities carried out by recipients with the grants, and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT APPROPRIATED.—Any amount appropriated to carry out this section shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this section, not more than 3 percent shall be available for administrative expenses of the Commission.

SEC. 1802. STATE DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Subtitle L—Enhancement of Enforcement

SEC. 1811. ENHANCEMENT OF ENFORCEMENT OF HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.

(a) COMPLAINTS; AVAILABILITY OF PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Section 401 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Attorney General” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General”; and

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

“(b) FILING OF COMPLAINTS BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person who is aggrieved by a violation of title III which has occurred, is occurring, or is about to occur may file a written, signed, notarized complaint with the Attorney General describing the violation and requesting the Attorney General to take appropriate action under this section. The Attorney General shall immediately provide a copy of a complaint filed under the previous sentence to the entity responsible for administering the State-based administrative complaint procedures described in section 402(a) for the State involved.

“(2) RESPONSE BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall respond to each com-

plaint filed under paragraph (1), in accordance with procedures established by the Attorney General that require responses and determinations to be made within the same (or shorter) deadlines which apply to a State under the State-based administrative complaint procedures described in section 402(a)(2). The Attorney General shall immediately provide a copy of the response made under the previous sentence to the entity responsible for administering the State-based administrative complaint procedures described in section 402(a) for the State involved.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is authorized to file a complaint under subsection (b)(1) (including any individual who seeks to enforce the individual’s right to a voter-verified paper ballot, the right to have the voter-verified paper ballot counted in accordance with this Act, or any other right under title III) may file an action under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) to enforce the uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements under subtitle A of title III.

“(d) NO EFFECT ON STATE PROCEDURES.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the availability of the State-based administrative complaint procedures required under section 402 to any person filing a complaint under this subsection.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations occurring with respect to elections for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

Subtitle M—Federal Election Integrity

SEC. 1821. PROHIBITION ON CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS.

(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:

“CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

“SEC. 319A. (a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a chief State election administration official to take an active part in political management or in a political campaign with respect to any election for Federal office over which such official has supervisory authority.

“(b) CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL.—The term ‘chief State election administration official’ means the highest State official with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections under State law.

“(c) ACTIVE PART IN POLITICAL MANAGEMENT OR IN A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.—The term ‘active part in political management or in a political campaign’ means—

“(1) serving as a member of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office;

“(2) the use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election for Federal office;

“(3) the solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of a contribution from any person on behalf of a candidate for Federal office; and

“(4) any other act which would be prohibited under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 7323(b) of title 5, United States Code, if taken by an individual to whom such paragraph applies (other than any prohibition on running for public office).

“(d) EXCEPTION IN CASE OF RECUSAL FROM ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS INVOLVING OFFICIAL OR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section does not apply to a chief State election administration official with respect to an election for

Federal office in which the official or an immediate family member of the official is a candidate, but only if—

“(A) such official recuses himself or herself from all of the official’s responsibilities for the administration of such election; and

“(B) the official who assumes responsibility for supervising the administration of the election does not report directly to such official.

“(2) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate, a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held after December 2019.

Subtitle N—Promoting Voter Access Through Election Administration Improvements

PART 1—PROMOTING VOTER ACCESS

SEC. 1901. TREATMENT OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS AS VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES UNDER NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.—Section 7(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

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

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

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

“(C) each institution of higher education which has a program participation agreement in effect with the Secretary of Education under section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094), other than an institution which is treated as a contributing agency under the Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2019.”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(A), by inserting “or, in the case of an institution of higher education, with each registration of a student for enrollment in a course of study, including enrollment in a program of distance education, as defined in section 103(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(7)),” after “assistance.”

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTITUTIONS UNDER HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 487(a)(23) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(23)) is amended to read as follows:

“(23)(A)(i) The institution will ensure that an appropriate staff person or office is designated publicly as a ‘Campus Vote Coordinator’ and will ensure that such person’s or office’s contact information is included on the institution’s website.

“(ii) Not fewer than twice during each calendar year (beginning with 2020), the Campus Vote Coordinator shall transmit electronically to each student enrolled in the institution (including students enrolled in distance education programs) a message containing the following information:

“(I) Information on the location of polling places in the jurisdiction in which the institution is located, together with information on available methods of transportation to and from such polling places.

“(II) A referral to a government-affiliated website or online platform which provides centralized voter registration information for all States, including access to applicable voter registration forms and information to assist individuals who are not registered to vote in registering to vote.

“(III) Any additional voter registration and voting information the Coordinator considers appropriate, in consultation with the appropriate State election official.

“(iii) In addition to transmitting the message described in clause (ii) not fewer than twice during each calendar year, the Campus Vote Coordinator shall transmit the message under such clause not fewer than 30 days prior to the deadline for registering to vote for any election for Federal, State, or local office in the State.

“(B) If the institution in its normal course of operations requests each student registering for enrollment in a course of study, including students registering for enrollment in a program of distance education, to affirm whether or not the student is a United States citizen, the institution will comply with the applicable requirements for a contributing agency under the Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2019.

“(C) If the institution is not described in subparagraph (B), the institution will comply with the requirements for a voter registration agency in the State in which it is located in accordance with section 7 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506).

“(D) This paragraph applies only with respect to an institution which is located in a State to which section 4(b) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503(b)) does not apply.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.

(C) **GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS DEMONSTRATING EXCELLENCE IN STUDENT VOTER REGISTRATION.**—

(1) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Education may award competitive grants to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education that are subject to the requirements of section 487(a)(23) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(23)), as amended by subsection (a) and that the Secretary determines have demonstrated excellence in registering students to vote in elections for public office beyond meeting the minimum requirements of such section.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—An institution of higher education is eligible to receive a grant under this subsection if the institution submits to the Secretary of Education, at such time and in such form as the Secretary may require, an application containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require to make the determination described in paragraph (1), including information and assurances that the institution carried out activities to promote voter registration by students, such as the following:

(A) Sponsoring large on-campus voter mobilization efforts.

(B) Engaging the surrounding community in nonpartisan voter registration and get out the vote efforts.

(C) Creating a website for students with centralized information about voter registration and election dates.

(D) Inviting candidates to speak on campus.

(E) Offering rides to students to the polls to increase voter education, registration, and mobilization.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 and each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to award grants under this subsection.

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO OPTION OF STUDENTS TO REGISTER IN JURISDICTION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION OR JURISDICTION OF DOMICILE.**—It is the sense of Congress that, as provided under existing law, students who attend an institution of higher education and reside in the jurisdiction of the institution while attending the institution should have the option of registering to vote in elections for Federal office in that

jurisdiction or in the jurisdiction of their own domicile.

SEC. 1902. MINIMUM NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTERS AFFECTED BY POLLING PLACE CHANGES.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 302 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21082), as amended by section 1601(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

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

“(f) **MINIMUM NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTERS AFFECTED BY POLLING PLACE CHANGES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a State assigns an individual who is a registered voter in a State to a polling place with respect to an election for Federal office which is not the same polling place to which the individual was previously assigned with respect to the most recent election for Federal office in the State in which the individual was eligible to vote—

“(A) the State shall notify the individual of the location of the polling place not later than 7 days before the date of the election; or

“(B) if the State makes such an assignment fewer than 7 days before the date of the election and the individual appears on the date of the election at the polling place to which the individual was previously assigned, the State shall make every reasonable effort to enable the individual to vote on the date of the election.

“(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2020.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 302(g) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21082(g)), as redesignated by subsection (a) and as amended by section 1601(b), is amended by striking “(d)(2) and (e)(2)” and inserting “(d)(2), (e)(2), and (f)(2)”.

SEC. 1903. PERMITTING USE OF SWORN WRITTEN STATEMENT TO MEET IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING.

(a) **PERMITTING USE OF STATEMENT.**—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“**SEC. 303A. PERMITTING USE OF SWORN WRITTEN STATEMENT TO MEET IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**

“(a) **USE OF STATEMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), if a State has in effect a requirement that an individual present identification as a condition of receiving and casting a ballot in an election for Federal office, the State shall permit the individual to meet the requirement—

“(A) in the case of an individual who desires to vote in person, by presenting the appropriate State or local election official with a sworn written statement, signed by the individual under penalty of perjury, attesting to the individual’s identity and attesting that the individual is eligible to vote in the election; or

“(B) in the case of an individual who desires to vote by mail, by submitting with the ballot the statement described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF PRE-PRINTED VERSION OF STATEMENT BY COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall develop a pre-printed version of the statement described in paragraph (1)(A) which includes a blank space for an individual to provide a name and signature for use by election officials in States which are subject to paragraph (1).

“(3) **PROVIDING PRE-PRINTED COPY OF STATEMENT.**—A State which is subject to paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) make copies of the pre-printed version of the statement described in paragraph (1)(A) which is prepared by the Commission

available at polling places for election officials to distribute to individuals who desire to vote in person; and

“(B) include a copy of such pre-printed version of the statement with each blank absentee or other ballot transmitted to an individual who desires to vote by mail.

“(b) **REQUIRING USE OF BALLOT IN SAME MANNER AS INDIVIDUALS PRESENTING IDENTIFICATION.**—An individual who presents or submits a sworn written statement in accordance with subsection (a)(1) shall be permitted to cast a ballot in the election in the same manner as an individual who presents identification.

“(c) **EXCEPTION FOR FIRST-TIME VOTERS REGISTERING BY MAIL.**—Subsections (a) and (b) do not apply with respect to any individual described in paragraph (1) of section 303(b) who is required to meet the requirements of paragraph (2) of such section.”.

(b) **REQUIRING STATES TO INCLUDE INFORMATION ON USE OF SWORN WRITTEN STATEMENT IN VOTING INFORMATION MATERIAL POSTED AT POLLING PLACES.**—Section 302(b)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21082(b)(2)), as amended by section 1072(b) and section 1202(b), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (G);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(I) in the case of a State that has in effect a requirement that an individual present identification as a condition of receiving and casting a ballot in an election for Federal office, information on how an individual may meet such requirement by presenting a sworn written statement in accordance with section 303A.”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Permitting use of sworn written statement to meet identification requirements.”.

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

SEC. 1904. POSTAGE-FREE BALLOTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 34 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 3406 the following:

“**§ 3407. Absentee ballots**

“(a) Any absentee ballot for any election for Federal office shall be carried expeditiously, with postage prepaid by the State or unit of local government responsible for the administration of the election.

“(b) As used in this section, the term ‘absentee ballot’ means any ballot transmitted by a voter by mail in an election for Federal office, but does not include any ballot covered by section 3406.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 34 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3406 the following:

“3407. Absentee ballots carried free of postage.”.

SEC. 1905. REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED BY STATES IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM TO TRACK AND CONFIRM RECEIPT OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.

(a) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART 7—PAYMENTS TO REIMBURSE STATES FOR COSTS INCURRED IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM TO TRACK AND CONFIRM RECEIPT OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS

“SEC. 297. PAYMENTS TO STATES.

“(a) PAYMENTS FOR COSTS OF ESTABLISHING PROGRAM.—In accordance with this section, the Commission shall make a payment to a State to reimburse the State for the costs incurred in establishing, if the State so chooses to establish, an absentee ballot tracking program with respect to elections for Federal office held in the State (including costs incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this part).

“(b) ABSENTEE BALLOT TRACKING PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—

“(1) PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this part, an ‘absentee ballot tracking program’ is a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots in an election for Federal office under which the State or local election official responsible for the receipt of voted absentee ballots in the election carries out procedures to track and confirm the receipt of such ballots, and makes information on the receipt of such ballots available to the individual who cast the ballot, by means of online access using the Internet site of the official’s office.

“(B) INFORMATION ON WHETHER VOTE WAS COUNTED.—The information referred to under subparagraph (A) with respect to the receipt of an absentee ballot shall include information regarding whether the vote cast on the ballot was counted, and, in the case of a vote which was not counted, the reasons therefor.

“(2) USE OF TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER BY OFFICIALS WITHOUT INTERNET SITE.—A program established by a State or local election official whose office does not have an Internet site may meet the description of a program under paragraph (1) if the official has established a toll-free telephone number that may be used by an individual who cast an absentee ballot to obtain the information on the receipt of the voted absentee ballot as provided under such paragraph.

“(c) CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE AND COSTS.—

“(1) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—In order to receive a payment under this section, a State shall submit to the Commission a statement containing—

“(A) a certification that the State has established an absentee ballot tracking program with respect to elections for Federal office held in the State; and

“(B) a statement of the costs incurred by the State in establishing the program.

“(2) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of a payment made to a State under this section shall be equal to the costs incurred by the State in establishing the absentee ballot tracking program, as set forth in the statement submitted under paragraph (1), except that such amount may not exceed the product of—

“(A) the number of jurisdictions in the State which are responsible for operating the program; and

“(B) \$3,000.

“(3) LIMIT ON NUMBER OF PAYMENTS RECEIVED.—A State may not receive more than one payment under this part.

“SEC. 297A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission for fiscal year 2020 and each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for payments under this part.

“(b) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization under this section shall remain available until expended.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

“PART 7—PAYMENTS TO REIMBURSE STATES FOR COSTS INCURRED IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM TO TRACK AND CONFIRM RECEIPT OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS

“Sec. 297. Payments to States.

“Sec. 297A. Authorization of appropriations.”.

SEC. 1906. VOTER INFORMATION RESPONSE SYSTEMS AND HOTLINE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF SYSTEMS AND SERVICES.—

(1) STATE-BASED RESPONSE SYSTEMS.—The Attorney General shall coordinate the establishment of a State-based response system for responding to questions and complaints from individuals voting or seeking to vote, or registering to vote or seeking to register to vote, in elections for Federal office. Such system shall provide—

(A) State-specific, same-day, and immediate assistance to such individuals, including information on how to register to vote, the location and hours of operation of polling places, and how to obtain absentee ballots; and

(B) State-specific, same-day, and immediate assistance to individuals encountering problems with registering to vote or voting, including individuals encountering intimidation or deceptive practices.

(2) HOTLINE.—The Attorney General, in consultation with State election officials, shall establish and operate a toll-free telephone service, using a telephone number that is accessible throughout the United States and that uses easily identifiable numerals, through which individuals throughout the United States—

(A) may connect directly to the State-based response system described in paragraph (1) with respect to the State involved;

(B) may obtain information on voting in elections for Federal office, including information on how to register to vote in such elections, the locations and hours of operation of polling places, and how to obtain absentee ballots; and

(C) may report information to the Attorney General on problems encountered in registering to vote or voting, including incidences of voter intimidation or suppression.

(3) COLLABORATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL ELECTION OFFICIALS.—

(A) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION FROM STATES.—The Attorney General shall coordinate the collection of information on State and local election laws and policies, including information on the Statewide computerized voter registration lists maintained under title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, so that individuals who contact the free telephone service established under paragraph (2) on the date of an election for Federal office may receive an immediate response on that day.

(B) FORWARDING QUESTIONS AND COMPLAINTS TO STATES.—If an individual contacts the free telephone service established under paragraph (2) on the date of an election for Federal office with a question or complaint with respect to a particular State or jurisdiction within a State, the Attorney General shall forward the question or complaint immediately to the appropriate election official of the State or jurisdiction so that the official may answer the question or remedy the complaint on that date.

(4) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SYSTEMS AND SERVICES.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the State-based response system under paragraph (1) and the free telephone service

under paragraph (2) are each developed in consultation with civil rights organizations, voting rights groups, State and local election officials, voter protection groups, and other interested community organizations, especially those that have experience in the operation of similar systems and services.

(b) USE OF SERVICE BY INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND INDIVIDUALS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY.—The Attorney General shall design and operate the telephone service established under this section in a manner that ensures that individuals with disabilities are fully able to use the service, and that assistance is provided in any language in which the State (or any jurisdiction in the State) is required to provide election materials under section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965..

(c) VOTER HOTLINE TASK FORCE.—

(1) APPOINTMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall appoint individuals (in such number as the Attorney General considers appropriate but in no event fewer than 3) to serve on a Voter Hotline Task Force to provide ongoing analysis and assessment of the operation of the telephone service established under this section, and shall give special consideration in making appointments to the Task Force to individuals who represent civil rights organizations. At least one member of the Task Force shall be a representative of an organization promoting voting rights or civil rights which has experience in the operation of similar telephone services or in protecting the rights of individuals to vote, especially individuals who are members of racial, ethnic, or linguistic minorities or of communities who have been adversely affected by efforts to suppress voting rights.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—An individual shall be eligible to serve on the Task Force under this subsection if the individual meets such criteria as the Attorney General may establish, except that an individual may not serve on the task force if the individual has been convicted of any criminal offense relating to voter intimidation or voter suppression.

(3) TERM OF SERVICE.—An individual appointed to the Task Force shall serve a single term of 2 years, except that the initial terms of the members first appointed to the Task Force shall be staggered so that there are at least 3 individuals serving on the Task Force during each year. A vacancy in the membership of the Task Force shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(4) NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.—Members of the Task Force shall serve without pay, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) BI-ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 1 of each odd-numbered year, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the operation of the telephone service established under this section during the previous 2 years, and shall include in the report—

(1) an enumeration of the number and type of calls that were received by the service;

(2) a compilation and description of the reports made to the service by individuals citing instances of voter intimidation or suppression;

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the service in making information available to all households in the United States with telephone service;

(4) any recommendations developed by the Task Force established under subsection (c) with respect to how voting systems may be maintained or upgraded to better accommodate voters and better ensure the integrity

of elections, including but not limited to identifying how to eliminate coordinated voter suppression efforts and how to establish effective mechanisms for distributing updates on changes to voting requirements; and

(5) any recommendations on best practices for the State-based response systems established under subsection (a)(1).

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for fiscal year 2019 and each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) SET-ASIDE FOR OUTREACH.—Of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year pursuant to the authorization under paragraph (1), not less than 15 percent shall be used for outreach activities to make the public aware of the availability of the telephone service established under this section, with an emphasis on outreach to individuals with disabilities and individuals with limited proficiency in the English language.

PART 2—IMPROVEMENTS IN OPERATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SEC. 1911. REAUTHORIZATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.

Section 210 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20930) is amended—

(1) by striking “for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2005” and inserting “for fiscal year 2019 and each succeeding fiscal year”; and

(2) by striking “(but not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each such year)”.

SEC. 1913. REQUIRING STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN POST-GENERAL ELECTION SURVEYS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1903(a), is further amended by inserting after section 303A the following new section:

“SEC. 303B. REQUIRING PARTICIPATION IN POST-GENERAL ELECTION SURVEYS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Each State shall furnish to the Commission such information as the Commission may request for purposes of conducting any post-election survey of the States with respect to the administration of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and any succeeding election.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1903(c), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303A the following new item:

“Sec. 303B. Requiring participation in post-general election surveys.”.

SEC. 1914. REPORTS BY NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ON USE OF FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.

(a) REQUIRING REPORTS ON USE FUNDS AS CONDITION OF RECEIPT.—Section 231 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM COMMISSION.—To the extent that funds are transferred from the Commission to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for purposes of carrying out this section during any fiscal year, the Director may not use such funds unless the Director certifies at the time of transfer that the Director will submit a report to the Commission not later than 90

days after the end of the fiscal year detailing how the Director used such funds during the year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2020 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1915. RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE OPERATIONS OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND CYBERSECURITY.—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Election Assistance Commission shall carry out an assessment of the security and effectiveness of the Commission’s information technology systems, including the cybersecurity of such systems.

(b) IMPROVEMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.—

(1) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES.—The Election Assistance Commission shall carry out a review of the effectiveness and efficiency of the State-based administrative complaint procedures established and maintained under section 402 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21112) for the investigation and resolution of allegations of violations of title III of such Act.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS TO STREAMLINE PROCEDURES.—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the review carried out under paragraph (1), and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate to streamline and improve the procedures which are the subject of the review.

SEC. 1916. REPEAL OF EXEMPTION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FROM CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 205 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20925) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts entered into by the Election Assistance Commission on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PART 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 1921. APPLICATION OF LAWS TO COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.—Section 3(4) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502(4)) is amended by striking “States and the District of Columbia” and inserting “States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

(b) HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.—

(1) COVERAGE OF COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—Section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141) is amended by striking “and the United States Virgin Islands” and inserting “the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.—Such Act is further amended as follows:

(A) The second sentence of section 213(a)(2) (52 U.S.C. 20943(a)(2)) is amended by striking “and American Samoa” and inserting “American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

(B) Section 252(c)(2) (52 U.S.C. 21002(c)(2)) is amended by striking “or the United States Virgin Islands” and inserting “the United States Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO CONSULTATION OF HELP AMERICA VOTE FOUNDATION WITH LOCAL ELECTION OFFICIALS.—Section 90102(c) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the United

States Virgin Islands” and inserting “the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year which begins after funds are appropriated to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pursuant to the payment under section 2.

SEC. 1922. NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as specifically provided, nothing in this title may be construed to authorize or require conduct prohibited under any of the following laws, or to supersede, restrict, or limit the application of such laws:

(1) The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

(2) The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20101 et seq.).

(3) The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

(4) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.).

(5) The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(6) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

(b) NO EFFECT ON PRECLEARANCE OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS UNDER VOTING RIGHTS ACT.—

The approval by any person of a payment or grant application under this title, or any other action taken by any person under this title, shall not be considered to have any effect on requirements for preclearance under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10304) or any other requirements of such Act.

(c) NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY OF STATES TO PROVIDE GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOTING.—Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title may be construed to prohibit any State from enacting any law which provides greater opportunities for individuals to register to vote and to vote in elections for Federal office than are provided by this title and the amendments made by this title.

Subtitle O—Severability

SEC. 1931. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE II—ELECTION INTEGRITY

Subtitle A—Findings Reaffirming Commitment of Congress to Restore the Voting Rights Act

Sec. 2001. Findings reaffirming commitment of Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act.

Subtitle B—Findings Relating to Native American Voting Rights

Sec. 2101. Findings relating to Native American voting rights.

Subtitle C—Findings Relating to District of Columbia Statehood

Sec. 2201. Findings relating to District of Columbia statehood.

Subtitle D—Findings Relating to Territorial Voting Rights

Sec. 2301. Findings relating to territorial voting rights.

Subtitle E—Redistricting Reform

Sec. 2400. Short title; finding of constitutional authority.

PART 1—REQUIREMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Sec. 2401. Requiring congressional redistricting to be conducted through plan of independent State commission.

Sec. 2402. Ban on mid-decade redistricting.

PART 2—INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

Sec. 2411. Independent redistricting commission.

Sec. 2412. Establishment of selection pool of individuals eligible to serve as members of commission.

Sec. 2413. Criteria for redistricting plan by independent commission; public notice and input.

Sec. 2414. Establishment of related entities.

PART 3—ROLE OF COURTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLANS

Sec. 2421. Enactment of plan developed by 3-judge court.

Sec. 2422. Special rule for redistricting conducted under order of Federal court.

PART 4—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 2431. Payments to States for carrying out redistricting.

Sec. 2432. Civil enforcement.

Sec. 2433. State apportionment notice defined.

Sec. 2434. No effect on elections for State and local office.

Sec. 2435. Effective date.

Subtitle F—Saving Eligible Voters From Voter Purging

Sec. 2501. Short title.

Sec. 2502. Conditions for removal of voters from list of registered voters.

Subtitle G—No Effect on Authority of States to Provide Greater Opportunities for Voting

Sec. 2601. No effect on authority of States to provide greater opportunities for voting.

Subtitle H—Severability

Sec. 2701. Severability.

Subtitle A—Findings Reaffirming Commitment of Congress to Restore the Voting Rights Act**SEC. 2001. FINDINGS REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT OF CONGRESS TO RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The right to vote for all Americans is sacrosanct and rules for voting and election administration should protect the right to vote and promote voter participation.

(2) The Voting Rights Act has empowered the Department of Justice and Federal courts for nearly a half a century to block discriminatory voting practices before their implementation in States and localities with the most troubling histories and ongoing records of racial discrimination.

(3) There continues to be an alarming movement to erect barriers to make it more difficult for Americans to participate in our Nation's democratic process. The Nation has witnessed unprecedented efforts to turn back the clock and erect barriers to voting for communities of color which have faced historic and continuing discrimination, as well as disabled, young, elderly, and low-income Americans.

(4) The Supreme Court's 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision gutted decades-long Federal protections for communities of color that face historic and continuing discrimination, emboldening States and local jurisdictions to pass voter suppression laws and implement procedures, such as those requiring photo identification, limiting early voting hours, eliminating same-day registration, purging voters from the rolls, and reducing the number of polling places. Congress is committed to reversing the devastating impact of this decision.

(5) Racial discrimination in voting is a clear and persistent problem. The actions of States and localities around the country post-*Shelby County*, including at least 10 findings by Federal courts of intentional discrimination, underscore the need for Congress to conduct investigatory and evidentiary hearings to determine the legislation necessary to restore the Voting Rights Act and combat continuing efforts in America that suppress the free exercise of the franchise in communities of color.

(6) The 2018 midterm election provides further evidence that systemic voter discrimination and intimidation continues to occur in communities of color across the country, making it clear that democracy reform cannot be achieved until Congress restores key provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

(7) Congress must remain vigilant in protecting every eligible citizen's right to vote. Congress should respond by modernizing the electoral system to—

(A) improve access to the ballot;

(B) enhance the integrity and security of our voting systems;

(C) ensure greater accountability for the administration of elections; and

(D) restore protections for voters against practices in States and localities plagued by the persistence of voter disenfranchisement; and

(E) ensure that Federal civil rights laws protect the rights of voters against discriminatory and deceptive practices.

Subtitle B—Findings Relating to Native American Voting Rights**SEC. 2101. FINDINGS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICAN VOTING RIGHTS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The right to vote for all Americans is sacred. Congress must fulfill the Federal Government's trust responsibility to protect and promote Native Americans' exercise of their fundamental right to vote, including equal access to voter registration voting mechanisms and locations, and the ability to serve as election officials.

(2) The Native American Voting Rights Coalition's four-State survey of voter discrimination (2016) and nine field hearings in Indian Country (2017-2018) revealed obstacles that Native Americans must overcome, including a lack of accessible and proximate registration and polling sites, nontraditional addresses for residents on Indian reservations, inadequate language assistance for Tribal members, and voter identification laws that discriminate against Native Americans. The Department of Justice and courts have recognized that some jurisdictions have been unresponsive to reasonable requests from federally recognized Indian Tribes for more accessible and proximate voter registration sites and in-person voting locations.

(3) The 2018 elections provide further evidence that systemic voter discrimination and intimidation continues to occur in communities of color and Tribal lands across the country, making it clear that democracy reform cannot be achieved until Congress restores key provisions of the Voting Rights Act and passes additional protections.

(4) Congress has broad, plenary authority to enact legislation to safeguard the voting rights of Native American voters.

(5) Congress must conduct investigatory and evidentiary hearings to determine the necessary legislation to restore the Voting Rights Act and combat continuous efforts that suppress the voter franchise within Tribal lands, to include, but not to be limited to, the Native American Voting Rights Act (NAVRA) and the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA).

Subtitle C—Findings Relating to District of Columbia Statehood**SEC. 2201. FINDINGS RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) District of Columbia residents deserve full congressional voting rights and self-government, which only statehood can provide.

(2) The 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia pay more Federal taxes per capita than residents of any State in the country, yet do not have full and equal representation in Congress and self-government.

(3) Since the founding of the United States, the residents of the District of Columbia have always carried all the obligations of citizenship, including serving in all of the Nation's wars and paying Federal taxes, all without voting representation on the floor in either Chamber of Congress or freedom from congressional interference in purely local matters.

(4) There are no constitutional, historical, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia should not be granted statehood.

(5) The District of Columbia has a larger population than two States, Wyoming and Vermont, and is close to the population of the seven States that have a population of under one million fully represented residents.

(6) The District of Columbia government has one of the strongest fiscal positions of any jurisdiction in the United States, with a \$14.6 billion budget for fiscal year 2019 and a \$2.8 billion general fund balance as of September 30, 2018.

(7) The District of Columbia's total personal income is higher than that of seven States, its per capita personal consumption expenditures is higher than those of any State, and its total personal consumption expenditures is greater than those of seven States.

(8) Congress has authority under article IV, section 3, clause 1, which gives Congress power to admit new states to the Union, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which grants Congress power over the seat of the Federal Government, to admit the new State carved out of the residential areas of the Federal seat of Government, while maintaining as the Federal seat of Government the United States Capitol Complex, the principal Federal monuments, Federal buildings and grounds, the National Mall, the White House and other Federal property.

Subtitle D—Territorial Voting Rights**SEC. 2301. FINDINGS RELATING TO TERRITORIAL VOTING RIGHTS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The right to vote is one of the most powerful instruments residents of the territories of the United States have to ensure that their voices are heard.

(2) These Americans have played an important part in the American democracy for more than 120 years.

(3) Political participation and the right to vote are among the highest concerns of territorial residents in part because they were not always afforded these rights.

(4) Voter participation in the territories consistently ranks higher than many communities on the mainland.

(5) Territorial residents serve and die, on a per capita basis, at a higher rate in every United States war and conflict since WWI, as an expression of their commitment to American democratic principles and patriotism.

SEC. 2302. CONGRESSIONAL TASK FORCE ON VOTING RIGHTS OF UNITED STATES CITIZEN RESIDENTS OF TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the legislative branch a Congressional Task Force on Voting Rights of United

States Citizen Residents of Territories of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Task Force shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(3) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(4) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(5) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(6) One Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(7) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(8) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(9) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(10) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(11) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(12) One Member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, in coordination with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(c) **DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.**—All appointments to the Task Force shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **CHAIR.**—The Speaker shall designate one Member to serve as chair of the Task Force.

(e) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy in the Task Force shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(f) **STATUS UPDATE.**—Between September 1, 2019, and September 30, 2019, the Task Force shall provide a status update to the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes—

(1) information the Task Force has collected; and

(2) a discussion on matters that the chairman of the Task Force deems urgent for consideration by Congress.

(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Task Force shall issue a report of its findings to the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding—

(1) the economic and societal consequences (through statistical data and other metrics) that come with political disenfranchisement of United States citizens in territories of the United States;

(2) impediments to full and equal voting rights for United States citizens who are residents of territories of the United States in Federal elections, including the election of the President and Vice President of the United States;

(3) impediments to full and equal voting representation in the House of Representatives for United States citizens who are residents of territories of the United States;

(4) recommended changes that, if adopted, would allow for full and equal voting rights for United States citizens who are residents of territories of the United States in Federal elections, including the election of the President and Vice President of the United States;

(5) recommended changes that, if adopted, would allow for full and equal voting representation in the House of Representatives for United States citizens who are residents of territories of the United States; and

(6) additional information the Task Force deems appropriate.

(h) **CONSENSUS VIEWS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, the report issued under subsection (g) shall reflect the shared views of all 12 Members, except that the report may contain dissenting views.

(i) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Task Force may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Task Force considers appropriate.

(j) **STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION.**—In carrying out its duties, the Task Force shall consult with the governments of American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(k) **RESOURCES.**—The Task Force shall carry out its duties by utilizing existing facilities, services, and staff of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(l) **TERMINATION.**—The Task Force shall terminate upon issuing the report required under subsection (g).

Subtitle E—Redistricting Reform

SEC. 2400. SHORT TITLE; FINDING OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This subtitle may be cited as the “Redistricting Reform Act of 2019”.

(b) **FINDING OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.**—Congress finds that it has the authority to establish the terms and conditions States must follow in carrying out congressional redistricting after an apportionment of Members of the House of Representatives because—

(1) the authority granted to Congress under article I, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the authority granted to Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce section 2 of such amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.

PART 1—REQUIREMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

SEC. 2401. REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING TO BE CONDUCTED THROUGH PLAN OF INDEPENDENT STATE COMMISSION.

(a) **USE OF PLAN REQUIRED.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in subsection (c), any congressional redistricting conducted by a State shall be conducted in accordance with—

(1) the redistricting plan developed and enacted into law by the independent redistricting commission established in the State, in accordance with part 2; or

(2) if a plan developed by such commission is not enacted into law, the redistricting plan developed and enacted into law by a 3-judge court, in accordance with section 2421.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 22(c) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(c)), is amended by striking “in the manner provided by the law thereof” and inserting: “in the manner provided by the Redistricting Reform Act of 2019”.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE FOR EXISTING COMMISSIONS.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to any State in which, under law in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, congressional redistricting is carried out in accordance with a plan developed and approved by an independent redistricting commission which is in compliance with each of the following requirements:

(1) **PUBLICLY AVAILABLE APPLICATION PROCESS.**—Membership on the commission is open to citizens of the State through a publicly available application process.

(2) **DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND POLITICAL APPOINTMENT.**—Individuals who, for a covered period of time as established by the State, hold or have held public office, individuals who are or have been candidates for elected public office, and individuals who serve or have served as an officer, employee, or paid consultant of a campaign committee of a candidate for public office are disqualified from serving on the commission.

(3) **SCREENING FOR CONFLICTS.**—Individuals who apply to serve on the commission are screened through a process that excludes persons with conflicts of interest from the pool of potential commissioners.

(4) **MULTI-PARTISAN COMPOSITION.**—Membership on the commission represents those who are affiliated with the two political parties whose candidates received the most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State, as well as those who are unaffiliated with any party or who are affiliated with political parties other than the two political parties whose candidates received the most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(5) **CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING.**—Members of the commission are required to meet certain criteria in the map drawing process, including minimizing the division of communities of interest and a ban on drawing maps to favor a political party.

(6) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—Public hearings are held and comments from the public are accepted before a final map is approved.

(7) **BROAD-BASED SUPPORT FOR APPROVAL OF FINAL PLAN.**—The approval of the final redistricting plan requires a majority vote of the members of the commission, including the support of at least one member of each of the following:

(A) Members who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the

most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) Members who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the second most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(C) Members who not affiliated with any political party or who are affiliated with political parties other than the political parties described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

SEC. 2402. BAN ON MID-DECADE REDISTRICTING.

A State that has been redistricted in accordance with this subtitle and a State described in section 2401(c) may not be redistricted again until after the next apportionment of Representatives under section 22(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), unless a court requires the State to conduct such subsequent redistricting to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

PART 2—INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

SEC. 2411. INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 2414(a) shall establish an independent redistricting commission for the State, which shall consist of 15 members appointed by the agency as follows:

(A) Not later than October 1 of a year ending in the numeral zero, the agency shall, at a public meeting held not earlier than 15 days after notice of the meeting has been given to the public, first appoint 6 members as follows:

(i) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the majority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(A)).

(ii) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the minority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(B)).

(iii) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the independent category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(C)).

(B) Not later than November 15 of a year ending in the numeral zero, the members appointed by the agency under subparagraph (A) shall, at a public meeting held not earlier than 15 days after notice of the meeting has been given to the public, then appoint 9 members as follows:

(i) The members shall appoint 3 members from the majority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(A)).

(ii) The members shall appoint 3 members from the minority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(B)).

(iii) The members shall appoint 3 members from the independent category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 2412(b)(1)(C)).

(2) RULES FOR APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—

(A) AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF AT LEAST 4 MEMBERS.—The appointment of any of the 9 members of the independent redistricting commission who are appointed by the first members of the commission pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), as well as the designation of alternates for such members pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) and the appointment of alternates to fill

vacancies pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), shall require the affirmative vote of at least 4 of the members appointed by the nonpartisan agency under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), including at least one member from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph.

(B) ENSURING DIVERSITY.—In appointing the 9 members pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), as well as in designating alternates pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) and in appointing alternates to fill vacancies pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), the first members of the independent redistricting commission shall ensure that the membership is representative of the demographic groups (including racial, ethnic, economic, and gender) and geographic regions of the State, and provides racial, ethnic, and language minorities protected under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with a meaningful opportunity to participate in the development of the State's redistricting plan.

(3) DESIGNATION OF ALTERNATES TO SERVE IN CASE OF VACANCIES.—

(A) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY AGENCY.—At the time the agency appoints the members of the independent redistricting commission under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the agency shall, on a random basis, designate 2 other individuals from such category to serve as alternate members who may be appointed to fill vacancies in the commission in accordance with paragraph (4).

(B) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—At the time the members appointed by the agency appoint the other members of the independent redistricting commission under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), designate 2 other individuals from such category to serve as alternate members who may be appointed to fill vacancies in the commission in accordance with paragraph (4).

(4) APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES TO SERVE IN CASE OF VACANCIES.—

(A) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY AGENCY.—If a vacancy occurs in the commission with respect to a member who was appointed by the nonpartisan agency under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) from one of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the agency shall fill the vacancy by appointing, on a random basis, one of the 2 alternates from such category who was designated under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3). At the time the agency appoints an alternate to fill a vacancy under the previous sentence, the agency shall designate, on a random basis, another individual from the same category to serve as an alternate member, in accordance with subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3).

(B) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—If a vacancy occurs in the commission with respect to a member who was appointed by the first members of the commission under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) from one of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the first members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), fill the vacancy by appointing one of the 2 alternates from such category who was designated under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3). At the time the first members appoint an alternate to fill a vacancy under the previous sentence, the first members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), designate another individual from the same category to serve as an alternate member, in accordance with subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

(5) REMOVAL.—A member of the independent redistricting commission may be removed by a majority vote of the remaining members of the commission if it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the member is not eligible to serve on the commission under section 2412(a).

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING COMMISSION BUSINESS.—

(1) CHAIR.—Members of an independent redistricting commission established under this section shall select by majority vote one member who was appointed from the independent category of the approved selection pool described in section 2412(b)(1)(C) to serve as chair of the commission. The commission may not take any action to develop a redistricting plan for the State under section 2413 until the appointment of the commission's chair.

(2) REQUIRING MAJORITY APPROVAL FOR ACTIONS.—The independent redistricting commission of a State may not publish and disseminate any draft or final redistricting plan, or take any other action, without the approval of at least—

(A) a majority of the whole membership of the commission; and

(B) at least one member of the commission appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 2412(b)(1).

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) STAFF; CONTRACTORS.—

(1) STAFF.—Under a public application process in which all application materials are available for public inspection, the independent redistricting commission of a State shall appoint and set the pay of technical experts, legal counsel, consultants, and such other staff as it considers appropriate, subject to State law.

(2) CONTRACTORS.—The independent redistricting commission of a State may enter into such contracts with vendors as it considers appropriate, subject to State law, except that any such contract shall be valid only if approved by the vote of a majority of the members of the commission, including at least one member appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 2412(b)(1).

(3) REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—

(A) REPORT BY APPLICANTS.—Each individual who applies for a position as an employee of the independent redistricting commission and each vendor who applies for a contract with the commission shall, at the time of applying, file with the commission a report summarizing—

(i) any expenditure for political activity made by such individual or vendor during the 10 most recent calendar years; and

(ii) any income received by such individual or vendor during the 10 most recent calendar years which is attributable to an expenditure for political activity.

(B) ANNUAL REPORTS BY EMPLOYEES AND VENDORS.—Each person who is an employee or vendor of the independent redistricting commission shall, not later than one year after the person is appointed as an employee or enters into a contract as a vendor (as the case may be) and annually thereafter for each year during which the person serves as an employee or a vendor, file with the commission a report summarizing the expenditures and income described in subparagraph (A) during the 10 most recent calendar years.

(C) EXPENDITURE FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term "expenditure for political activity" means a disbursement for any of the following:

(i) An independent expenditure, as defined in section 301(17) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(17)).

(ii) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)) or any other public communication, as defined in section 301(22) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101(22)) that would be an electioneering communication if it were a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication.

(iii) Any dues or other payments to trade associations or organizations described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code that are, or could reasonably be anticipated to be, used or transferred to another association or organization for a use described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) of section 501(c) of such Code.

(4) GOAL OF IMPARTIALITY.—The commission shall take such steps as it considers appropriate to ensure that any staff appointed under this subsection, and any vendor with whom the commission enters into a contract under this subsection, will work in an impartial manner, and may require any person who applies for an appointment to a staff position or for a vendor's contract with the commission to provide information on the person's history of political activity beyond the information on the person's expenditures for political activity provided in the reports required under paragraph (3) (including donations to candidates, political committees, and political parties) as a condition of the appointment or the contract.

(5) DISQUALIFICATION; WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The independent redistricting commission may not appoint an individual as an employee, and may not enter into a contract with a vendor, if the individual or vendor meets any of the criteria for the disqualification of an individual from serving as a member of the commission which are set forth in section 2412(a)(2).

(B) WAIVER.—The commission may by unanimous vote of its members waive the application of subparagraph (A) to an individual or a vendor after receiving and reviewing the report filed by the individual or vendor under paragraph (3).

(C) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The independent redistricting commission of a State shall terminate on the earlier of—

(A) June 14 of the next year ending in the numeral zero; or

(B) the day on which the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 2414(a) has, in accordance with section 2412(b)(1), submitted a selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 2414(b).

(2) PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—The State shall ensure that the records of the independent redistricting commission are retained in the appropriate State archive in such manner as may be necessary to enable the State to respond to any civil action brought with respect to congressional redistricting in the State.

SEC. 2412. ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECTION POOL OF INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual is eligible to serve as a member of an independent redistricting commission if the individual meets each of the following criteria:

(A) As of the date of appointment, the individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State.

(B) During the 3-year period ending on the date of the individual's appointment, the individual has been continuously registered to vote with the same political party, or has not been registered to vote with any political party.

(C) The individual submits to the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 2413, at such time and in such form as the agency may require, an application for inclusion in the selection pool under this section, and includes with the application a written statement, with an attestation under penalty of perjury, containing the following information and assurances:

(i) The full current name and any former names of, and the contact information for, the individual, including an electronic mail address, the address of the individual's residence, mailing address, and telephone numbers.

(ii) The individual's race, ethnicity, gender, age, date of birth, and household income for the most recent taxable year.

(iii) The political party with which the individual is affiliated, if any.

(iv) The reason or reasons the individual desires to serve on the independent redistricting commission, the individual's qualifications, and information relevant to the ability of the individual to be fair and impartial, including, but not limited to—

(I) any involvement with, or financial support of, professional, social, political, religious, or community organizations or causes;

(II) the individual's employment and educational history.

(v) An assurance that the individual shall commit to carrying out the individual's duties under this subtitle in an honest, independent, and impartial fashion, and to upholding public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.

(vi) An assurance that, during the covered periods described in paragraph (3), the individual has not taken and will not take any action which would disqualify the individual from serving as a member of the commission under paragraph (2).

(2) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—An individual is not eligible to serve as a member of the commission if any of the following applies during any of the covered periods described in paragraph (3):

(A) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual holds public office or is a candidate for election for public office.

(B) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual serves as an officer of a political party or as an officer, employee, or paid consultant of a campaign committee of a candidate for public office or of any political action committee (as determined in accordance with the law of the State).

(C) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual holds a position as a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) or an equivalent State or local law.

(D) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual is an employee of an elected public official, a contractor with the government of the State, or a donor to the campaign of any candidate for public office or to any political action committee (other than a donor who, during any of such covered periods, gives an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or less to the campaigns of all candidates for all public offices and to all political action committees).

(3) COVERED PERIODS DESCRIBED.—In this subsection, the term "covered period"

means, with respect to the appointment of an individual to the commission, any of the following:

(A) The 10-year period ending on the date of the individual's appointment.

(B) The period beginning on the date of the individual's appointment and ending on August 14 of the next year ending in the numeral one.

(C) The 10-year period beginning on the day after the last day of the period described in subparagraph (B).

(4) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "immediate family member" means, with respect to an individual, a father, stepfather, mother, stepmother, son, stepson, daughter, stepdaughter, brother, stepbrother, sister, stepsister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.

(b) DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF SELECTION POOL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 15 of each year ending in the numeral zero, the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 2414(a) shall develop and submit to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 2414(b) a selection pool of 36 individuals who are eligible to serve as members of the independent redistricting commission of the State under this subtitle, consisting of individuals in the following categories:

(A) A majority category, consisting of 12 individuals who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) A minority category, consisting of 12 individuals who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the second most votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(C) An independent category, consisting of 12 individuals who are not affiliated with either of the political parties described in subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

(2) FACTORS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DEVELOPING POOL.—In selecting individuals for the selection pool under this subsection, the nonpartisan agency shall—

(A) ensure that the pool is representative of the demographic groups (including racial, ethnic, economic, and gender) and geographic regions of the State, and includes applicants who would allow racial, ethnic, and language minorities protected under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 a meaningful opportunity to participate in the development of the State's redistricting plan; and

(B) take into consideration the analytical skills of the individuals selected in relevant fields (including mapping, data management, law, community outreach, demography, and the geography of the State) and their ability to work on an impartial basis.

(3) INTERVIEWS OF APPLICANTS.—To assist the nonpartisan agency in developing the selection pool under this subsection, the nonpartisan agency shall conduct interviews of applicants under oath. If an individual is included in a selection pool developed under this section, all of the interviews of the individual shall be transcribed and the transcriptions made available on the nonpartisan agency's website contemporaneously with release of the report under paragraph (6).

(4) DETERMINATION OF POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION OF INDIVIDUALS IN SELECTION POOL.—For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered to be affiliated with a political party only if the nonpartisan agency is able to verify (to the greatest extent possible) the information the individual provides in the application submitted under subsection (a)(1)(D), including by considering additional information provided by other

persons with knowledge of the individual's history of political activity.

(5) ENCOURAGING RESIDENTS TO APPLY FOR INCLUSION IN POOL.—The nonpartisan agency shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that residents of the State across various geographic regions and demographic groups are aware of the opportunity to serve on the independent redistricting commission, including publicizing the role of the panel and using newspapers, broadcast media, and online sources, including ethnic media, to encourage individuals to apply for inclusion in the selection pool developed under this subsection.

(6) REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECTION POOL.—At the time the nonpartisan agency submits the selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting under paragraph (1), it shall publish and post on the agency's public website a report describing the process by which the pool was developed, and shall include in the report a description of how the individuals in the pool meet the eligibility criteria of subsection (a) and of how the pool reflects the factors the agency is required to take into consideration under paragraph (2).

(7) PUBLIC COMMENT ON SELECTION POOL.—During the 14-day period which begins on the date the nonpartisan agency publishes the report under paragraph (6), the agency shall accept comments from the public on the individuals included in the selection pool. The agency shall post all such comments contemporaneously on the nonpartisan agency's website and shall transmit them to the Select Committee on Redistricting immediately upon the expiration of such period.

(8) ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 15 days and not later than 21 days after receiving the selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 2411(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool, in which case the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit a replacement selection pool in accordance with subsection (c).

(B) INACTION DEEMED REJECTION.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(C) DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT SELECTION POOL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the selection pool submitted by the nonpartisan agency under subsection (b), not later than 14 days after the rejection, the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit to the Select Committee a replacement selection pool, under the same terms and conditions that applied to the development and submission of the selection pool under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b). The replacement pool submitted under this paragraph may include individuals who were included in the rejected selection pool submitted under subsection (b), so long as at least one of the individuals in the replacement pool was not included in such rejected pool.

(2) ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after receiving the replacement selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 2411(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool, in which case the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit a second replacement selection pool in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) INACTION DEEMED REJECTION.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(D) DEVELOPMENT OF SECOND REPLACEMENT SELECTION POOL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the replacement selection pool submitted by the nonpartisan agency under subsection (c), not later than 14 days after the rejection, the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit to the Select Committee a second replacement selection pool, under the same terms and conditions that applied to the development and submission of the selection pool under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b). The second replacement selection pool submitted under this paragraph may include individuals who were included in the rejected selection pool submitted under subsection (b) or the rejected replacement selection pool submitted under subsection (c), so long as at least one of the individuals in the replacement pool was not included in either such rejected pool.

(2) ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 15 days and not later than 14 days after receiving the second replacement selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 2411(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool.

(B) INACTION DEEMED REJECTION.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(C) EFFECT OF REJECTION.—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the second replacement pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the redistricting plan for the State shall be developed and enacted in accordance with part 3.

SEC. 2413. CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING PLAN BY INDEPENDENT COMMISSION; PUBLIC NOTICE AND INPUT.

(A) DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLAN.—

(1) CRITERIA.—In developing a redistricting plan of a State, the independent redistricting commission of a State shall establish single-member congressional districts using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:

(A) Districts shall comply with the United States Constitution, including the requirement that they equalize total population.

(B) Districts shall comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) and all applicable Federal laws.

(C) Districts shall provide racial, ethnic, and language minorities with an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of choice and shall not dilute or diminish their ability to elect candidates of choice whether alone or in coalition with others.

(D) Districts shall respect communities of interest, neighborhoods, and political subdivisions to the extent practicable and after compliance with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (C). A community of interest is defined as an area with recognized similarities of interests, including but not limited to ethnic, racial, economic, social, cultural, geographic or historic identities. The term communities of interest may, in

certain circumstances, include political subdivisions such as counties, municipalities, or school districts, but shall not include common relationships with political parties or political candidates.

(2) NO FAVORING OR DISFAVORING OF POLITICAL PARTIES.—Except as may be required to meet the criteria described in paragraph (1), the redistricting plan developed by the independent redistricting commission shall not, when considered on a Statewide basis, unduly favor or disfavor any political party.

(3) FACTORS PROHIBITED FROM CONSIDERATION.—In developing the redistricting plan for the State, the independent redistricting commission may not take into consideration any of the following factors, except to the extent necessary to comply with the criteria described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), paragraph (2), and to enable the redistricting plan to be measured against the external metrics described in subsection (e):

(A) The residence of any Member of the House of Representatives or candidate.

(B) The political party affiliation or voting history of the population of a district.

(b) PUBLIC NOTICE AND INPUT.—

(1) USE OF OPEN AND TRANSPARENT PROCESS.—The independent redistricting commission of a State shall hold each of its meetings in public, shall solicit and take into consideration comments from the public, including proposed maps, throughout the process of developing the redistricting plan for the State, and shall carry out its duties in an open and transparent manner which provides for the widest public dissemination reasonably possible of its proposed and final redistricting plans.

(2) WEBSITE.—

(A) FEATURES.—The commission shall maintain a public Internet site which is not affiliated with or maintained by the office of any elected official and which includes the following features:

(i) General information on the commission, its role in the redistricting process, and its members, including contact information.

(ii) An updated schedule of commission hearings and activities, including deadlines for the submission of comments.

(iii) All draft redistricting plans developed by the commission under subsection (c) and the final redistricting plan developed under subsection (d), including the accompanying written evaluation under subsection (e).

(iv) All comments received from the public on the commission's activities, including any proposed maps submitted under paragraph (1).

(v) Live streaming of commission hearings and an archive of previous meetings, including any documents considered at any such meeting, which the commission shall post not later than 24 hours after the conclusion of the meeting.

(vi) Access in an easily useable format to the demographic and other data used by the commission to develop and analyze the proposed redistricting plans, together with access to any software used to draw maps of proposed districts and to any reports analyzing and evaluating any such maps.

(vii) A method by which members of the public may submit comments and proposed maps directly to the commission.

(viii) All records of the commission, including all communications to or from members, employees, and contractors regarding the work of the commission.

(ix) A list of all contractors receiving payment from the commission, together with the annual disclosures submitted by the contractors under section 2411(c)(3).

(x) A list of the names of all individuals who submitted applications to serve on the commission, together with the applications

submitted by individuals included in any selection pool, except that the commission may redact from such applications any financial or other personally sensitive information.

(B) **SEARCHABLE FORMAT.**—The commission shall ensure that all information posted and maintained on the site under this paragraph, including information and proposed maps submitted by the public, shall be maintained in an easily searchable format.

(C) **DEADLINE.**—The commission shall ensure that the public internet site under this paragraph is operational (in at least a preliminary format) not later than January 1 of the year ending in the numeral one.

(3) **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**—The commission shall solicit, accept, and consider comments from the public with respect to its duties, activities, and procedures at any time during the period—

(A) which begins on January 1 of the year ending in the numeral one; and

(B) which ends 7 days before the date of the meeting at which the commission shall vote on approving the final redistricting plan for enactment into law under subsection (d)(2).

(4) **MEETINGS AND HEARINGS IN VARIOUS GEOGRAPHIC LOCATIONS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, the commission shall hold its meetings and hearings in various geographic regions and locations throughout the State.

(5) **MULTIPLE LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL NOTICES.**—The commission shall make each notice which is required to be posted and published under this section available in any language in which the State (or any jurisdiction in the State) is required to provide election materials under section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICATION OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Prior to developing and publishing a final redistricting plan under subsection (d), the independent redistricting commission of a State shall develop and publish a preliminary redistricting plan.

(2) **MINIMUM PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT.**—

(A) **3 HEARINGS REQUIRED.**—Prior to developing a preliminary redistricting plan under this subsection, the commission shall hold not fewer than 3 public hearings at which members of the public may provide input and comments regarding the potential contents of redistricting plans for the State and the process by which the commission will develop the preliminary plan under this subsection.

(B) **MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO HEARINGS.**—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date of each hearing held under this paragraph, the commission shall post notices of the hearing in on the website maintained under subsection (b)(2), and shall provide for the publication of such notices in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State. Each such notice shall specify the date, time, and location of the hearing.

(C) **SUBMISSION OF PLANS AND MAPS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.**—Any member of the public may submit maps or portions of maps for consideration by the commission. As provided under subsection (b)(2)(A), any such map shall be made publicly available on the commission's website and open to comment.

(3) **PUBLICATION OF PRELIMINARY PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The commission shall post the preliminary redistricting plan developed under this subsection, together with a report that includes the commission's responses to any public comments received under subsection (b)(3), on the website maintained under subsection (b)(2), and shall provide for the publication of each such plan in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State.

(B) **MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO PUBLICATION.**—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date on which the commission posts and publishes the preliminary plan under this paragraph, the commission shall notify the public through the website maintained under subsection (b)(2), as well as through publication of notice in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State, of the pending publication of the plan.

(4) **MINIMUM POST-PUBLICATION PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The commission shall accept and consider comments from the public (including through the website maintained under subsection (b)(2)) with respect to the preliminary redistricting plan published under paragraph (3), including proposed revisions to maps, for not fewer than 30 days after the date on which the plan is published.

(5) **POST-PUBLICATION HEARINGS.**—

(A) **3 HEARINGS REQUIRED.**—After posting and publishing the preliminary redistricting plan under paragraph (3), the commission shall hold not fewer than 3 public hearings in different geographic areas of the State at which members of the public may provide input and comments regarding the preliminary plan.

(B) **MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO HEARINGS.**—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date of each hearing held under this paragraph, the commission shall post notices of the hearing in on the website maintained under subsection (b)(2), and shall provide for the publication of such notices in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State. Each such notice shall specify the date, time, and location of the hearing.

(6) **PERMITTING MULTIPLE PRELIMINARY PLANS.**—At the option of the commission, after developing and publishing the preliminary redistricting plan under this subsection, the commission may develop and publish subsequent preliminary redistricting plans, so long as the process for the development and publication of each such subsequent plan meets the requirements set forth in this subsection for the development and publication of the first preliminary redistricting plan.

(d) **PROCESS FOR ENACTMENT OF FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After taking into consideration comments from the public on any preliminary redistricting plan developed and published under subsection (c), the independent redistricting commission of a State shall develop and publish a final redistricting plan for the State.

(2) **MEETING; FINAL VOTE.**—Not later than the deadline specified in subsection (h), the commission shall hold a public hearing at which the members of the commission shall vote on approving the final plan for enactment into law.

(3) **PUBLICATION OF PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING MATERIALS.**—Not fewer than 14 days before the date of the meeting under paragraph (2), the commission shall provide the following information to the public through the website maintained under subsection (b)(2), as well as through newspapers of general circulation throughout the State:

(A) The final redistricting plan, including all relevant maps.

(B) A report by the commission to accompany the plan which provides the background for the plan and the commission's reasons for selecting the plan as the final redistricting plan, including responses to the public comments received on any preliminary redistricting plan developed and published under subsection (c).

(C) Any dissenting or additional views with respect to the plan of individual members of the commission.

(4) **ENACTMENT.**—The final redistricting plan developed and published under this sub-

section shall be deemed to be enacted into law if—

(A) the plan is approved by a majority of the whole membership of the commission; and

(B) at least one member of the commission appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 2412(b)(1) approves the plan.

(e) **WRITTEN EVALUATION OF PLAN AGAINST EXTERNAL METRICS.**—The independent redistricting commission shall include with each redistricting plan developed and published under this section a written evaluation that measures each such plan against external metrics which cover the criteria set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), including the impact of the plan on the ability of communities of color to elect candidates of choice, measures of partisan fairness using multiple accepted methodologies, and the degree to which the plan preserves or divides communities of interest.

(f) **TIMING.**—The independent redistricting commission of a State may begin its work on the redistricting plan of the State upon receipt of relevant population information from the Bureau of the Census, and shall approve a final redistricting plan for the State in each year ending in the numeral one not later than 8 months after the date on which the State receives the State apportionment notice or October 1, whichever occurs later.

SEC. 2414. ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATED ENTITIES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OR DESIGNATION OF NONPARTISAN AGENCY OF STATE LEGISLATURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State shall establish a nonpartisan agency in the legislative branch of the State government to appoint the members of the independent redistricting commission for the State in accordance with section 2411.

(2) **NONPARTISANSHIP DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of this subsection, an agency shall be considered to be nonpartisan if under law the agency—

(A) is required to provide services on a nonpartisan basis;

(B) is required to maintain impartiality; and

(C) is prohibited from advocating for the adoption or rejection of any legislative proposal.

(3) **TRAINING OF MEMBERS APPOINTED TO COMMISSION.**—Not later than January 15 of a year ending in the numeral one, the nonpartisan agency established or designated under this subsection shall provide the members of the independent redistricting commission with initial training on their obligations as members of the commission, including obligations under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and other applicable laws.

(4) **REGULATIONS.**—The nonpartisan agency established or designated under this subsection shall adopt and publish regulations, after notice and opportunity for comment, establishing the procedures that the agency will follow in fulfilling its duties under this subtitle, including the procedures to be used in vetting the qualifications and political affiliation of applicants and in creating the selection pools, the randomized process to be used in selecting the initial members of the independent redistricting commission, and the rules that the agency will apply to ensure that the agency carries out its duties under this subtitle in a maximally transparent, publicly accessible, and impartial manner.

(5) **DESIGNATION OF EXISTING AGENCY.**—At its option, a State may designate an existing agency in the legislative branch of its government to appoint the members of the independent redistricting commission plan for the State under this subtitle, so long as the

agency meets the requirements for non-partisanship under this subsection.

(6) **TERMINATION OF AGENCY SPECIFICALLY ESTABLISHED FOR REDISTRICTING.**—If a State does not designate an existing agency under paragraph (5) but instead establishes a new agency to serve as the nonpartisan agency under this section, the new agency shall terminate upon the enactment into law of the redistricting plan for the State.

(7) **PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.**—The State shall ensure that the records of the nonpartisan agency are retained in the appropriate State archive in such manner as may be necessary to enable the State to respond to any civil action brought with respect to congressional redistricting in the State.

(8) **DEADLINE.**—The State shall meet the requirements of this subsection not later than each October 15 of a year ending in the numeral nine.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State shall appoint a Select Committee on Redistricting to approve or disapprove a selection pool developed by the independent redistricting commission for the State under section 2412.

(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Select Committee on Redistricting for a State under this subsection shall consist of the following members:

(A) 1 member of the upper house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the greatest number of seats in the upper house.

(B) 1 member of the upper house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the second greatest number of seats in the upper house.

(C) 1 member of the lower house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the greatest number of seats in the lower house.

(D) 1 member of the lower house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the second greatest number of seats in the lower house.

(3) **SPECIAL RULE FOR STATES WITH UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE.**—In the case of a State with a unicameral legislature, the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State under this subsection shall consist of the following members:

(A) 2 members of the State legislature appointed by the chair of the political party of the State whose candidate received the highest percentage of votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) 2 members of the State legislature appointed by the chair of the political party whose candidate received the second highest percentage of votes in the most recent Statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(4) **DEADLINE.**—The State shall meet the requirements of this subsection not later than each January 15 of a year ending in the numeral zero.

PART 3—ROLE OF COURTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLANS

SEC. 2421. ENACTMENT OF PLAN DEVELOPED BY 3-JUDGE COURT.

(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.**—If any of the triggering events described in subsection (f) occur with respect to a State—

(1) not later than December 15 of the year in which the triggering event occurs, the United States district court for the applicable venue, acting through a 3-judge Court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, shall develop and publish the congressional redistricting plan for the State; and

(2) the final plan developed and published by the Court under this section shall be

deemed to be enacted on the date on which the Court publishes the final plan, as described in subsection (d).

(b) **APPLICABLE VENUE DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of this section, the “applicable venue” with respect to a State is the District of Columbia or the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located, as selected by the first party to file with the court sufficient evidence of the occurrence of a triggering event described in subsection (f).

(c) **PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.**—

(1) **CRITERIA.**—In developing a redistricting plan for a State under this section, the Court shall adhere to the same terms and conditions that applied (or that would have applied, as the case may be) to the development of a plan by the independent redistricting commission of the State under section 2413(a).

(2) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND RECORDS OF COMMISSION.**—The Court shall have access to any information, data, software, or other records and material that was used (or that would have been used, as the case may be) by the independent redistricting commission of the State in carrying out its duties under this subtitle.

(3) **HEARING; PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—In developing a redistricting plan for a State, the Court shall—

(A) hold one or more evidentiary hearings at which interested members of the public may appear and be heard and present testimony, including expert testimony, in accordance with the rules of the Court; and

(B) consider other submissions and comments by the public, including proposals for redistricting plans to cover the entire State or any portion of the State.

(4) **USE OF SPECIAL MASTER.**—To assist in the development and publication of a redistricting plan for a State under this section, the Court may appoint a special master to make recommendations to the Court on possible plans for the State.

(d) **PUBLICATION OF PLAN.**—

(1) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INITIAL PLAN.**—Upon completing the development of one or more initial redistricting plans, the Court shall make the plans available to the public at no cost, and shall also make available the underlying data used by the Court to develop the plans and a written evaluation of the plans against external metrics (as described in section 2413(e)).

(2) **PUBLICATION OF FINAL PLAN.**—At any time after the expiration of the 14-day period which begins on the date the Court makes the plans available to the public under paragraph (1), and taking into consideration any submissions and comments by the public which are received during such period, the Court shall develop and publish the final redistricting plan for the State.

(e) **USE OF INTERIM PLAN.**—In the event that the Court is not able to develop and publish a final redistricting plan for the State with sufficient time for an upcoming election to proceed, the Court may develop and publish an interim redistricting plan which shall serve as the redistricting plan for the State until the Court develops and publishes a final plan in accordance with this section. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority or discretion of the Court to develop and publish the final redistricting plan, including but not limited to the discretion to make any changes the Court deems necessary to an interim redistricting plan.

(f) **TRIGGERING EVENTS DESCRIBED.**—The “triggering events” described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) The failure of the State to establish or designate a nonpartisan agency of the State legislature under section 2414(a) prior to the

expiration of the deadline set forth in section 2414(a)(5).

(2) The failure of the State to appoint a Select Committee on Redistricting under section 2414(b) prior to the expiration of the deadline set forth in section 2414(b)(4).

(3) The failure of the Select Committee on Redistricting to approve any selection pool under section 2412 prior to the expiration of the deadline set forth for the approval of the second replacement selection pool in section 2412(d)(2).

(4) The failure of the independent redistricting commission of the State to approve a final redistricting plan for the State prior to the expiration of the deadline set forth in section 2413(f).

SEC. 2422. SPECIAL RULE FOR REDISTRICTING CONDUCTED UNDER ORDER OF FEDERAL COURT.

If a Federal court requires a State to conduct redistricting subsequent to an apportionment of Representatives in the State in order to comply with the Constitution or to enforce the Voting Rights Act of 1965, section 2413 shall apply with respect to the redistricting, except that the court may revise any of the deadlines set forth in such section if the court determines that a revision is appropriate in order to provide for a timely enactment of a new redistricting plan for the State.

PART 4—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 2431. PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CARRYING OUT REDISTRICTING.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENTS.**—Subject to subsection (d), not later than 30 days after a State receives a State apportionment notice, the Election Assistance Commission shall, subject to the availability of appropriations provided pursuant to subsection (e), make a payment to the State in an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled, as provided under the notice; and

(2) \$150,000.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A State shall use the payment made under this section to establish and operate the State’s independent redistricting commission, to implement the State redistricting plan, and to otherwise carry out congressional redistricting in the State.

(c) **NO PAYMENT TO STATES WITH SINGLE MEMBER.**—The Election Assistance Commission shall not make a payment under this section to any State which is not entitled to more than one Representative under its State apportionment notice.

(d) **REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF SELECTION POOL AS CONDITION OF PAYMENT.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Election Assistance Commission may not make a payment to a State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 2414(a) has, in accordance with section 2412(b)(1), submitted a selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 2414(b).

(2) **EXCEPTION FOR STATES WITH EXISTING COMMISSIONS.**—In the case of a State which, pursuant to section 2401(c), is exempt from the requirements of section 2401(a), the Commission may not make a payment to the State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that its redistricting commission meets the requirements of section 2401(c).

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payments under this section.

SEC. 2432. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) ACTIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for such relief as may be appropriate to carry out this subtitle.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any citizen of a State who is aggrieved by the failure of the State to meet the requirements of this subtitle may bring a civil action in the United States district court for the applicable venue for such relief as may be appropriate to remedy the failure. For purposes of this section, the “applicable venue” is the District of Columbia or the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located, as selected by the person who brings the civil action.

(b) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—In any action brought forth under this section, the following rules shall apply:

(1) The action shall be filed in the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia or for the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located, as selected by the person bringing the action.

(2) The action shall be heard by a 3-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code.

(3) The 3-judge court shall consolidate actions brought for relief under subsection (b)(1) with respect to the same State redistricting plan.

(4) A copy of the complaint shall be delivered promptly to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.

(5) A final decision in the action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.

(6) It shall be the duty of the district court and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.

(c) ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In a civil action under this section, the court may allow the prevailing party (other than the United States) reasonable attorney fees, including litigation expenses, and costs.

(d) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—

(1) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES ADDITIONAL TO OTHER RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies established by this section are in addition to all other rights and remedies provided by law, and neither the rights and remedies established by this section nor any other provision of this subtitle shall supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

(2) VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.—Nothing in this subtitle authorizes or requires conduct that is prohibited by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

SEC. 2433. STATE APPORTIONMENT NOTICE DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the “State apportionment notice” means, with respect to a State, the notice sent to the State from the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 22(b) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), of the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled.

SEC. 2434. NO EFFECT ON ELECTIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICE.

Nothing in this subtitle or in any amendment made by this subtitle may be construed to affect the manner in which a State carries out elections for State or local office, includ-

ing the process by which a State establishes the districts used in such elections.

SEC. 2435. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to redistricting carried out pursuant to the decennial census conducted during 2020 or any succeeding decennial census.

Subtitle F—Saving Eligible Voters From Voter Purging

SEC. 2501. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Stop Automatically Voiding Eligible Voters Off Their Enlisted Rolls in States Act” or the “Save Voters Act”.

SEC. 2502. CONDITIONS FOR REMOVAL OF VOTERS FROM LIST OF REGISTERED VOTERS.

(a) CONDITIONS DESCRIBED.—The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

“SEC. 8A. CONDITIONS FOR REMOVAL OF VOTERS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF REGISTERED VOTERS.

“(a) VERIFICATION ON BASIS OF OBJECTIVE AND RELIABLE EVIDENCE OF INELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) REQUIRING VERIFICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State may not remove the name of any registrant from the official list of voters eligible to vote in elections for Federal office in the State unless the State verifies, on the basis of objective and reliable evidence, that the registrant is ineligible to vote in such elections.

“(2) FACTORS NOT CONSIDERED AS OBJECTIVE AND RELIABLE EVIDENCE OF INELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the following factors, or any combination thereof, shall not be treated as objective and reliable evidence of a registrant’s ineligibility to vote:

“(A) The failure of the registrant to vote in any election.

“(B) The failure of the registrant to respond to any notice sent under section 8(d), unless the notice has been returned as undeliverable.

“(C) The failure of the registrant to take any other action with respect to voting in any election or with respect to the registrant’s status as a registrant.

“(b) NOTICE AFTER REMOVAL.—

“(1) NOTICE TO INDIVIDUAL REMOVED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 48 hours after a State removes the name of a registrant from the official list of eligible voters for any reason (other than the death of the registrant), the State shall send notice of the removal to the former registrant, and shall include in the notice the grounds for the removal and information on how the former registrant may contest the removal or be reinstated, including a telephone number for the appropriate election official.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply in the case of a registrant—

“(i) who sends written confirmation to the State that the registrant is no longer eligible to vote in the registrar’s jurisdiction in which the registrant was registered; or

“(ii) who is removed from the official list of eligible voters by reason of the death of the registrant.

“(2) PUBLIC NOTICE.—Not later than 48 hours after conducting any general program to remove the names of ineligible voters from the official list of eligible voters (as described in section 8(a)(4)), the State shall disseminate a public notice through such methods as may be reasonable to reach the general public (including by publishing the notice in a newspaper of wide circulation or posting the notice on the websites of the appropriate election officials) that list maintenance is taking place and that registrants should check their registration status to en-

sure no errors or mistakes have been made. The State shall ensure that the public notice disseminated under this paragraph is in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to voters with disabilities, including voters who have low vision or are blind.”.

(b) CONDITIONS FOR TRANSMISSION OF NOTICES OF REMOVAL.—Section 8(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) A State may not transmit a notice to a registrant under this subsection unless the State obtains objective and reliable evidence (in accordance with the standards for such evidence which are described in section 8A(a)(2)) that the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar’s jurisdiction in which the registrant is registered.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.—Section 8(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “provide” and inserting “subject to section 8A, provide”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “conduct” and inserting “subject to section 8A, conduct”.

(2) HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.—Section 303(a)(4)(A) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “, registrants” and inserting “, and subject to section 8A of such Act, registrants”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle G—No Effect on Authority of States to Provide Greater Opportunities for Voting
SEC. 2601. NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY OF STATES TO PROVIDE GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOTING.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title may be construed to prohibit any State from enacting any law which provides greater opportunities for individuals to register to vote and to vote in elections for Federal office than are provided by this title and the amendments made by this title.

Subtitle H—Severability

SEC. 2701. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE III—ELECTION SECURITY

Sec. 3000. Short title; sense of Congress.

Subtitle A—Financial Support for Election Infrastructure

PART 1—VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Sec. 3001. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.

Sec. 3002. Coordination of voting system security activities with use of requirements payments and election administration requirements under Help America Vote Act of 2002.

Sec. 3003. Incorporation of definitions.

PART 2—GRANTS FOR RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS

Sec. 3011. Grants to States for conducting risk-limiting audits of results of elections.

Sec. 3012. GAO analysis of effects of audits.

PART 3—ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE
INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 3021. Election infrastructure innovation grant program.

Subtitle B—Security Measures

Sec. 3101. Election infrastructure designation.

Sec. 3102. Timely threat information.

Sec. 3103. Security clearance assistance for election officials.

Sec. 3104. Security risk and vulnerability assessments.

Sec. 3105. Annual reports.

Subtitle C—Enhancing Protections for
United States Democratic Institutions

Sec. 3201. National strategy to protect United States democratic institutions.

Sec. 3202. National Commission to Protect United States Democratic Institutions.

Subtitle D—Promoting Cybersecurity
Through Improvements in Election Administration

Sec. 3301. Testing of existing voting systems to ensure compliance with election cybersecurity guidelines and other guidelines.

Sec. 3302. Treatment of electronic poll books as part of voting systems.

Sec. 3303. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.

Sec. 3304. Streamlining collection of election information.

Subtitle E—Preventing Election Hacking

Sec. 3401. Short title.

Sec. 3402. Election Security Bug Bounty Program.

Sec. 3403. Definitions.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 3501. Definitions.

Sec. 3502. Initial report on adequacy of resources available for implementation.

Subtitle G—Severability

Sec. 3601. Severability.

SEC. 3000. SHORT TITLE; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Election Security Act”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NEED TO IMPROVE ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY.**—It is the sense of Congress that, in light of the lessons learned from Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election, the Federal Government should intensify its efforts to improve the security of election infrastructure in the United States, including through the use of individual, durable, paper ballots marked by the voter by hand.

Subtitle A—Financial Support for Election Infrastructure

PART 1—VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

SEC. 3001. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS.**—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.), as amended by section 1905(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART 8—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

“SEC. 298. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

“(a) **AVAILABILITY AND USE OF GRANT.**—The Commission shall make a grant to each eligible State—

“(1) to replace a voting system—

“(A) which does not meet the requirements which are first imposed on the State pursuant to the amendments made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019 with a voting system which does meet such requirements, for use in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020, or

“(B) which does meet such requirements but which is not in compliance with the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines issued by the Commission prior to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 with another system which does meet such requirements and is in compliance with such guidelines; and

“(2) to carry out voting system security improvements described in section 298A with respect to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding election for Federal office.

“(b) **AMOUNT OF GRANT.**—The amount of a grant made to a State under this section shall be such amount as the Commission determines to be appropriate, except that such amount may not be less than the product of \$1 and the average of the number of individuals who cast votes in any of the two most recent regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State.

“(c) **PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.**—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants under this part is insufficient to ensure that each State receives the amount of the grant calculated under subsection (b), the Commission shall make such pro rata reductions in such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that the entire amount appropriated under this part is distributed to the States.

“(d) **ABILITY OF REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS TO ADMINISTER RANKED CHOICE ELECTIONS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, an eligible State which receives a grant to replace a voting system under this section shall ensure that the replacement system is capable of administering a system of ranked choice voting under which each voter shall rank the candidates for the office in the order of the voter's preference.

“SEC. 298A. VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS DESCRIBED.

“(a) **PERMITTED USES.**—A voting system security improvement described in this section is any of the following:

“(1) The acquisition of goods and services from qualified election infrastructure vendors by purchase, lease, or such other arrangements as may be appropriate.

“(2) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

“(3) A security risk and vulnerability assessment of the State's election infrastructure which is carried out by a provider of cybersecurity services under a contract entered into between the chief State election official and the provider.

“(4) The maintenance of election infrastructure, including addressing risks and vulnerabilities which are identified under either of the security risk and vulnerability assessments described in paragraph (3), except that none of the funds provided under this part may be used to renovate or replace a building or facility which is used primarily for purposes other than the administration of elections for public office.

“(5) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part of the State's election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State's election infrastructure.

“(6) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of the information technology infrastructure described in paragraph (4).

“(7) Enhancing the cybersecurity of voter registration systems.

“(b) QUALIFIED ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE VENDORS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this part, a ‘qualified election infrastructure vendor’ is any person who provides, supports, or maintains, or who seeks to provide, support, or maintain, election infrastructure on behalf of a State, unit of local government, or election agency (as defined in section 3501 of the Election Security Act) who meets the criteria described in paragraph (2).

“(2) **CRITERIA.**—The criteria described in this paragraph are such criteria as the Chairman, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall establish and publish, and shall include each of the following requirements:

“(A) The vendor must be owned and controlled by a citizen or permanent resident of the United States.

“(B) The vendor must disclose to the Chairman and the Secretary, and to the chief State election official of any State to which the vendor provides any goods and services with funds provided under this part, of any sourcing outside the United States for parts of the election infrastructure.

“(C) The vendor agrees to ensure that the election infrastructure will be developed and maintained in a manner that is consistent with the cybersecurity best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

“(D) The vendor agrees to maintain its information technology infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the cybersecurity best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

“(E) The vendor agrees to meet the requirements of paragraph (3) with respect to any known or suspected cybersecurity incidents involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

“(F) The vendor agrees to permit independent security testing by the Commission (in accordance with section 231(a)) and by the Secretary of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

“(3) CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A vendor meets the requirements of this paragraph if, upon becoming aware of the possibility that an election cybersecurity incident has occurred involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part—

“(i) the vendor promptly assesses whether or not such an incident occurred, and submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the Secretary and the Chairman of the assessment as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred);

“(ii) if the incident involves goods or services provided to an election agency, the vendor submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the agency as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred), and cooperates with the agency in providing any other necessary notifications relating to the incident; and

“(iii) the vendor provides all necessary updates to any notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii).

“(B) **CONTENTS OF NOTIFICATIONS.**—Each notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall contain the following information with respect to any election cybersecurity incident covered by the notification:

“(i) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident began, if known.

“(ii) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident was detected.

“(iii) The date, time, and duration of the election cybersecurity incident.

“(iv) The circumstances of the election cybersecurity incident, including the specific election infrastructure systems believed to have been accessed and information acquired, if any.

“(v) Any planned and implemented technical measures to respond to and recover from the incident.

“(vi) In the case of any notification which is an update to a prior notification, any additional material information relating to the incident, including technical data, as it becomes available.

“SEC. 298B. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

“A State is eligible to receive a grant under this part if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

“(1) a description of how the State will use the grant to carry out the activities authorized under this part;

“(2) a certification and assurance that, not later than 5 years after receiving the grant, the State will carry out risk-limiting audits and will carry out voting system security improvements, as described in section 298A; and

“(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

“SEC. 298C. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, including the Committees on Homeland Security, House Administration, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Judiciary, and Rules and Administration of the Senate, on the activities carried out with the funds provided under this part.

“SEC. 298D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this part—

“(1) \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(2) \$175,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2022, 2024, and 2026.

“(b) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of this section shall remain available until expended.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1905(b), is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

“PART 8—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

“Sec. 298. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.

“Sec. 298A. Voting system security improvements described.

“Sec. 298B. Eligibility of States.

“Sec. 298C. Reports to Congress.

“Sec. 298D. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3002. COORDINATION OF VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY ACTIVITIES WITH USE OF REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.

(a) DUTIES OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “by” and inserting “and the security of election infrastructure by”.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON BOARD OF ADVISORS OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 214(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20944(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “37 members” and inserting “38 members”; and

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

“(17) The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary’s designee.”

(c) REPRESENTATIVE OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(c)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) A representative of the Department of Homeland Security.”

(d) GOALS OF PERIODIC STUDIES OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION ISSUES; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 241(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20981(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Commission shall” and inserting “the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security (as appropriate), shall”; and

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) will be secure against attempts to undermine the integrity of election systems by cyber or other means; and”

(e) REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS.—

(1) USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 251(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)), as amended by section 1061(a)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) PERMITTING USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—A State may use a requirements payment to carry out any of the following activities:

“(A) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

“(B) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part of the State’s election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State’s election infrastructure.

“(C) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of the information technology infrastructure described in subparagraph (B).

“(D) Enhancing the security of voter registration databases.”

(2) INCORPORATION OF ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION IN STATE PLANS FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 254(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21004(a)(1)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, including the protection of election infrastructure.”

(3) COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING STATE PLAN FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 255 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21005) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.—The members of the committee shall be a representative group of individuals from the State’s counties, cities, towns, and Indian tribes, and shall represent the needs of rural as well as urban areas of the State, as the case may be.”

(f) ENSURING PROTECTION OF COMPUTERIZED STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION LIST.—Section 303(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(3)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, as well as other measures to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents, as identified by the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.”

SEC. 3003. INCORPORATION OF DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act, the following definitions apply:

“(1) The term ‘cybersecurity incident’ has the meaning given the term ‘incident’ in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148).

“(2) The term ‘election infrastructure’ has the meaning given such term in section 3501 of the Election Security Act.

“(3) The term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 901 to read as follows:

“Sec. 901. Definitions.”

PART 2—GRANTS FOR RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 3011. GRANTS TO STATES FOR CONDUCTING RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.), as amended by sections 1905(a) and 3001(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART 9—GRANTS FOR CONDUCTING RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS

“SEC. 299. GRANTS FOR CONDUCTING RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS.

“(a) AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS.—The Commission shall make a grant to each eligible State to conduct risk-limiting audits as described in subsection (b) with respect to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding election for Federal office.

“(b) RISK-LIMITING AUDITS DESCRIBED.—In this part, a ‘risk-limiting audit’ is a post-election process—

“(1) which is conducted in accordance with rules and procedures established by the chief State election official of the State which meet the requirements of subsection (c); and

“(2) under which, if the reported outcome of the election is incorrect, there is at least a predetermined percentage chance that the audit will replace the incorrect outcome with the correct outcome as determined by a full, hand-to-eye tabulation of all votes validly cast in that election that ascertains voter intent manually and directly from voter-verifiable paper records.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR RULES AND PROCEDURES.—The rules and procedures established for conducting a risk-limiting audit shall include the following elements:

“(1) Rules for ensuring the security of ballots and documenting that prescribed procedures were followed.

“(2) Rules and procedures for ensuring the accuracy of ballot manifests produced by election agencies.

“(3) Rules and procedures for governing the format of ballot manifests, cast vote records, and other data involved in the audit.

“(4) Methods to ensure that any cast vote records used in the audit are those used by the voting system to tally the election results sent to the chief State election official and made public.

“(5) Procedures for the random selection of ballots to be inspected manually during each audit.

“(6) Rules for the calculations and other methods to be used in the audit and to determine whether and when the audit of an election is complete.

“(7) Procedures and requirements for testing any software used to conduct risk-limiting audits.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this part, the following definitions apply:

“(1) The term ‘ballot manifest’ means a record maintained by each election agency that meets each of the following requirements:

“(A) The record is created without reliance on any part of the voting system used to tabulate votes.

“(B) The record functions as a sampling frame for conducting a risk-limiting audit.

“(C) The record contains the following information with respect to the ballots cast and counted in the election:

“(i) The total number of ballots cast and counted by the agency (including undervotes, overvotes, and other invalid votes).

“(ii) The total number of ballots cast in each election administered by the agency (including undervotes, overvotes, and other invalid votes).

“(iii) A precise description of the manner in which the ballots are physically stored, including the total number of physical groups of ballots, the numbering system for each group, a unique label for each group, and the number of ballots in each such group.

“(2) The term ‘incorrect outcome’ means an outcome that differs from the outcome that would be determined by a full tabulation of all votes validly cast in the election, determining voter intent manually, directly from voter-verifiable paper records.

“(3) The term ‘outcome’ means the winner of an election, whether a candidate or a position.

“(4) The term ‘reported outcome’ means the outcome of an election which is determined according to the canvass and which will become the official, certified outcome unless it is revised by an audit, recount, or other legal process.

“SEC. 299A. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

“A State is eligible to receive a grant under this part if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

“(1) a certification that, not later than 5 years after receiving the grant, the State will conduct risk-limiting audits of the results of elections for Federal office held in the State as described in section 299;

“(2) a certification that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the chief State election official of the State has established or will establish the rules and procedures for conducting the audits which meet the requirements of section 299(c);

“(3) a certification that the audit shall be completed not later than the date on which the State certifies the results of the election;

“(4) a certification that, after completing the audit, the State shall publish a report on the results of the audit, together with such information as necessary to confirm that the audit was conducted properly;

“(5) a certification that, if a risk-limiting audit conducted under this part leads to a full manual tally of an election, State law requires that the State or election agency shall use the results of the full manual tally as the official results of the election; and

“(6) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

“SEC. 299B. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this part \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, to remain available until expended.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by sections 1905(b) and 3001(b), is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

“PART 9—GRANTS FOR CONDUCTING RISK-LIMITING AUDITS OF RESULTS OF ELECTIONS

“Sec. 299. Grants for conducting risk-limiting audits of results of elections.

“Sec. 299A. Eligibility of States.

“Sec. 299B. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3012. GAO ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS OF AUDITS.

(a) ANALYSIS.—Not later than 6 months after the first election for Federal office is held after grants are first awarded to States for conducting risk-limiting audits under part 9 of subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 3011) for conducting risk-limiting audits of elections for Federal office, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis of the extent to which such audits have improved the administration of such elections and the security of election infrastructure in the States receiving such grants.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees.

PART 3—ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 3021. ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second section 319 (relating to EMP and GMD mitigation research and development) as section 320; and

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

“SEC. 321. ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, in coordination with the Chairman of the Election Assistance Commission (established pursuant to the Help America Vote Act of 2002) and in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation, shall establish a competitive grant program to award grants to eligible entities, on a competitive basis, for purposes of research and development that are determined to have the potential to significantly improve the security (including cybersecurity), quality, reliability, accuracy, accessibility, and affordability of election infrastructure.

“(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the conclusion of each fiscal year for which grants are awarded under this

section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate a report describing such grants and analyzing the impact, if any, of such grants on the security and operation of election infrastructure.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$6,250,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2027 for purposes of carrying out this section.

“(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(1) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)), including an institution of higher education that is a historically Black college or university (which has the meaning given the term ‘part B institution’ in section 322 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1061)) or other minority-serving institution listed in section 371(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a));

“(2) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; or

“(3) an organization, association, or a for-profit company, including a small business concern (as such term is defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), including a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals as defined under section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).”

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (20) as paragraphs (7) through (21), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘election infrastructure’ means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by striking both items relating to section 319 and the item relating to section 318 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 318. Social media working group.

“Sec. 319. Transparency in research and development.

“Sec. 320. EMP and GMD mitigation research and development.

“Sec. 321. Election infrastructure innovation grant program.”

Subtitle B—Security Measures

SEC. 3101. ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGNATION.

Subparagraph (J) of section 2001(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 601(3)) is amended by inserting “, including election infrastructure” before the period at the end.

SEC. 3102. TIMELY THREAT INFORMATION.

Subsection (d) of section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(24) To provide timely threat information regarding election infrastructure to the chief State election official of the State with respect to which such information pertains.”.

SEC. 3103. SECURITY CLEARANCE ASSISTANCE FOR ELECTION OFFICIALS.

In order to promote the timely sharing of information on threats to election infrastructure, the Secretary may—

(1) help expedite a security clearance for the chief State election official and other appropriate State personnel involved in the administration of elections, as designated by the chief State election official;

(2) sponsor a security clearance for the chief State election official and other appropriate State personnel involved in the administration of elections, as designated by the chief State election official; and

(3) facilitate the issuance of a temporary clearance to the chief State election official and other appropriate State personnel involved in the administration of elections, as designated by the chief State election official, if the Secretary determines classified information to be timely and relevant to the election infrastructure of the State at issue.

SEC. 3104. SECURITY RISK AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (6) of section 2209(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659(c)) is amended by inserting “(including by carrying out a security risk and vulnerability assessment)” after “risk management support”.

(b) PRIORITIZATION TO ENHANCE ELECTION SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a written request from a chief State election official, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, commence a security risk and vulnerability assessment pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 2209(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) on election infrastructure in the State at issue.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary, upon receipt of a request described in paragraph (1), determines that a security risk and vulnerability assessment cannot be commenced within 90 days, the Secretary shall expeditiously notify the chief State election official who submitted such request.

SEC. 3105. ANNUAL REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS ON ASSISTANCE AND ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter through 2026, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) efforts to carry out section 203 during the prior year, including specific information on which States were helped, how many officials have been helped in each State, how many security clearances have been sponsored in each State, and how many temporary clearances have been issued in each State; and

(2) efforts to carry out section 205 during the prior year, including specific information on which States were helped, the dates on which the Secretary received a request for a security risk and vulnerability assessment pursuant to such section, the dates on which the Secretary commenced each such request, and the dates on which the Secretary transmitted a notification in accordance with subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(b) REPORTS ON FOREIGN THREATS.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2019), the Secretary and the Director of National Intel-

ligence, in coordination with the heads of appropriate offices of the Federal government, shall submit a joint report to the appropriate congressional committees on foreign threats to elections in the United States, including physical and cybersecurity threats.

(c) INFORMATION FROM STATES.—For purposes of preparing the reports required under this section, the Secretary shall solicit and consider information and comments from States and election agencies, except that the provision of such information and comments by a State or election agency shall be voluntary and at the discretion of the State or agency.

Subtitle C—Enhancing Protections for United States Democratic Institutions**SEC. 3201. NATIONAL STRATEGY TO PROTECT UNITED STATES DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Secretary, in consultation with the Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, the Director of National Intelligence, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, and the heads of any other appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a national strategy to protect against cyber attacks, influence operations, disinformation campaigns, and other activities that could undermine the security and integrity of United States democratic institutions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The national strategy required under subsection (a) shall include consideration of the following:

(1) The threat of a foreign state actor, foreign terrorist organization (as designated pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189)), or a domestic actor carrying out a cyber attack, influence operation, disinformation campaign, or other activity aimed at undermining the security and integrity of United States democratic institutions.

(2) The extent to which United States democratic institutions are vulnerable to a cyber attack, influence operation, disinformation campaign, or other activity aimed at undermining the security and integrity of such democratic institutions.

(3) Potential consequences, such as an erosion of public trust or an undermining of the rule of law, that could result from a successful cyber attack, influence operation, disinformation campaign, or other activity aimed at undermining the security and integrity of United States democratic institutions.

(4) Lessons learned from other Western governments the institutions of which were subject to a cyber attack, influence operation, disinformation campaign, or other activity aimed at undermining the security and integrity of such institutions, as well as actions that could be taken by the United States Government to bolster collaboration with foreign partners to detect, deter, prevent, and counter such activities.

(5) Potential impacts such as an erosion of public trust in democratic institutions as could be associated with a successful cyber breach or other activity negatively-affecting election infrastructure.

(6) Roles and responsibilities of the Secretary, the Chairman, and the heads of other Federal entities and non-Federal entities, including chief State election officials and representatives of multi-state information sharing and analysis center.

(7) Any findings, conclusions, and recommendations to strengthen protections for United States democratic institutions that have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members on the National Commis-

sion to Protect United States Democratic Institutions, authorized pursuant to section 3202.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of the national strategy required under subsection (a), the President, acting through the Secretary, in coordination with the Chairman, shall issue an implementation plan for Federal efforts to implement such strategy that includes the following:

(1) Strategic objectives and corresponding tasks.

(2) Projected timelines and costs for the tasks referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Metrics to evaluate performance of such tasks.

(d) CLASSIFICATION.—The national strategy required under subsection (a) shall be in unclassified form.

(e) CIVIL RIGHTS REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the issuance of the national strategy required under subsection (a), and not later than 60 days after the issuance of the implementation plan required under subsection (c), the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (established under subsection 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee)) shall submit a report to Congress on any potential privacy and civil liberties impacts of such strategy and implementation plan, respectively.

SEC. 3202. NATIONAL COMMISSION TO PROTECT UNITED STATES DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the legislative branch the National Commission to Protect United States Democratic Institutions (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Commission is to counter efforts to undermine democratic institutions within the United States.

(c) COMPOSITION.—

(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of 10 members appointed for the life of the Commission as follows:

(A) One member shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(B) One member shall be appointed by the Chairman.

(C) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(E) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, the Chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(F) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security, the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Individuals shall be selected for appointment to the Commission solely on the basis of their professional qualifications, achievements, public stature, experience, and expertise in relevant fields, including, but not limited to cybersecurity,

national security, and the Constitution of the United States.

(3) **NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.**—Members shall not receive compensation for service on the Commission, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) **DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.**—All members of the Commission shall be appointed no later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. The appointment of the replacement member shall be made not later than 60 days after the date on which the vacancy occurs.

(d) **CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.**—The Commission shall elect a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members.

(e) **QUORUM AND MEETINGS.**—

(1) **QUORUM.**—The Commission shall meet and begin the operations of the Commission not later than 30 days after the date on which all members have been appointed or, if such meeting cannot be mutually agreed upon, on a date designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro Tempore of the Senate. Each subsequent meeting shall occur upon the call of the Chair or a majority of its members. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold meetings.

(2) **AUTHORITY OF INDIVIDUALS TO ACT FOR COMMISSION.**—Any member of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take under this section.

(f) **POWERS.**—

(1) **HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.**—The Commission (or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof) may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties.

(2) **CONTRACTING.**—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this section.

(g) **ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) **OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—In addition to the assistance provided under paragraph (1), the Department of Homeland Security, the Election Assistance Commission, and other appropriate departments and agencies of the United States shall provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, and staff as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(h) **PUBLIC MEETINGS.**—Any public meetings of the Commission shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the protection of information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or Executive order.

(i) **SECURITY CLEARANCES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The heads of appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch shall cooperate with the Commission to expeditiously provide Commission members and staff with appropriate security clearances to the extent possible under applicable procedures and requirements.

(2) **PREFERENCES.**—In appointing staff, obtaining detailees, and entering into con-

tracts for the provision of services for the Commission, the Commission shall give preference to individuals otherwise who have active security clearances.

(j) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—At any time prior to the submission of the final report under paragraph (2), the Commission may submit interim reports to the President and Congress such findings, conclusions, and recommendations to strengthen protections for democratic institutions in the United States as have been agreed to by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations to strengthen protections for democratic institutions in the United States as have been agreed to by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(k) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall terminate upon the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date on which the Commission submits the final report required under subsection (j)(2).

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO TERMINATION.**—During the 60-day period described in paragraph (2), the Commission may carry out such administrative activities as may be required to conclude its work, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning the final report and disseminating the final report.

Subtitle D—Promoting Cybersecurity Through Improvements in Election Administration

SEC. 3301. TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES AND OTHER GUIDELINES.

(a) **REQUIRING TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 231(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **TESTING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES.**—

“(A) **TESTING.**—Not later than 9 months before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Commission shall provide for the testing by accredited laboratories under this section of the voting system hardware and software which was certified for use in the most recent such election, on the basis of the most recent voting system guidelines applicable to such hardware or software (including election cybersecurity guidelines) issued under this Act.

“(B) **DECERTIFICATION OF HARDWARE OR SOFTWARE FAILING TO MEET GUIDELINES.**—If, on the basis of the testing described in subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that any voting system hardware or software does not meet the most recent guidelines applicable to such hardware or software issued under this Act, the Commission shall decertify such hardware or software.”

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

(b) **ISSUANCE OF CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES BY TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.**—Section 221(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the

enactment of this paragraph, the Development Committee shall issue election cybersecurity guidelines, including standards and best practices for procuring, maintaining, testing, operating, and updating election systems to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents.”

SEC. 3302. TREATMENT OF ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS AS PART OF VOTING SYSTEMS.

(a) **INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF VOTING SYSTEM.**—Section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and inserting “this Act”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) any electronic poll book used with respect to the election; and”

(b) **DEFINITION.**—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081) is amended—

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

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

“(c) **ELECTRONIC POLL BOOK DEFINED.**—In this Act, the term ‘electronic poll book’ means the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used—

“(1) to retain the list of registered voters at a polling location, or vote center, or other location at which voters cast votes in an election for Federal office; and

“(2) to identify registered voters who are eligible to vote in an election.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 301(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(e)), as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, or, with respect to any requirements relating to electronic poll books, on and after January 1, 2020.”

SEC. 3303. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

(a) **REQUIRING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.**—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 301 the following new section:

“SEC. 301A. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

“(a) **REQUIRING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.**—Not later than 120 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the chief State election official of a State shall submit a report to the Commission containing a detailed voting system usage plan for each jurisdiction in the State which will administer the election, including a detailed plan for the usage of electronic poll books and other equipment and components of such system.

“(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 301 the following new item:

“Sec. 301A. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.”

SEC. 3304. STREAMLINING COLLECTION OF ELECTION INFORMATION.

Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Commission” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

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

“(b) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information for purposes of maintaining the clearinghouse described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a).”.

Subtitle E—Preventing Election Hacking
SEC. 3401. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Prevent Election Hacking Act of 2019”.

SEC. 3402. ELECTION SECURITY BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to be known as the “Election Security Bug Bounty Program” (hereafter in this subtitle referred to as the “Program”) to improve the cybersecurity of the systems used to administer elections for Federal office by facilitating and encouraging assessments by independent technical experts, in cooperation with State and local election officials and election service providers, to identify and report election cybersecurity vulnerabilities.

(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION BY ELECTION OFFICIALS AND ELECTION SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

(1) NO REQUIREMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAM.—Participation in the Program shall be entirely voluntary for State and local election officials and election service providers.

(2) ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION AND INPUT FROM ELECTION OFFICIALS.—In developing the Program, the Secretary shall solicit input from, and encourage participation by, State and local election officials.

(c) ACTIVITIES FUNDED.—In establishing and carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish a process for State and local election officials and election service providers to voluntarily participate in the program;

(2) designate appropriate information systems to be included in the Program;

(3) provide compensation to eligible individuals, organizations, and companies for reports of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities within the information systems designated under subparagraph (A) and establish criteria for individuals, organizations, and companies to be considered eligible for such compensation in compliance with Federal laws;

(4) consult with the Attorney General on how to ensure that approved individuals, organizations, or companies that comply with the requirements of the Program are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law, and from liability under civil actions for specific activities authorized under the Program;

(5) consult with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of other departments and agencies that have implemented programs to provide compensation for reports of previously undisclosed vulnerabilities in information systems, regarding lessons that may be applied from such programs;

(6) develop an expeditious process by which an individual, organization, or company can register with the Department, submit to a background check as determined by the Department, and receive a determination as to eligibility for participation in the Program; and

(7) engage qualified interested persons, including representatives of private entities, about the structure of the Program and, to

the extent practicable, establish a recurring competition for independent technical experts to assess election systems for the purpose of identifying and reporting election cybersecurity vulnerabilities;

(d) USE OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Secretary may award competitive contracts as necessary to manage the Program.

SEC. 3403. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) The terms “election” and “Federal office” have the meanings given such terms in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).

(2) The term “election cybersecurity vulnerability” means any security vulnerability (as defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501)) that affects an election system.

(3) The term “election service provider” means any person providing, supporting, or maintaining an election system on behalf of a State or local election official, such as a contractor or vendor.

(4) The term “election system” means any information system (as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code) which is part of an election infrastructure.

(5) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security, or, upon designation by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security of the Department of Homeland Security, or a Senate-confirmed official that reports to the Director.

(6) The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(7) The term “voting system” has the meaning given such term in section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)).

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 3501. DEFINITIONS.

Except as provided in section 3403, in this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “Chairman” means the chair of the Election Assistance Commission.

(2) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committees on Homeland Security and House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(3) The term “chief State election official” means, with respect to a State, the individual designated by the State under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509) to be responsible for coordination of the State’s responsibilities under such Act.

(4) The term “Commission” means the Election Assistance Commission.

(5) The term “democratic institutions” means the diverse range of institutions that are essential to ensuring an independent judiciary, free and fair elections, and rule of law.

(6) The term “election agency” means any component of a State, or any component of a unit of local government in a State, which is responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office in the State.

(7) The term “election infrastructure” means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other commu-

nications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

(8) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(9) The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141).

SEC. 3502. INITIAL REPORT ON ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, the Chairman and the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committees on Homeland Security and House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, analyzing the adequacy of the funding, resources, and personnel available to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

Subtitle G—Severability

SEC. 3601. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

DIVISION B—CAMPAIGN FINANCE
TITLE IV—CAMPAIGN FINANCE
TRANSPARENCY

Subtitle A—Findings Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy

Sec. 4001. Findings relating to illicit money undermining our democracy.

Subtitle B—DISCLOSE Act

Sec. 4100. Short title.

PART 1—REGULATION OF CERTAIN POLITICAL SPENDING

Sec. 4101. Application of ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations, limited liability corporations, and partnerships that are foreign-controlled, foreign-influenced, and foreign-owned.

Sec. 4102. Clarification of application of foreign money ban to certain disbursements and activities.

PART 2—REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS

Sec. 4111. Reporting of campaign-related disbursements.

Sec. 4112. Application of foreign money ban to disbursements for campaign-related disbursements consisting of covered transfers.

Sec. 4113. Effective date.

PART 3—OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

Sec. 4121. Petition for certiorari.

Sec. 4122. Judicial review of actions related to campaign finance laws.

Subtitle C—Honest Ads

Sec. 4201. Short title.

Sec. 4202. Purpose.

Sec. 4203. Findings.

Sec. 4204. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 4205. Expansion of definition of public communication.

Sec. 4206. Expansion of definition of electioneering communication.

- Sec. 4207. Application of disclaimer statements to online communications.
- Sec. 4208. Political record requirements for online platforms.
- Sec. 4209. Preventing contributions, expenditures, independent expenditures, and disbursements for electioneering communications by foreign nationals in the form of online advertising.

Subtitle D—Stand By Every Ad

- Sec. 4301. Short title.
- Sec. 4302. Stand By Every Ad.
- Sec. 4303. Disclaimer requirements for communications made through prerecorded telephone calls.
- Sec. 4304. No expansion of persons subject to disclaimer requirements on Internet communications.
- Sec. 4305. Effective date.

Subtitle E—Secret Money Transparency

- Sec. 4401. Repeal of restriction of use of funds by Internal Revenue Service to bring transparency to political activity of certain nonprofit organizations.

Subtitle F—Shareholder Right-to-Know

- Sec. 4501. Repeal of restriction on use of funds by Securities and Exchange Commission to ensure shareholders of corporations have knowledge of corporation political activity.

Subtitle G—Disclosure of Political Spending by Government Contractors

- Sec. 4601. Repeal of restriction on use of funds to require disclosure of political spending by government contractors.

Subtitle H—Limitation and Disclosure Requirements for Presidential Inaugural Committees

- Sec. 4701. Short title.
- Sec. 4702. Limitations and disclosure of certain donations to, and disbursements by, Inaugural Committees.

Subtitle I—Severability

- Sec. 4801. Severability.

Subtitle A—Findings Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy

SEC. 4001. FINDINGS RELATING TO ILLICIT MONEY UNDERMINING OUR DEMOCRACY.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Criminals, terrorists, and corrupt government officials frequently abuse anonymously held Limited Liability Companies (LLCs), also known as “shell companies,” to hide, move, and launder the dirty money derived from illicit activities such as trafficking, bribery, exploitation, and embezzlement. Ownership and control of the finances that run through shell companies are obscured to regulators and law enforcement because little information is required and collected when establishing these entities.

(2) The public release of the “Panama Papers” in 2016 and the “Paradise Papers” in 2017 revealed that these shell companies often purchase and sell United States real estate. United States anti-money laundering laws do not apply to cash transactions involving real estate effectively concealing the beneficiaries and transactions from regulators and law enforcement.

(3) Congress should curb the use of anonymous shell companies for illicit purposes by requiring United States companies to disclose their beneficial owners, strengthening anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism finance laws.

(4) Congress should examine the money laundering and terrorist financing risks in

the real estate market, including the role of anonymous parties, and review legislation to address any vulnerabilities identified in this sector.

(5) Congress should examine the methods by which corruption flourishes and the means to detect and deter the financial misconduct that fuels this driver of global instability. Congress should monitor government efforts to enforce United States anti-corruption laws and regulations.

Subtitle B—DISCLOSE Act

SEC. 4100. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light On Spending in Elections Act of 2019” or the “DISCLOSE Act of 2019”.

PART 1—REGULATION OF CERTAIN POLITICAL SPENDING

SEC. 4101. 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) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) 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 expenditures, or disbursement for an electioneering communication by a corporation, limited liability corporation, or partnership during a year, the chief executive officer of the corporation, limited liability corporation, or partnership (or, if the corporation, limited liability corporation, or partnership does not have a chief executive officer, the highest ranking official of the corporation, limited liability corporation, or partnership), shall file a certification with the Commission, under penalty or 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, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

SEC. 4102. 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 decisionmaking 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 decision-making 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.”.

PART 2—REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS

SEC. 4111. REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS.

(a) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CORPORATIONS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, AND CERTAIN OTHER ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 324. DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS BY COVERED ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any covered organization that makes campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 in an election reporting cycle shall, not later than 24 hours after each disclosure date, file a statement with the Commission made under penalty of perjury that contains the information described in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the case of the first statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the first such disclosure date) and ending on the first such disclosure date; and

“(B) in the case of any subsequent statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the previous disclosure date and ending on such disclosure date.

“(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph is as follows:

“(A) The name of the covered organization and the principal place of business of such organization and, in the case of a covered organization that is a corporation (other than a business concern that is an issuer of a class of securities registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l) or that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d))) or an entity described in subsection

(e)(2), a list of the beneficial owners (as defined in paragraph (4)(A)) of the entity that—

“(i) identifies each beneficial owner by name and current residential or business street address; and

“(ii) if any beneficial owner exercises control over the entity through another legal entity, such as a corporation, partnership, limited liability company, or trust, identifies each such other legal entity and each such beneficial owner who will use that other entity to exercise control over the entity.

“(B) The amount of each campaign-related disbursement made by such organization during the period covered by the statement of more than \$1,000, and the name and address of the person to whom the disbursement was made.

“(C) In the case of a campaign-related disbursement that is not a covered transfer, the election to which the campaign-related disbursement pertains and if the disbursement is made for a public communication, the name of any candidate identified in such communication and whether such communication is in support of or in opposition to a candidate.

“(D) A certification by the chief executive officer or person who is the head of the covered organization that the campaign-related disbursement is not made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with or at the request or suggestion of a candidate, authorized committee, or agent of a candidate, political party, or agent of a political party.

“(E)(i) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using exclusively funds in a segregated bank account consisting of funds that were paid directly to such account by persons other than the covered organization that controls the account, for each such payment to the account—

“(I) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

“(II) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(III) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date, but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the account in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date.

“(ii) In any calendar year after 2020, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to the amount described in clause (i) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amounts described in subsection (b), the ‘base period’ shall be 2020.

“(F)(i) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using funds other than funds in a segregated bank account described in subparagraph (E), for each payment to the covered organization—

“(I) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

“(II) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(III) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date, but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the covered orga-

nization in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date.

“(ii) In any calendar year after 2020, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to the amount described in clause (i) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amounts described in subsection (b), the ‘base period’ shall be 2020.

“(G) Such other information as required in rules established by the Commission to promote the purposes of this section.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS.—The requirement to include in a statement filed under paragraph (1) the information described in paragraph (2) shall not apply to amounts received by the covered organization in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments (other than investments by the principal shareholder in a limited liability corporation) in the covered organization. For purposes of this subparagraph, amounts received by a covered organization as remittances from an employee to the employee’s collective bargaining representative shall be treated as amounts received in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of the business conducted by the covered organization.

“(B) DONOR RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply if—

“(i) the person described in such subparagraph prohibited, in writing, the use of the payment made by such person for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the covered organization agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(C) THREAT OF HARASSMENT OR REPRISAL.—The requirement to include any information relating to the name or address of any person (other than a candidate) in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) shall not apply if the inclusion of the information would subject the person to serious threats, harassment, or reprisals.

“(4) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(A) BENEFICIAL OWNER DEFINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘beneficial owner’ means, with respect to any entity, a natural person who, directly or indirectly—

“(I) exercises substantial control over an entity through ownership, voting rights, agreement, or otherwise; or

“(II) has a substantial interest in or receives substantial economic benefits from the assets of an entity.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘beneficial owner’ shall not include—

“(I) a minor child;

“(II) a person acting as a nominee, intermediary, custodian, or agent on behalf of another person;

“(III) a person acting solely as an employee of an entity and whose control over or economic benefits from the entity derives solely from the employment status of the person;

“(IV) a person whose only interest in an entity is through a right of inheritance, unless the person also meets the requirements of clause (i); or

“(V) a creditor of an entity, unless the creditor also meets the requirements of clause (i).

“(iii) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—The exceptions under clause (ii) shall not apply if used for the purpose of evading, circumventing, or abusing the provisions of clause (i) or paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) DISCLOSURE DATE.—The term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(i) the first date during any election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000; and

“(ii) any other date during such election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such election reporting cycle.

“(C) ELECTION REPORTING CYCLE.—The term ‘election reporting cycle’ means the 2-year period beginning on the date of the most recent general election for Federal office.

“(D) PAYMENT.—The term ‘payment’ includes any contribution, donation, transfer, payment of dues, or other payment.

“(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—

“(1) OTHER REPORTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION.—Information included in a statement filed under this section may be excluded from statements and reports filed under section 304.

“(2) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUND.—A segregated bank account referred to in subsection (a)(2)(E) may be treated as a separate segregated fund for purposes of section 527(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(c) FILING.—Statements required to be filed under subsection (a) shall be subject to the requirements of section 304(d) to the same extent and in the same manner as if such reports had been required under subsection (c) or (g) of section 304.

“(d) CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENT DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘campaign-related disbursement’ means a disbursement by a covered organization for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office, or is the functional equivalent of express advocacy because, when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate for election for Federal office.

“(B) Any public communication which refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and which promotes or supports the election of a candidate for that office, or attacks or opposes the election of a candidate for that office, without regard to whether the communication expressly advocates a vote for or against a candidate for that office.

“(C) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3).

“(D) A covered transfer.

“(2) INTENT NOT REQUIRED.—A disbursement for an item described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) shall be treated as a campaign-related disbursement regardless of the intent of the person making the disbursement.

“(e) COVERED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered organization’ means any of the following:

“(1) A corporation (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(2) A limited liability corporation that is not otherwise treated as a corporation for

purposes of this Act (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(3) An organization described in section 501(c) of such Code and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of such Code).

“(4) A labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)).

“(5) Any political organization under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, other than a political committee under this Act (except as provided in paragraph (6)).

“(6) A political committee with an account that accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the contribution limits or source prohibitions under this Act, but only with respect to such accounts.

“(f) COVERED TRANSFER DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any transfer or payment of funds by a covered organization to another person if the covered organization—

“(A) designates, requests, or suggests that the amounts be used for—

“(i) campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(B) made such transfer or payment in response to a solicitation or other request for a donation or payment for—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(C) engaged in discussions with the recipient of the transfer or payment regarding—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) donating or transferring any amount of such transfer or payment to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(D) made campaign-related disbursements (other than a covered transfer) in an aggregate amount of \$50,000 or more during the 2-year period ending on the date of the transfer or payment, or knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment made such disbursements in such an aggregate amount during that 2-year period; or

“(E) knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment would make campaign-related disbursements in an aggregate amount of \$50,000 or more during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the transfer or payment.

“(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘covered transfer’ does not include any of the following:

“(A) A disbursement made by a covered organization in a commercial transaction in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments made by the covered organization.

“(B) A disbursement made by a covered organization if—

“(i) the covered organization prohibited, in writing, the use of such disbursement for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the recipient of the disbursement agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the disbursement in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.—

“(A) SPECIAL RULE.—A transfer of an amount by one covered organization to another covered organization which is treated as a transfer between affiliates under sub-

paragraph (C) shall be considered a covered transfer by the covered organization which transfers the amount only if the aggregate amount transferred during the year by such covered organization to that same covered organization is equal to or greater than \$50,000.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AMONG AFFILIATES.—In determining the amount of a transfer between affiliates for purposes of subparagraph (A), to the extent that the transfer consists of funds attributable to dues, fees, or assessments which are paid by individuals on a regular, periodic basis in accordance with a per-individual calculation which is made on a regular basis, the transfer shall be attributed to the individuals paying the dues, fees, or assessments and shall not be attributed to the covered organization.

“(C) DESCRIPTION OF TRANSFERS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.—A transfer of amounts from one covered organization to another covered organization shall be treated as a transfer between affiliates if—

“(i) one of the organizations is an affiliate of the other organization; or

“(ii) each of the organizations is an affiliate of the same organization, except that the transfer shall not be treated as a transfer between affiliates if one of the organizations is established for the purpose of making campaign-related disbursements.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF AFFILIATE STATUS.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), a covered organization is an affiliate of another covered organization if—

“(i) the governing instrument of the organization requires it to be bound by decisions of the other organization;

“(ii) the governing board of the organization includes persons who are specifically designated representatives of the other organization or are members of the governing board, officers, or paid executive staff members of the other organization, or whose service on the governing board is contingent upon the approval of the other organization; or

“(iii) the organization is chartered by the other organization.

“(E) COVERAGE OF TRANSFERS TO AFFILIATED SECTION 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATIONS.—This paragraph shall apply with respect to an amount transferred by a covered organization to an organization described in paragraph (3) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code in the same manner as this paragraph applies to an amount transferred by a covered organization to another covered organization.

“(G) NO EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive or otherwise affect any other requirement of this Act which relates to the reporting of campaign-related disbursements.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(f)(6) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by striking “Any requirement” and inserting “Except as provided in section 324(b), any requirement”.

(b) COORDINATION WITH FINCEN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury shall provide the Federal Election Commission with such information as necessary to assist in administering and enforcing section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by this section.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, in consultation with the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury, shall sub-

mit to Congress a report with recommendations for providing further legislative authority to assist in the administration and enforcement of such section 324.

SEC. 4112. APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO DISBURSEMENTS FOR CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS CONSISTING OF COVERED TRANSFERS.

Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)), as amended by section 4102, is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: “, and any disbursement, other than a disbursement described in section 324(a)(3)(A), to another person who made a campaign-related disbursement consisting of a covered transfer (as described in section 324) during the 2-year period ending on the date of the disbursement;”.

SEC. 4113. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this part shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after January 1, 2020, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

PART 3—OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

SEC. 4121. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 307(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(6)) is amended by inserting “(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)” after “appeal”.

SEC. 4122. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ACTIONS RELATED TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30141 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 406 the following new section:

“SEC. 407. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 373(f), if any action is brought for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or of chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or is brought to with respect to any action of the Commission under chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the following rules shall apply:

“(1) The action shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and an appeal from the decision of the district court may be taken to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

“(2) In the case of an action relating to declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of a provision—

“(A) a copy of the complaint shall be delivered promptly to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate; and

“(B) it shall be the duty of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.

“(b) INTERVENTION BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—In any action in which the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is raised, any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) or Senate shall have the right to intervene either in support of or opposition to the position of a party to the case regarding the constitutionality of the provision. To avoid duplication of efforts and reduce the burdens placed on the parties to the action, the court in any such action may make such orders as it considers necessary, including orders to

require interveners taking similar positions to file joint papers or to be represented by a single attorney at oral argument.

“(c) CHALLENGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Any Member of Congress may bring an action, subject to the special rules described in subsection (a), for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Section 9011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9011. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“For provisions relating to judicial review of certifications, determinations, and actions by the Commission under this chapter, see section 407 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”

(B) Section 9041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9041. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“For provisions relating to judicial review of actions by the Commission under this chapter, see section 407 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”

(C) Section 403 of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 30110 note) is repealed.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions brought on or after January 1, 2019.

Subtitle C—Honest Ads

SEC. 4201. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 4202. 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. 4203. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On January 6, 2017, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence published a report titled “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections”, noting that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election . . .”. Moscow’s influence campaign followed a Russian messaging strategy that blends covert intelligence operation—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users or “trolls”.

(2) On November 24, 2016, The Washington Post reported findings from 2 teams of independent researchers that concluded Russians “exploited American-made technology platforms to attack U.S. democracy at a particularly vulnerable moment . . . as part of a broadly effective strategy of sowing distrust in U.S. democracy and its leaders.”

(3) Findings from a 2017 study on the manipulation of public opinion through social media conducted by the Computational Propaganda Research Project at the Oxford Internet Institute found that the Kremlin is using pro-Russian bots to manipulate public discourse to a highly targeted audience. With a sample of nearly 1,300,000 tweets, researchers found that in the 2016 election’s 3 decisive States, propaganda constituted 40 percent of the sampled election-related tweets that went to Pennsylvanians, 34 percent to Michigan voters, and 30 percent to those in Wisconsin. In other swing States, the figure reached 42 percent in Missouri, 41

percent in Florida, 40 percent in North Carolina, 38 percent in Colorado, and 35 percent in Ohio.

(4) On September 6, 2017, the nation’s largest social media platform disclosed that between June 2015 and May 2017, Russian entities purchased \$100,000 in political advertisements, publishing roughly 3,000 ads linked to fake accounts associated with the Internet Research Agency, a pro-Kremlin organization. According to the company, the ads purchased focused “on amplifying divisive social and political messages . . .”.

(5) In 2002, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act became law, establishing disclosure requirements for political advertisements distributed from a television or radio broadcast station or provider of cable or satellite television. In 2003, the Supreme Court upheld regulations on electioneering communications established under the Act, noting that such requirements “provide the electorate with information and insure that the voters are fully informed about the person or group who is speaking.”

(6) According to a study from Borrell Associates, in 2016, \$1,415,000,000 was spent on online advertising, more than quadruple the amount in 2012.

(7) The reach of a few large internet platforms—larger than any broadcast, satellite, or cable provider—has greatly facilitated the scope and effectiveness of disinformation campaigns. For instance, the largest platform has over 210,000,000 Americans users—over 160,000,000 of them on a daily basis. By contrast, the largest cable television provider has 22,430,000 subscribers, while the largest satellite television provider has 21,000,000 subscribers. And the most-watched television broadcast in United States history had 118,000,000 viewers.

(8) The public nature of broadcast television, radio, and satellite ensures a level of publicity for any political advertisement. These communications are accessible to the press, fact-checkers, and political opponents; this creates strong disincentives for a candidate to disseminate materially false, inflammatory, or contradictory messages to the public. Social media platforms, in contrast, can target portions of the electorate with direct, ephemeral advertisements often on the basis of private information the platform has on individuals, enabling political advertisements that are contradictory, racially or socially inflammatory, or materially false.

(9) According to comScore, 2 companies own 8 of the 10 most popular smartphone applications as of June 2017, including the most popular social media and email services—which deliver information and news to users without requiring proactivity by the user. Those same 2 companies accounted for 99 percent of revenue growth from digital advertising in 2016, including 77 percent of gross spending. 79 percent of online Americans—representing 68 percent of all Americans—use the single largest social network, while 66 percent of these users are most likely to get their news from that site.

(10) In its 2006 rulemaking, the Federal Election Commission noted that only 18 percent of all Americans cited the internet as their leading source of news about the 2004 Presidential election; by contrast, the Pew Research Center found that 65 percent of Americans identified an internet-based source as their leading source of information for the 2016 election.

(11) The Federal Election Commission, the independent Federal agency charged with protecting the integrity of the Federal campaign finance process by providing transparency and administering campaign finance laws, has failed to take action to address online political advertisements.

(12) In testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence titled, “Disinformation: A Primer in Russian Active Measures and Influence Campaigns”, multiple expert witnesses testified that while the disinformation tactics of foreign adversaries have not necessarily changed, social media services now provide “platform[s] practically purpose-built for active measures[.]” Similarly, as Gen. Keith B. Alexander (RET.), the former Director of the National Security Agency, testified, during the Cold War “if the Soviet Union sought to manipulate information flow, it would have to do so principally through its own propaganda outlets or through active measures that would generate specific news: planting of leaflets, inciting of violence, creation of other false materials and narratives. But the news itself was hard to manipulate because it would have required actual control of the organs of media, which took long-term efforts to penetrate. Today, however, because the clear majority of the information on social media sites is uncurated and there is a rapid proliferation of information sources and other sites that can reinforce information, there is an increasing likelihood that the information available to average consumers may be inaccurate (whether intentionally or otherwise) and may be more easily manipulable than in prior eras.”

(13) Current regulations on political advertisements do not provide sufficient transparency to uphold the public’s right to be fully informed about political advertisements made online.

SEC. 4204. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the dramatic increase in digital political advertisements, and the growing centrality of online platforms in the lives of Americans, requires the Congress and the Federal Election Commission to take meaningful action to ensure that laws and regulations provide the accountability and transparency that is fundamental to our democracy.

(2) free and fair elections require both transparency and accountability which give the public a right to know the true sources of funding for political advertisements in order to make informed political choices and hold elected officials accountable; and

(3) transparency of funding for political advertisements is essential to enforce other campaign finance laws, including the prohibition on campaign spending by foreign nationals.

SEC. 4205. 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. 4206. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ELECTORATE TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

(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 (j)(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. 4207. 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 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 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).

(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”; and

(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. 4208. POLITICAL RECORD REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.

(A) 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 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(j) 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; and

(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(j) 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(j) 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. 4209. 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), as amended by section 4101(a)(2) and section 4101(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCAST STATIONS, PROVIDERS OF CABLE AND SATELLITE TELEVISION, AND ONLINE PLATFORMS.—Each television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform (as defined in section 304(j)(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.”

Subtitle D—Stand By Every Ad

SEC. 4301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Stand By Every Ad Act”.

SEC. 4302. STAND BY EVERY AD.

(a) EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120), as amended by section 4207(b)(1), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

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

“(e) EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY CANDIDATES OR COMMITTEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (6), any communication described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) which is transmitted in an audio or video format (including an Internet or digital communication), or which is an Internet or digital communication transmitted in a text or graphic format, shall include, in addition to the requirements of paragraph (3) of subsection (a), the following:

“(A) The individual disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(A) (if the person paying for the communication is an individual) or the organizational disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(B) (if the person paying for the communication is not an individual).

“(B) If the communication is transmitted in a video format, or is an Internet or digital communication which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, and is paid for in whole or in part with a payment which is treated as a campaign-related disbursement under section 324—

“(i) the Top Five Funders list (if applicable); or

“(ii) in the case of a communication which, as determined on the basis of criteria established in regulations issued by the Commission, is of such short duration that including the Top Five Funders list in the communication would constitute a hardship to the person paying for the communication by requiring a disproportionate amount of the content of the communication to consist of the Top Five Funders list, the name of a website which contains the Top Five Funders list (if applicable) or, in the case of an Internet or digital communication, a hyperlink to such website.

“(C) If the communication is transmitted in an audio format and is paid for in whole or in part with a payment which is treated as a campaign-related disbursement under section 324—

“(i) the Top Two Funders list (if applicable); or

“(ii) in the case of a communication which, as determined on the basis of criteria established in regulations issued by the Commission, is of such short duration that including the Top Two Funders list in the communication would constitute a hardship to the person paying for the communication by requiring a disproportionate amount of the content of the communication to consist of the Top Two Funders list, the name of a website which contains the Top Two Funders list (if applicable).

“(2) DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS DESCRIBED.—

“(A) INDIVIDUAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.—The individual disclosure statement described in this subparagraph is the following: ‘I am _____, and I approve this message.’, with the blank filled in with the name of the applicable individual.

“(B) ORGANIZATIONAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.—The organizational disclosure statement described in this subparagraph is the following: ‘I am _____, the _____ of _____, and _____ approves this message.’, with—

“(i) the first blank to be filled in with the name of the applicable individual;

“(ii) the second blank to be filled in with the title of the applicable individual; and

“(iii) the third and fourth blank each to be filled in with the name of the organization or other person paying for the communication.

“(3) METHOD OF CONVEYANCE OF STATEMENT.—

“(A) COMMUNICATIONS IN TEXT OR GRAPHIC FORMAT.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, the disclosure statements required under paragraph (1) shall appear in letters at least as large as the majority of the text in the communication.

“(B) COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTED IN AUDIO FORMAT.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in an audio format, the disclosure statements required under paragraph (1) shall be made by audio by the applicable individual in a clear and conspicuous manner.

“(C) COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTED IN VIDEO FORMAT.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a video format, the information required under paragraph (1)—

“(i) shall appear in writing at the end of the communication or in a crawl along the bottom of the communication in a clear and conspicuous manner, with a reasonable degree of color contrast between the background and the printed statement, for a period of at least 6 seconds; and

“(ii) shall also be conveyed by an unobscured, full-screen view of the applicable individual or by the applicable individual making the statement in voice-over accompanied by a clearly identifiable photograph or similar image of the individual, except in the case of a Top Five Funders list.

“(4) APPLICABLE INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—The term ‘applicable individual’ means, with respect to a communication to which this subsection applies—

“(A) if the communication is paid for by an individual, the individual involved;

“(B) if the communication is paid for by a corporation, the chief executive officer of the corporation (or, if the corporation does not have a chief executive officer, the highest ranking official of the corporation);

“(C) if the communication is paid for by a labor organization, the highest ranking officer of the labor organization; and

“(D) if the communication is paid for by any other person, the highest ranking official of such person.

“(5) TOP FIVE FUNDERS LIST AND TOP TWO FUNDERS LIST DEFINED.—

“(A) TOP FIVE FUNDERS LIST.—The term ‘Top Five Funders list’ means, with respect to a communication which is paid for in whole or in part with a campaign-related disbursement (as defined in section 324), a list of the five persons who, during the 12-month period ending on the date of the disbursement, provided the largest payments of any type in an aggregate amount equal to or exceeding \$10,000 to the person who is paying for the communication and the amount of the payments each such person provided. If two or more people provided the fifth largest of such payments, the person paying for the communication shall select one of those persons to be included on the Top Five Funders list.

“(B) TOP TWO FUNDERS LIST.—The term ‘Top Two Funders list’ means, with respect to a communication which is paid for in whole or in part with a campaign-related disbursement (as defined in section 324), a list of the persons who, during the 12-month period ending on the date of the disbursement, provided the largest and the second largest payments of any type in an aggregate amount equal to or exceeding \$10,000 to the person who is paying for the communication and the amount of the payments each such person provided. If two or more persons provided the second largest of such payments, the person paying for the communication

shall select one of those persons to be included on the Top Two Funders list.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), in determining the amount of payments made by a person to a person paying for a communication, there shall be excluded the following:

“(i) Any amounts provided in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the person paying for the communication or in the form of investments in the person paying for the communication.

“(ii) Any payment which the person prohibited, in writing, from being used for campaign-related disbursements, but only if the person paying for the communication agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(6) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(A) EXCEPTION FOR COMMUNICATIONS PAID FOR BY POLITICAL PARTIES AND CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—This subsection does not apply to any communication to which subsection (d)(2) applies.

“(B) TREATMENT OF VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS LASTING 10 SECONDS OR LESS.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a video format, or is an Internet or digital communication which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, the communication shall meet the following requirements:

“(i) The communication shall include the individual disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(A) (if the person paying for the communication is an individual) or the organizational disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(B) (if the person paying for the communication is not an individual).

“(ii) The statement described in clause (i) shall appear in writing at the end of the communication, or in a crawl along the bottom of the communication, in a clear and conspicuous manner, with a reasonable degree of color contrast between the background and the printed statement, for a period of at least 4 seconds.

“(iii) The communication shall include, in a clear and conspicuous manner, a website address with a landing page which will provide all of the information described in paragraph (1) with respect to the communication. Such address shall appear for the full duration of the communication.

“(iv) To the extent that the format in which the communication is made permits the use of a hyperlink, the communication shall include a hyperlink to the website address described in clause (iii).”

(b) APPLICATION OF EXPANDED REQUIREMENTS TO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS CONSISTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS.—Section 318(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended by striking “for the purpose of financing communications expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate” and inserting “for a campaign-related disbursement, as defined in section 324, consisting of a public communication”.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMMUNICATIONS PAID FOR BY POLITICAL PARTIES AND CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—Section 318(d)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “OTHERS” and inserting “CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES”;

(2) by striking “Any communication” and inserting “(A) Any communication”;

(3) by inserting “which (except to the extent provided in subparagraph (B)) is paid for by a political committee (including a political committee of a political party) and” after “subsection (a)”;

(4) by striking “or other person” each place it appears; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B)(i) This paragraph does not apply to a communication paid for in whole or in part during a calendar year with a campaign-related disbursement, but only if the covered organization making the campaign-related disbursement made campaign-related disbursements (as defined in section 324) aggregating more than \$10,000 during such calendar year.

“(ii) For purposes of clause (i), in determining the amount of campaign-related disbursements made by a covered organization during a year, there shall be excluded the following:

“(I) Any amounts received by the covered organization in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments in the covered organization.

“(II) Any amounts received by the covered organization from a person who prohibited, in writing, the organization from using such amounts for campaign-related disbursements, but only if the covered organization agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the amounts in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.”

SEC. 4303. DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS MADE THROUGH PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.

(a) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 318(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)), as amended by section 4205(c), is amended by inserting after “public communication” each place it appears the following: “(including a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message)”.

(2) APPLICATION TO COMMUNICATIONS SUBJECT TO EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 318(e)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(e)(1)), as added by section 4302(a), is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “which is transmitted in an audio or video format” and inserting “which is transmitted in an audio or video format or which consists of a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message”.

(b) TREATMENT AS COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTED IN AUDIO FORMAT.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS BY CANDIDATES OR AUTHORIZED PERSONS.—Section 318(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.—Any communication described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) (other than a communication which is subject to subsection (e)) which is a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message shall include, in addition to the requirements of such paragraph, the audio statement required under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) or the audio statement required under paragraph (2) (whichever is applicable), except that the statement shall be made at the beginning of the telephone call.”

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SUBJECT TO EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 318(e)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(e)(3)), as added by section 4302(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message, the communication shall be considered to be transmitted in an audio format.”

SEC. 4304. NO EXPANSION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS ON INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle may be construed to require any person who is not required under section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as provided under section 110.11 of title 11 of the Code of Federal Regulations) to include a disclaimer on communications made by the person through the internet to include any disclaimer on any such communications.

SEC. 4305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2020, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

Subtitle E—Secret Money Transparency

SEC. 4401. REPEAL OF RESTRICTION OF USE OF FUNDS BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO BRING TRANSPARENCY TO POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CERTAIN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 124 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019 (division D of Public Law 116-6) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4402. REPEAL OF REVENUE PROCEDURE THAT ELIMINATED REQUIREMENT TO REPORT INFORMATION REGARDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO CERTAIN TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

Revenue Procedure 2018-38 shall have no force and effect.

Subtitle F—Shareholder Right-to-Know

SEC. 4501. REPEAL OF RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS BY SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION TO ENSURE SHAREHOLDERS OF CORPORATIONS HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF CORPORATION POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

Section 629 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019 (division D of Public Law 116-6) is hereby repealed.

Subtitle G—Disclosure of Political Spending by Government Contractors

SEC. 4601. REPEAL OF RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE OF POLITICAL SPENDING BY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS.

Section 735 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019 (division D of Public Law 116-6) is hereby repealed.

Subtitle H—Limitation and Disclosure Requirements for Presidential Inaugural Committees

SEC. 4701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Presidential Inaugural Committee Oversight Act”.

SEC. 4702. LIMITATIONS AND DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN DONATIONS TO, AND DISBURSEMENTS BY, INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 325. INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.

“(a) PROHIBITED DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful—

“(A) for an Inaugural Committee—

“(i) to solicit, accept, or receive a donation from a person that is not an individual; or

“(ii) to solicit, accept, or receive a donation from a foreign national;

“(B) for a person—

“(i) to make a donation to an Inaugural Committee in the name of another person, or

to knowingly authorize his or her name to be used to effect such a donation;

“(ii) to knowingly accept a donation to an Inaugural Committee made by a person in the name of another person; or

“(iii) to convert a donation to an Inaugural Committee to personal use as described in paragraph (2); and

“(C) for a foreign national to, directly or indirectly, make a donation, or make an express or implied promise to make a donation, to an Inaugural Committee.

“(2) CONVERSION OF DONATION TO PERSONAL USE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(iii), a donation shall be considered to be converted to personal use if any part of the donated amount is used to fulfill a commitment, obligation, or expense of a person that would exist irrespective of the responsibilities of the Inaugural Committee under chapter 5 of title 36, United States Code.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON DISBURSEMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an Inaugural Committee from disbursing unused funds to an organization which is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(b) LIMITATION ON DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for an individual to make donations to an Inaugural Committee which, in the aggregate, exceed \$50,000.

“(2) INDEXING.—At the beginning of each Presidential election year (beginning with 2024), the amount described in paragraph (1) shall be increased by the cumulative percent difference determined in section 315(c)(1)(A) since the previous Presidential election year. If any amount after such increase is not a multiple of \$1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000.

“(c) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN DONATIONS AND DISBURSEMENTS.—

“(1) DONATIONS OVER \$1,000.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An Inaugural Committee shall file with the Commission a report disclosing any donation by an individual to the committee in an amount of \$1,000 or more not later than 24 hours after the receipt of such donation.

“(B) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—A report filed under subparagraph (A) shall contain—

“(i) the amount of the donation;

“(ii) the date the donation is received; and

“(iii) the name and address of the individual making the donation.

“(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 90 days after the date of the Presidential inaugural ceremony, the Inaugural Committee shall file with the Commission a report containing the following information:

“(A) For each donation of money or anything of value made to the committee in an aggregate amount equal to or greater than \$200—

“(i) the amount of the donation;

“(ii) the date the donation is received; and

“(iii) the name and address of the individual making the donation.

“(B) The total amount of all disbursements, and all disbursements in the following categories:

“(i) Disbursements made to meet committee operating expenses.

“(ii) Repayment of all loans.

“(iii) Donation refunds and other offsets to donations.

“(iv) Any other disbursements.

“(C) The name and address of each person—

“(i) to whom a disbursement in an aggregate amount or value in excess of \$200 is made by the committee to meet a committee operating expense, together with date,

amount, and purpose of such operating expense;

“(ii) who receives a loan repayment from the committee, together with the date and amount of such loan repayment;

“(iii) who receives a donation refund or other offset to donations from the committee, together with the date and amount of such disbursement; and

“(iv) to whom any other disbursement in an aggregate amount or value in excess of \$200 is made by the committee, together with the date and amount of such disbursement.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1)(A) The term ‘donation’ includes—

“(i) any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person to the committee; or

“(ii) the payment by any person of compensation for the personal services of another person which are rendered to the committee without charge for any purpose.

“(B) The term ‘donation’ does not include the value of services provided without compensation by any individual who volunteers on behalf of the committee.

“(2) The term ‘foreign national’ has the meaning given that term by section 319(b).

“(3) The term ‘Inaugural Committee’ has the meaning given that term by section 501 of title 36, United States Code.”.

(b) CONFIRMING AMENDMENT RELATED TO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (h); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATED TO STATUS OF COMMITTEE.—Section 510 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“**§ 510. Disclosure of and prohibition on certain donations**

“A committee shall not be considered to be the Inaugural Committee for purposes of this chapter unless the committee agrees to, and meets, the requirements of section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to Inaugural Committees established under chapter 5 of title 36, United States Code, for inaugurations held in 2021 and any succeeding year.

Subtitle I—Severability

SEC. 4801. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE V—CAMPAIGN FINANCE EMPOWERMENT

Subtitle A—Findings Relating to Citizens United Decision

Sec. 5001. Findings relating to *Citizens United* decision.

Subtitle B—Congressional Elections

Sec. 5100. Short title.

PART 1—MY VOICE VOUCHER PILOT PROGRAM

Sec. 5101. Establishment of pilot program.

Sec. 5102. Voucher program described.

Sec. 5103. Reports.

Sec. 5104. Definitions.

PART 2—SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Sec. 5111. Benefits and eligibility requirements for candidates.

“TITLE V—SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

“Subtitle A—Benefits

“Sec. 501. Benefits for participating candidates.

“Sec. 502. Procedures for making payments.

“Sec. 503. Use of funds.

“Sec. 504. Qualified small dollar contributions described.

“Subtitle B—Eligibility and Certification

“Sec. 511. Eligibility.

“Sec. 512. Qualifying requirements.

“Sec. 513. Certification.

“Subtitle C—Requirements for Candidates Certified as Participating Candidates

“Sec. 521. Contribution and expenditure requirements.

“Sec. 522. Administration of campaign.

“Sec. 523. Preventing unnecessary spending of public funds.

“Sec. 524. Remitting unspent funds after election.

“Subtitle D—Enhanced Match Support

“Sec. 531. Enhanced support for general election.

“Sec. 532. Eligibility.

“Sec. 533. Amount.

“Sec. 534. Waiver of authority to retain portion of unspent funds after election.

“Subtitle E—Administrative Provisions

“Sec. 541. Freedom From Influence Fund.

“Sec. 542. Reviews and reports by Government Accountability Office.

“Sec. 543. Administration by Commission.

“Sec. 544. Violations and penalties.

“Sec. 545. Appeals process.

“Sec. 546. Indexing of amounts.

“Sec. 547. Election cycle defined.

Sec. 5112. Contributions and expenditures by multicandidate and political party committees on behalf of participating candidates.

Sec. 5113. Prohibiting use of contributions by participating candidates for purposes other than campaign for election.

Sec. 5114. Effective date.

Subtitle C—Presidential Elections

Sec. 5200. Short title.

PART 1—PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Sec. 5201. Increase in and modifications to matching payments.

Sec. 5202. Eligibility requirements for matching payments.

Sec. 5203. Repeal of expenditure limitations.

Sec. 5204. Period of availability of matching payments.

Sec. 5205. Examination and audits of matchable contributions.

Sec. 5206. Modification to limitation on contributions for Presidential primary candidates.

Sec. 5207. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.

PART 2—GENERAL ELECTIONS

Sec. 5211. Modification of eligibility requirements for public financing.

Sec. 5212. Repeal of expenditure limitations and use of qualified campaign contributions.

Sec. 5213. Matching payments and other modifications to payment amounts.

Sec. 5214. Increase in limit on coordinated party expenditures.

Sec. 5215. Establishment of uniform date for release of payments.

Sec. 5216. Amounts in Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

Sec. 5217. Use of general election payments for general election legal and accounting compliance.

Sec. 5218. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.

PART 3—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 5221. Effective date.

Subtitle D—Personal Use Services as Authorized Campaign Expenditures

Sec. 5301. Short title; findings; purpose.

Sec. 5302. Treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as authorized campaign expenditure.

Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 5401. Severability.

Subtitle A—Findings Relating to *Citizens United* Decision

SEC. 5001. FINDINGS RELATING TO *CITIZENS UNITED* DECISION.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The American Republic was founded on the principle that all people are created equal, with rights and responsibilities as citizens to vote, be represented, speak, debate, and participate in self-government on equal terms regardless of wealth. To secure these rights and responsibilities, our Constitution not only protects the equal rights of all Americans but also provides checks and balances to prevent corruption and prevent concentrated power and wealth from undermining effective self-government.

(2) The Supreme Court's decisions in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010) and *McCutcheon v. FEC*, 572 U.S. 185 (2014), as well as other court decisions, erroneously invalidated even-handed rules about the spending of money in local, State, and Federal elections. These flawed decisions have empowered large corporations, extremely wealthy individuals, and special interests to dominate election spending, corrupt our politics, and degrade our democracy through tidal waves of unlimited and anonymous spending. These decisions also stand in contrast to a long history of efforts by Congress and the States to regulate money in politics to protect democracy, and they illustrate a troubling deregulatory trend in campaign finance-related court decisions. Additionally, an unknown amount of foreign money continues to be spent in our political system as subsidiaries of foreign-based corporations and hostile foreign actors sometimes connected to nation-States work to influence our elections.

(3) The Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the Constitution to empower monied interests at the expense of the American people in elections has seriously eroded over 100 years of congressional action to promote fairness and protect elections from the toxic influence of money.

(4) In 1907, Congress passed the Tillman Act in response to the concentration of corporate power in the post-Civil War Gilded Age. The Act prohibited corporations from making contributions in connection with Federal elections, aiming "not merely to prevent the subversion of the integrity of the electoral process [but] . . . to sustain the active, alert responsibility of the individual citizen in a democracy for the wise conduct of government".

(5) By 1910, Congress began passing disclosure requirements and campaign expenditure limits, and dozens of States passed corrupt practices Acts to prohibit corporate spending in elections. States also enacted campaign spending limits, and some States limited the amount that people could contribute to campaigns.

(6) In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act prohibited corporations and unions from making campaign contributions or other expenditures to

influence elections. In 1962, a Presidential commission on election spending recommended spending limits and incentives to increase small contributions from more people.

(7) The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA), as amended in 1974, required disclosure of contributions and expenditures, imposed contribution and expenditure limits for individuals and groups, set spending limits for campaigns, candidates, and groups, implemented a public funding system for Presidential campaigns, and created the Federal Election Commission to oversee and enforce the new rules.

(8) In the wake of *Citizens United* and other damaging Federal court decisions, Americans have witnessed an explosion of outside spending in elections. Outside spending increased nearly 900 percent between the 2008 and 2016 Presidential election years. Indeed, the 2018 elections once again made clear the overwhelming political power of wealthy special interests, to the tune of over \$5,000,000,000. And as political entities adapt to a post-*Citizens United*, post-*McCutcheon* landscape, these trends are getting worse, as evidenced by the experience in the 2018 midterm congressional elections, where outside spending more than doubled from the previous midterm cycle.

(9) The torrent of money flowing into our political system has a profound effect on the democratic process for everyday Americans, whose voices and policy preferences are increasingly being drowned out by those of wealthy special interests. The more campaign cash from wealthy special interests can flood our elections, the more policies that favor those interests are reflected in the national political agenda. When it comes to policy preferences, our Nation's wealthiest tend to have fundamentally different views than do average Americans when it comes to issues ranging from unemployment benefits to the minimum wage to health care coverage.

(10) The Court has tied the hands of Congress and the States, severely restricting them from setting reasonable limits on campaign spending. For example, the Court has held that only the Government's interest in preventing quid pro quo corruption, like bribery, or the appearance of such corruption, can justify limits on campaign contributions. More broadly, the Court has severely curtailed attempts to reduce the ability of the Nation's wealthiest and most powerful to skew our democracy in their favor by buying outsized influence in our elections. Because this distortion of the Constitution has prevented truly meaningful regulation or reform of the way we finance elections in America, a constitutional amendment is needed to achieve a democracy for all the people.

(11) Since the landmark *Citizens United* decision, 19 States and nearly 800 municipalities, including large cities like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia, have gone on record supporting a constitutional amendment. Transcending political leanings and geographic location, voters in States and municipalities across the country that have placed amendment questions on the ballot have routinely supported these initiatives by considerably large margins.

(12) At the same time millions of Americans have signed petitions, marched, called their Members of Congress, written letters to the editor, and otherwise demonstrated their public support for a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United* that will allow Congress to reign in the outsized influence of unchecked money in politics. Dozens of organizations, representing tens of millions of individuals, have come together in a

shared strategy of supporting such an amendment.

(13) In order to protect the integrity of democracy and the electoral process and to ensure political equality for all, the Constitution should be amended so that Congress and the States may regulate and set limits on the raising and spending of money to influence elections and may distinguish between natural persons and artificial entities, like corporations, that are created by law, including by prohibiting such artificial entities from spending money to influence elections.

Subtitle B—Congressional Elections

SEC. 5100. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Government By the People Act of 2019".

PART 1—MY VOICE VOUCHER PILOT PROGRAM

SEC. 5101. ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Federal Election Commission (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Commission") shall establish a pilot program under which the Commission shall select 3 eligible States to operate a voucher pilot program which is described in section 5102 during the program operation period.

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.—A State is eligible to be selected to operate a voucher pilot program under this part if, not later than 180 days after the beginning of the program application period, the State submits to the Commission an application containing—

(1) information and assurances that the State will operate a voucher program which contains the elements described in section 5102(a);

(2) information and assurances that the State will establish fraud prevention mechanisms described in section 5102(b);

(3) information and assurances that the State will establish a commission to oversee and implement the program as described in section 5102(c);

(4) information and assurances that the State will carry out a public information campaign as described in section 5102(d);

(5) information and assurances that the State will submit reports as required under section 5103; and

(6) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the beginning of the program application period, the Commission shall select the 3 States which will operate voucher pilot programs under this part.

(2) CRITERIA.—In selecting States for the operation of the voucher pilot programs under this part, the Commission shall apply such criteria and metrics as the Commission considers appropriate to determine the ability of a State to operate the program successfully, and shall attempt to select States in a variety of geographic regions and with a variety of political party preferences.

(3) NO SUPERMAJORITY REQUIRED FOR SELECTION.—The selection of States by the Commission under this subsection shall require the approval of only half of the Members of the Commission.

(d) DUTIES OF STATES DURING PROGRAM PREPARATION PERIOD.—During the program preparation period, each State selected to operate a voucher pilot program under this part shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that the State will be ready to operate the program during the program operation period, and shall complete such actions not later than 90 days before the beginning of the program operation period.

(e) TERMINATION.—Each voucher pilot program under this part shall terminate as of

the first day after the program operation period.

(f) REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS.—

(1) REIMBURSEMENT.—Upon receiving the report submitted by a State under section 5103(a) with respect to an election cycle, the Commission shall transmit a payment to the State in an amount equal to the reasonable costs incurred by the State in operating the voucher pilot program under this part during the cycle.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Payments to States under the program shall be made using amounts in the Freedom From Influence Fund under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 5111), hereafter referred to as the “Fund”.

(3) MANDATORY REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS IN CASE OF INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND.—

(A) ADVANCE AUDITS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 90 days before the first day of each program operation period, the Commission shall—

(i) audit the Fund to determine whether, after first making payments to participating candidates under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 5111), the amounts remaining in the Fund will be sufficient to make payments to States under this part in the amounts provided under this subsection; and

(ii) submit a report to Congress describing the results of the audit.

(B) REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) AUTOMATIC REDUCTION ON PRO RATA BASIS.—If, on the basis of the audit described in subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that the amount anticipated to be available in the Fund with respect to an election cycle involved is not, or may not be, sufficient to make payments to States under this part in the full amount provided under this subsection, the Commission shall reduce each amount which would otherwise be paid to a State under this subsection by such pro rata amount as may be necessary to ensure that the aggregate amount of payments anticipated to be made with respect to the cycle will not exceed the amount anticipated to be available for such payments in the Fund with respect to such cycle.

(ii) RESTORATION OF REDUCTIONS IN CASE OF AVAILABILITY OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS DURING ELECTION CYCLE.—If, after reducing the amounts paid to States with respect to an election cycle under clause (i), the Commission determines that there are sufficient amounts in the Fund to restore the amount by which such payments were reduced (or any portion thereof), to the extent that such amounts are available, the Commission may make a payment on a pro rata basis to each such State with respect to the cycle in the amount by which such State's payments were reduced under clause (i) (or any portion thereof, as the case may be).

(iii) NO USE OF AMOUNTS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—In any case in which the Commission determines that there are insufficient moneys in the Fund to make payments to States under this part, moneys shall not be made available from any other source for the purpose of making such payments.

(4) CAP ON AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The aggregate amount of payments made to any State with respect to any program operation period may not exceed \$10,000,000. If the State determines that the maximum payment amount under this paragraph with respect to the program operation period involved is not, or may not be, sufficient to cover the reasonable costs incurred by the State in operating the program under this part for such period, the State shall reduce the amount of the voucher provided to each qualified individual by such pro rata amount

as may be necessary to ensure that the reasonable costs incurred by the State in operating the program will not exceed the amount paid to the State with respect to such period.

SEC. 5102. VOUCHER PROGRAM DESCRIBED.

(a) GENERAL ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—

(1) ELEMENTS DESCRIBED.—The elements of a voucher pilot program operated by a State under this part are as follows:

(A) The State shall provide each qualified individual upon the individual's request with a voucher worth \$25 to be known as a “My Voice Voucher” during the election cycle which will be assigned a routing number and which at the option of the individual will be provided in either paper or electronic form.

(B) Using the routing number assigned to the My Voice Voucher, the individual may submit the My Voice Voucher in either electronic or paper form to qualified candidates for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress and allocate such portion of the value of the My Voice Voucher in increments of \$5 as the individual may select to any such candidate.

(C) If the candidate transmits the My Voice Voucher to the Commission, the Commission shall pay the candidate the portion of the value of the My Voice Voucher that the individual allocated to the candidate, which shall be considered a contribution by the individual to the candidate for purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(2) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a “qualified individual” with respect to a State means an individual—

(A) who is a resident of the State;

(B) who will be of voting age as of the date of the election for the candidate to whom the individual submits a My Voice Voucher; and

(C) who is not prohibited under Federal law from making contributions to candidates for election for Federal office.

(3) TREATMENT AS CONTRIBUTION TO CANDIDATE.—For purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the submission of a My Voice Voucher to a candidate by an individual shall be treated as a contribution to the candidate by the individual in the amount of the portion of the value of the Voucher that the individual allocated to the candidate.

(b) FRAUD PREVENTION MECHANISM.—In addition to the elements described in subsection (a), a State operating a voucher pilot program under this part shall permit an individual to revoke a My Voice Voucher not later than 2 days after submitting the My Voice Voucher to a candidate.

(c) OVERSIGHT COMMISSION.—In addition to the elements described in subsection (a), a State operating a voucher pilot program under this part shall establish a commission or designate an existing entity to oversee and implement the program in the State, except that no such commission or entity may be comprised of elected officials.

(d) PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN.—In addition to the elements described in subsection (a), a State operating a voucher pilot program under this part shall carry out a public information campaign to disseminate awareness of the program among qualified individuals.

SEC. 5103. REPORTS.

(a) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the first election cycle of the program operation period, a State which operates a voucher pilot program under this part shall submit a report to the Commission analyzing the operation and effectiveness of the program during the cycle and including such other information as the Commission may require.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the end of the program operation period, the State shall submit a final report to the Commission analyzing the operation and effectiveness of the program and including such other information as the Commission may require.

(c) REPORT BY COMMISSION.—Not later than the end of the first election cycle which begins after the program operation period, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress which summarizes and analyzes the results of the voucher pilot program, and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate regarding the expansion of the pilot program to all States and territories, along with such other recommendations and other information as the Commission considers appropriate.

SEC. 5104. DEFINITIONS.

(a) ELECTION CYCLE.—In this part, the term “election cycle” means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and ending on the date of the next regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

(b) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO PERIODS.—In this part, the following definitions apply:

(1) PROGRAM APPLICATION PERIOD.—The term “program application period” means the first election cycle which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PROGRAM PREPARATION PERIOD.—The term “program preparation period” means the first election cycle which begins after the program application period.

(3) PROGRAM OPERATION PERIOD.—The term “program operation period” means the first 2 election cycles which begin after the program preparation period.

PART 2—SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

SEC. 5111. BENEFITS AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDATES.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE V—SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

“Subtitle A—Benefits

“SEC. 501. BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If a candidate for election to the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election for such office, the candidate shall be entitled to payments as provided under this title.

“(b) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of a payment made under this title shall be equal to 600 percent of the amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate since the most recent payment made to the candidate under this title during the election cycle, without regard to whether or not the candidate received any of the contributions before, during, or after the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period applicable to the candidate under section 511(c).

“(c) LIMIT ON AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—The aggregate amount of payments made to a participating candidate with respect to an election cycle under this title may not exceed 50 percent of the average of the 20 greatest amounts of disbursements made by the authorized committees of any winning candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress during the most recent election cycle, rounded to the nearest \$100,000.

“SEC. 502. PROCEDURES FOR MAKING PAYMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make a payment under section 501 to a candidate who is certified as a participating candidate upon receipt from the candidate of a request for a payment which includes—

“(1) a statement of the number and amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate since the most recent payment made to the candidate under this title during the election cycle;

“(2) a statement of the amount of the payment the candidate anticipates receiving with respect to the request;

“(3) a statement of the total amount of payments the candidate has received under this title as of the date of the statement; and

“(4) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

“(b) RESTRICTIONS ON SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS.—A candidate may not submit a request under subsection (a) unless each of the following applies:

“(1) The amount of the qualified small dollar contributions in the statement referred to in subsection (a)(1) is equal to or greater than \$5,000, unless the request is submitted during the 30-day period which ends on the date of a general election.

“(2) The candidate did not receive a payment under this title during the 7-day period which ends on the date the candidate submits the request.

“(c) TIME OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that the Secretary is able to make payments under this section from the Treasury not later than 2 business days after the receipt of a request submitted under subsection (a).

“SEC. 503. USE OF FUNDS.

“(a) USE OF FUNDS FOR AUTHORIZED CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.—A candidate shall use payments made under this title, including payments provided with respect to a previous election cycle which are withheld from remittance to the Commission in accordance with section 524(a)(2), only for making direct payments for the receipt of goods and services which constitute authorized expenditures (as determined in accordance with title III) in connection with the election cycle involved.

“(b) PROHIBITING USE OF FUNDS FOR LEGAL EXPENSES, FINES, OR PENALTIES.—Notwithstanding title III, a candidate may not use payments made under this title for the payment of expenses incurred in connection with any action, claim, or other matter before the Commission or before any court, hearing officer, arbitrator, or other dispute resolution entity, or for the payment of any fine or civil monetary penalty.

“SEC. 504. QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS DESCRIBED.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title, the term ‘qualified small dollar contribution’ means, with respect to a candidate and the authorized committees of a candidate, a contribution that meets the following requirements:

“(1) The contribution is in an amount that is—

“(A) not less than \$1; and

“(B) not more than \$200.

“(2)(A) The contribution is made directly by an individual to the candidate or an authorized committee of the candidate and is not—

“(i) forwarded from the individual making the contribution to the candidate or committee by another person; or

“(ii) received by the candidate or committee with the knowledge that the contribution was made at the request, suggestion, or recommendation of another person.

“(B) In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘person’ does not include an individual (other than an individual described in section 304(i)(7) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), a political committee of a political party, or any political committee which is not a separate segregated fund described in section 316(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and which does not make contributions or independent expenditures, does not engage in lobbying activity under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and is not established by, controlled by, or affiliated with a registered lobbyist under such Act, an agent of a registered lobbyist under such Act, or an organization which retains or employs a registered lobbyist under such Act; and

“(ii) a contribution is not ‘made at the request, suggestion, or recommendation of another person’ solely on the grounds that the contribution is made in response to information provided to the individual making the contribution by any person, so long as the candidate or authorized committee does not know the identity of the person who provided the information to such individual.

“(3) The individual who makes the contribution does not make contributions to the candidate or the authorized committees of the candidate with respect to the election involved in an aggregate amount that exceeds the amount described in paragraph (1)(B), or any contribution to the candidate or the authorized committees of the candidate with respect to the election involved that otherwise is not a qualified small dollar contribution.

“(b) TREATMENT OF MY VOICE VOUCHERS.—Any payment received by a candidate and the authorized committees of a candidate which consists of a My Voice Voucher under the Government By the People Act of 2019 shall be considered a qualified small dollar contribution for purposes of this title, so long as the individual making the payment meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a).

“(c) RESTRICTION ON SUBSEQUENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) PROHIBITING DONOR FROM MAKING SUBSEQUENT NONQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS DURING ELECTION CYCLE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual who makes a qualified small dollar contribution to a candidate or the authorized committees of a candidate with respect to an election may not make any subsequent contribution to such candidate or the authorized committees of such candidate with respect to the election cycle which is not a qualified small dollar contribution.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES WHO VOLUNTARILY WITHDRAW FROM PARTICIPATION DURING QUALIFYING PERIOD.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a contribution made to a candidate who, during the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period described in section 511(c), submits a statement to the Commission under section 513(c) to voluntarily withdraw from participating in the program under this title.

“(2) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT NONQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—If, notwithstanding the prohibition described in paragraph (1), an individual who makes a qualified small dollar contribution to a candidate or the authorized committees of a candidate with respect to an election makes a subsequent contribution to such candidate or the authorized committees of such candidate with respect to the election which is prohibited under paragraph (1) because it is not a qualified small dollar contribution, the candidate may take one of the following actions:

“(A) Not later than 2 weeks after receiving the contribution, the candidate may return

the subsequent contribution to the individual. In the case of a subsequent contribution which is not a qualified small dollar contribution because the contribution fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) (relating to the aggregate amount of contributions made to the candidate or the authorized committees of the candidate by the individual making the contribution), the candidate may return an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the subsequent contribution and the amount described in paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (a).

“(B) The candidate may retain the subsequent contribution, so long as not later than 2 weeks after receiving the subsequent contribution, the candidate remits to the Commission for deposit in the Freedom From Influence Fund under section 541 an amount equal to any payments received by the candidate under this title which are attributable to the qualified small dollar contribution made by the individual involved.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON ABILITY TO MAKE MULTIPLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit an individual from making multiple qualified small dollar contributions to any candidate or any number of candidates, so long as each contribution meets each of the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

“(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDATES.—

“(1) NOTIFICATION.—Each authorized committee of a candidate who seeks to be a participating candidate under this title shall provide the following information in any materials for the solicitation of contributions, including any internet site through which individuals may make contributions to the committee:

“(A) A statement that if the candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title, the candidate will receive matching payments in an amount which is based on the total amount of qualified small dollar contributions received.

“(B) A statement that a contribution which meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a) shall be treated as a qualified small dollar contribution under this title.

“(C) A statement that if a contribution is treated as a qualified small dollar contribution under this title, the individual who makes the contribution may not make any contribution to the candidate or the authorized committees of the candidate during the election cycle which is not a qualified small dollar contribution.

“(2) ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF MEETING REQUIREMENTS.—An authorized committee may meet the requirements of paragraph (1)—

“(A) by including the information described in paragraph (1) in the receipt provided under section 512(b)(3) to a person making a qualified small dollar contribution; or

“(B) by modifying the information it provides to persons making contributions which is otherwise required under title III (including information it provides through the internet).

“Subtitle B—Eligibility and Certification**“SEC. 511. ELIGIBILITY.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress is eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election if the candidate meets the following requirements:

“(1) The candidate files with the Commission a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate.

“(2) The candidate meets the qualifying requirements of section 512.

“(3) The candidate files with the Commission a statement certifying that the authorized committees of the candidate meet the requirements of section 504(d).

“(4) Not later than the last day of the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period, the candidate files with the Commission an affidavit signed by the candidate and the treasurer of the candidate’s principal campaign committee declaring that the candidate—

“(A) has complied and, if certified, will comply with the contribution and expenditure requirements of section 521;

“(B) if certified, will run only as a participating candidate for all elections for the office that such candidate is seeking during that election cycle; and

“(C) has either qualified or will take steps to qualify under State law to be on the ballot.

“(b) GENERAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title for a general election or a general runoff election unless the candidate’s party nominated the candidate to be placed on the ballot for the general election or the candidate is otherwise qualified to be on the ballot under State law.

“(c) SMALL DOLLAR DEMOCRACY QUALIFYING PERIOD DEFINED.—The term ‘Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period’ means, with respect to any candidate for an office, the 180-day period (during the election cycle for such office) which begins on the date on which the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1), except that such period may not continue after the date that is 30 days before the date of the general election for the office.

“SEC. 512. QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) RECEIPT OF QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—A candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress meets the requirement of this section if, during the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period described in section 511(c), each of the following occurs:

“(1) Not fewer than 1,000 individuals make a qualified small dollar contribution to the candidate.

“(2) The candidate obtains a total dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions which is equal to or greater than \$50,000.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION.—Each qualified small dollar contribution—

“(1) may be made by means of a personal check, money order, debit card, credit card, electronic payment account, or any other method deemed appropriate by the Commission;

“(2) shall be accompanied by a signed statement (or, in the case of a contribution made online or through other electronic means, an electronic equivalent) containing the contributor’s name and address; and

“(3) shall be acknowledged by a receipt that is sent to the contributor with a copy (in paper or electronic form) kept by the candidate for the Commission.

“(c) VERIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall establish procedures for the auditing and verification of the contributions received and expenditures made by participating candidates under this title, including procedures for random audits, to ensure that such contributions and expenditures meet the requirements of this title.

“SEC. 513. CERTIFICATION.

“(a) DEADLINE AND NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 business days after a candidate files an affidavit under section 511(a)(4), the Commission shall—

“(A) determine whether or not the candidate meets the requirements for certification as a participating candidate;

“(B) if the Commission determines that the candidate meets such requirements, certify the candidate as a participating candidate; and

“(C) notify the candidate of the Commission’s determination.

“(2) DEEMED CERTIFICATION FOR ALL ELECTIONS IN ELECTION CYCLE.—If the Commission certifies a candidate as a participating candidate with respect to the first election of the election cycle involved, the Commission shall be deemed to have certified the candidate as a participating candidate with respect to all subsequent elections of the election cycle.

“(b) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall revoke a certification under subsection (a) if—

“(A) a candidate fails to qualify to appear on the ballot at any time after the date of certification (other than a candidate certified as a participating candidate with respect to a primary election who fails to qualify to appear on the ballot for a subsequent election in that election cycle);

“(B) a candidate ceases to be a candidate for the office involved, as determined on the basis of an official announcement by an authorized committee of the candidate or on the basis of a reasonable determination by the Commission; or

“(C) a candidate otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this title, including any regulatory requirements prescribed by the Commission.

“(2) EXISTENCE OF CRIMINAL SANCTION.—The Commission shall revoke a certification under subsection (a) if a penalty is assessed against the candidate under section 309(d) with respect to the election.

“(3) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—If a candidate’s certification is revoked under this subsection—

“(A) the candidate may not receive payments under this title during the remainder of the election cycle involved; and

“(B) in the case of a candidate whose certification is revoked pursuant to subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1)—

“(i) the candidate shall repay to the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 an amount equal to the payments received under this title with respect to the election cycle involved plus interest (at a rate determined by the Commission on the basis of an appropriate annual percentage rate for the month involved) on any such amount received; and

“(ii) the candidate may not be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to the next election cycle.

“(4) PROHIBITING PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE ELECTIONS FOR CANDIDATES WITH MULTIPLE REVOCATIONS.—If the Commission revokes the certification of an individual as a participating candidate under this title pursuant to subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) a total of 3 times, the individual may not be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to any subsequent election.

“(c) VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWAL FROM PARTICIPATING DURING QUALIFYING PERIOD.—At any time during the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period described in section 511(c), a candidate may withdraw from participation in the program under this title by submitting to the Commission a statement of withdrawal (without regard to whether or not the Commission has certified the candidate as a participating candidate under this title as of the time the candidate submits such statement), so long as the can-

didate has not submitted a request for payment under section 502.

“(d) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATE DEFINED.—In this title, a ‘participating candidate’ means a candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress who is certified under this section as eligible to receive benefits under this title.

“Subtitle C—Requirements for Candidates Certified as Participating Candidates

“SEC. 521. CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) PERMITTED SOURCES OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Except as provided in subsection (c), a participating candidate with respect to an election shall, with respect to all elections occurring during the election cycle for the office involved, accept no contributions from any source and make no expenditures from any amounts, other than the following:

“(1) Qualified small dollar contributions.

“(2) Payments under this title.

“(3) Contributions from political committees established and maintained by a national or State political party, subject to the applicable limitations of section 315.

“(4) Subject to subsection (b), personal funds of the candidate or of any immediate family member of the candidate (other than funds received through qualified small dollar contributions).

“(5) Contributions from individuals who are otherwise permitted to make contributions under this Act, subject to the applicable limitations of section 315, except that the aggregate amount of contributions a participating candidate may accept from any individual with respect to any election during the election cycle may not exceed \$1,000.

“(6) Contributions from multicandidate political committees, subject to the applicable limitations of section 315.

“(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR PERSONAL FUNDS.—

“(1) LIMIT ON AMOUNT.—A candidate who is certified as a participating candidate may use personal funds (including personal funds of any immediate family member of the candidate) so long as—

“(A) the aggregate amount used with respect to the election cycle (including any period of the cycle occurring prior to the candidate’s certification as a participating candidate) does not exceed \$50,000; and

“(B) the funds are used only for making direct payments for the receipt of goods and services which constitute authorized expenditures in connection with the election cycle involved.

“(2) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate—

“(A) the candidate’s spouse;

“(B) a child, stepchild, parent, grandparent, brother, half-brother, sister, or half-sister of the candidate or the candidate’s spouse; and

“(C) the spouse of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) EXCEPTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED PRIOR TO FILING OF STATEMENT OF INTENT.—A candidate who has accepted contributions that are not described in subsection (a) is not in violation of subsection (a), but only if all such contributions are—

“(A) returned to the contributor;

“(B) submitted to the Commission for deposit in the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541; or

“(C) spent in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR EXPENDITURES MADE PRIOR TO FILING OF STATEMENT OF INTENT.—If

a candidate has made expenditures prior to the date the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1) that the candidate is prohibited from making under subsection (a) or subsection (b), the candidate is not in violation of such subsection if the aggregate amount of the prohibited expenditures is less than the amount referred to in section 512(a)(2) (relating to the total dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions which the candidate is required to obtain) which is applicable to the candidate.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CAMPAIGN SURPLUSES FROM A PREVIOUS ELECTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), unexpended contributions received by the candidate or an authorized committee of the candidate with respect to a previous election may be retained, but only if the candidate places the funds in escrow and refrains from raising additional funds for or spending funds from that account during the election cycle in which a candidate is a participating candidate.

“(4) EXCEPTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS TITLE.—Contributions received and expenditures made by the candidate or an authorized committee of the candidate prior to the effective date of this title shall not constitute a violation of subsection (a) or (b). Unexpended contributions shall be treated the same as campaign surpluses under paragraph (3), and expenditures made shall count against the limit in paragraph (2).

“(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR COORDINATED PARTY EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of this section, a payment made by a political party in coordination with a participating candidate shall not be treated as a contribution to or as an expenditure made by the participating candidate.

“(e) PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—An authorized committee of a candidate who is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election may not establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than another authorized committee of the candidate.

“(2) STATUS OF EXISTING COMMITTEES FOR PRIOR ELECTIONS.—If a candidate established a joint fundraising committee described in paragraph (1) with respect to a prior election for which the candidate was not certified as a participating candidate under this title and the candidate does not terminate the committee, the candidate shall not be considered to be in violation of paragraph (1) so long as that joint fundraising committee does not receive any contributions or make any disbursements during the election cycle for which the candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title.

“(f) PROHIBITION ON LEADERSHIP PACS.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—A candidate who is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election may not associate with, establish, finance, maintain, or control a leadership PAC.

“(2) STATUS OF EXISTING LEADERSHIP PACS.—If a candidate established, financed, maintained, or controlled a leadership PAC prior to being certified as a participating candidate under this title and the candidate does not terminate the leadership PAC, the candidate shall not be considered to be in violation of paragraph (1) so long as the leadership PAC does not receive any contributions or make any disbursements during the election cycle for which the candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title.

“(3) LEADERSHIP PAC DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘leadership PAC’ has the meaning given such term in section 304(i)(8)(B).

“SEC. 522. ADMINISTRATION OF CAMPAIGN.

“(a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS PERMITTED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Each authorized committee of a candidate certified as a participating candidate under this title—

“(1) shall provide for separate accounting of each type of contribution described in section 521(a) which is received by the committee; and

“(2) shall provide for separate accounting for the payments received under this title.

“(b) ENHANCED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION ON DONORS.—

“(1) MANDATORY IDENTIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS MAKING QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—Each authorized committee of a participating candidate under this title shall elect, in accordance with section 304(b)(3)(A), to include in the reports the committee submits under section 304 the identification of each person who makes a qualified small dollar contribution to the committee.

“(2) MANDATORY DISCLOSURE THROUGH INTERNET.—Each authorized committee of a participating candidate under this title shall ensure that all information reported to the Commission under this Act with respect to contributions and expenditures of the committee is available to the public on the internet (whether through a site established for purposes of this subsection, a hyperlink on another public site of the committee, or a hyperlink on a report filed electronically with the Commission) in a searchable, sortable, and downloadable manner.

“SEC. 523. PREVENTING UNNECESSARY SPENDING OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

“(a) MANDATORY SPENDING OF AVAILABLE PRIVATE FUNDS.—An authorized committee of a candidate certified as a participating candidate under this title may not make any expenditure of any payments received under this title in any amount unless the committee has made an expenditure in an equivalent amount of funds received by the committee which are described in paragraphs (1), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 521(a).

“(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) applies to an authorized committee only to the extent that the funds referred to in such subsection are available to the committee at the time the committee makes an expenditure of a payment received under this title.

“SEC. 524. REMITTING UNSPENT FUNDS AFTER ELECTION.

“(a) REMITTANCE REQUIRED.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the last election for which a candidate certified as a participating candidate qualifies to be on the ballot during the election cycle involved, such participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 an amount equal to the balance of the payments received under this title by the authorized committees of the candidate which remain unexpended as of such date.

“(b) PERMITTING CANDIDATES PARTICIPATING IN NEXT ELECTION CYCLE TO RETAIN PORTION OF UNSPENT FUNDS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a participating candidate may withhold not more than \$100,000 from the amount required to be remitted under subsection (a) if the candidate files a signed affidavit with the Commission that the candidate will seek certification as a participating candidate with respect to the next election cycle, except that the candidate may not use any portion of the amount withheld until the candidate is certified as a participating candidate with respect to that next election cycle. If the candidate fails to seek certification as a participating candidate prior to the last day of the Small Dollar Democracy qualifying period for the next election cycle (as described in

section 511), or if the Commission notifies the candidate of the Commission’s determination does not meet the requirements for certification as a participating candidate with respect to such cycle, the candidate shall immediately remit to the Commission the amount withheld.

“Subtitle D—Enhanced Match Support

“SEC. 531. ENHANCED SUPPORT FOR GENERAL ELECTION.

“(a) AVAILABILITY OF ENHANCED SUPPORT.—In addition to the payments made under subtitle A, the Commission shall make an additional payment to an eligible candidate under this subtitle.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A candidate shall use the additional payment under this subtitle only for authorized expenditures in connection with the election involved.

“SEC. 532. ELIGIBILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate is eligible to receive an additional payment under this subtitle if the candidate meets each of the following requirements:

“(1) The candidate is on the ballot for the general election for the office the candidate seeks.

“(2) The candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to the election.

“(3) During the enhanced support qualifying period, the candidate receives qualified small dollar contributions in a total amount of not less than \$50,000.

“(4) During the enhanced support qualifying period, the candidate submits to the Commission a request for the payment which includes—

“(A) a statement of the number and amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate during the enhanced support qualifying period;

“(B) a statement of the amount of the payment the candidate anticipates receiving with respect to the request; and

“(C) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

“(5) After submitting a request for the additional payment under paragraph (4), the candidate does not submit any other application for an additional payment under this subtitle.

“(b) ENHANCED SUPPORT QUALIFYING PERIOD DESCRIBED.—In this subtitle, the term ‘enhanced support qualifying period’ means, with respect to a general election, the period which begins 60 days before the date of the election and ends 14 days before the date of the election.

“SEC. 533. AMOUNT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the amount of the additional payment made to an eligible candidate under this subtitle shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of—

“(1) the amount of the payment made to the candidate under section 501(b) with respect to the qualified small dollar contributions which are received by the candidate during the enhanced support qualifying period (as included in the request submitted by the candidate under section 532(a)(4)); or

“(2) in the case of a candidate who is not eligible to receive a payment under section 501(b) with respect to such qualified small dollar contributions because the candidate has reached the limit on the aggregate amount of payments under subtitle A for the election cycle under section 501(c), the amount of the payment which would have been made to the candidate under section 501(b) with respect to such qualified small dollar contributions if the candidate had not reached such limit.

“(b) LIMIT.—The amount of the additional payment determined under subsection (a) with respect to a candidate may not exceed \$500,000.

“(c) NO EFFECT ON AGGREGATE LIMIT.—The amount of the additional payment made to a candidate under this subtitle shall not be included in determining the aggregate amount of payments made to a participating candidate with respect to an election cycle under section 501(c).”

“SEC. 534. WAIVER OF AUTHORITY TO RETAIN PORTION OF UNSPENT FUNDS AFTER ELECTION.

“Notwithstanding section 524(a)(2), a candidate who receives an additional payment under this subtitle with respect to an election is not permitted to withhold any portion from the amount of unspent funds the candidate is required to remit to the Commission under section 524(a)(1).”

“Subtitle E—Administrative Provisions

“SEC. 541. FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the ‘Freedom From Influence Fund’.

“(b) AMOUNTS HELD BY FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the following amounts:

“(1) ASSESSMENTS AGAINST FINES, SETTLEMENTS, AND PENALTIES.—Amounts transferred under section 3015 of title 18, United States Code, section 9707 of title 31, United States Code, and section 6761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) DEPOSITS.—Amounts deposited into the Fund under—

“(A) section 521(c)(1)(B) (relating to exceptions to contribution requirements);

“(B) section 523 (relating to remittance of unspent payments from the Fund); and

“(C) section 544 (relating to violations).

“(3) INVESTMENT RETURNS.—Interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale or redemption of any obligations held by the Fund under subsection (c).

“(c) INVESTMENT.—The Commission shall invest portions of the Fund in obligations of the United States in the same manner as provided under section 9602(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(d) USE OF FUND TO MAKE PAYMENTS TO PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—

“(1) PAYMENTS TO PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation to make payments to participating candidates as provided in this title.

“(2) MANDATORY REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS IN CASE OF INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND.—

“(A) ADVANCE AUDITS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 90 days before the first day of each election cycle (beginning with the first election cycle that begins after the date of the enactment of this title), the Commission shall—

“(i) audit the Fund to determine whether the amounts in the Fund will be sufficient to make payments to participating candidates in the amounts provided in this title during such election cycle; and

“(ii) submit a report to Congress describing the results of the audit.

“(B) REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—

“(i) AUTOMATIC REDUCTION ON PRO RATA BASIS.—If, on the basis of the audit described in subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that the amount anticipated to be available in the Fund with respect to the election cycle involved is not, or may not be, sufficient to satisfy the full entitlements of participating candidates to payments under this title for such election cycle, the Commission shall reduce each amount which would otherwise be paid to a participating candidate under this title by such pro rata amount as may be necessary to ensure that the aggregate amount of payments anticipated to be made with respect to the election cycle will not exceed the amount anticipated to be available for such payments in the Fund with respect to such election cycle.

“(ii) RESTORATION OF REDUCTIONS IN CASE OF AVAILABILITY OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS DURING ELECTION CYCLE.—If, after reducing the amounts paid to participating candidates with respect to an election cycle under clause (i), the Commission determines that there are sufficient amounts in the Fund to restore the amount by which such payments were reduced (or any portion thereof), to the extent that such amounts are available, the Commission may make a payment on a pro rata basis to each such participating candidate with respect to the election cycle in the amount by which such candidate’s payments were reduced under clause (i) (or any portion thereof, as the case may be).

“(iii) NO USE OF AMOUNTS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—In any case in which the Commission determines that there are insufficient moneys in the Fund to make payments to participating candidates under this title, moneys shall not be made available from any other source for the purpose of making such payments.

“(e) USE OF FUND TO MAKE OTHER PAYMENTS.—In addition to the use described in subsection (d), amounts in the Fund shall be available without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation—

“(1) to make payments to States under the My Voice Voucher Program under the Government By the People Act of 2019, subject to reductions under section 5101(f)(3) of such Act;

“(2) to make payments to candidates under chapter 95 of subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, subject to reductions under section 9013(b) of such Code; and

“(3) to make payments to candidates under chapter 96 of subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, subject to reductions under section 9043(b) of such Code.

“(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this title.

“SEC. 542. REVIEWS AND REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

“(a) REVIEW OF SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—After each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Small Dollar financing program under this title, including—

“(A) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts of qualified small dollar contributions under section 504;

“(B) the number and value of qualified small dollar contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512(a) to be eligible for certification as a participating candidate;

“(C) the maximum amount of payments a candidate may receive under this title;

“(D) the overall satisfaction of participating candidates and the American public with the program; and

“(E) such other matters relating to financing of campaigns as the Comptroller General determines are appropriate.

“(2) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General shall consider the following:

“(A) QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—Whether the number and dollar amounts of qualified small dollar contributions required strikes an appropriate balance regarding the importance of voter involvement, the need to assure adequate incentives for participating, and fiscal responsibility, taking into consideration the number of primary and general election participating candidates, the electoral performance of those candidates, program cost, and any other information the Comptroller General determines is appropriate.

“(B) REVIEW OF PAYMENT LEVELS.—Whether the totality of the amount of funds allowed

to be raised by participating candidates (including through qualified small dollar contributions) and payments under this title are sufficient for voters in each State to learn about the candidates to cast an informed vote, taking into account the historic amount of spending by winning candidates, media costs, primary election dates, and any other information the Comptroller General determines is appropriate.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—Based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General may recommend to Congress adjustments of the following amounts:

“(A) The number and value of qualified small dollar contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512(a) to be eligible for certification as a participating candidate.

“(B) The maximum amount of payments a candidate may receive under this title.

“(b) REPORTS.—Not later than each June 1 which follows a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office for which payments were made under this title, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives a report—

“(1) containing an analysis of the review conducted under subsection (a), including a detailed statement of Comptroller General’s findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on such review, including any recommendations for adjustments of amounts described in subsection (a)(3); and

“(2) documenting, evaluating, and making recommendations relating to the administrative implementation and enforcement of the provisions of this title.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

“SEC. 543. ADMINISTRATION BY COMMISSION.

“The Commission shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title, including regulations to establish procedures for—

“(1) verifying the amount of qualified small dollar contributions with respect to a candidate;

“(2) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the raising of qualified small dollar contributions;

“(3) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the use of personal funds by participating candidates; and

“(4) monitoring the use of allocations from the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 and matching contributions under this title through audits of not fewer than 1/10 (or, in the case of the first 3 election cycles during which the program under this title is in effect, not fewer than 1/3) of all participating candidates or other mechanisms.

“SEC. 544. VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES.

“(a) CIVIL PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.—If a candidate who has been certified as a participating candidate accepts a contribution or makes an expenditure that is prohibited under section 521, the Commission may assess a civil penalty against the candidate in an amount that is not more than 3 times the amount of the contribution or expenditure. Any amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited into the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541.

“(b) REPAYMENT FOR IMPROPER USE OF FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission determines that any payment made to a participating candidate was not used as provided for in this title or that a participating candidate has violated any of the dates for remission of funds contained in this title, the

Commission shall so notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay to the Fund an amount equal to—

“(A) the amount of payments so used or not remitted, as appropriate; and

“(B) interest on any such amounts (at a rate determined by the Commission).

“(2) OTHER ACTION NOT PRECLUDED.—Any action by the Commission in accordance with this subsection shall not preclude enforcement proceedings by the Commission in accordance with section 309(a), including a referral by the Commission to the Attorney General in the case of an apparent knowing and willful violation of this title.

“(C) PROHIBITING CANDIDATES SUBJECT TO CRIMINAL PENALTY FROM QUALIFYING AS PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—A candidate is not eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election if a penalty has been assessed against the candidate under section 309(d) with respect to any previous election.

“SEC. 545. APPEALS PROCESS.

“(a) REVIEW OF ACTIONS.—Any action by the Commission in carrying out this title shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upon petition filed in the Court not later than 30 days after the Commission takes the action for which the review is sought.

“(b) PROCEDURES.—The provisions of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, apply to judicial review under this section.

“SEC. 546. INDEXING OF AMOUNTS.

“(a) INDEXING.—In any calendar year after 2024, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to each amount described in subsection (b) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amounts described in subsection (b), the ‘base period’ shall be 2024.

“(b) AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.—The amounts described in this subsection are as follows:

“(1) The amount referred to in section 502(b)(1) (relating to the minimum amount of qualified small dollar contributions included in a request for payment).

“(2) The amounts referred to in section 504(a)(1) (relating to the amount of a qualified small dollar contribution).

“(3) The amount referred to in section 512(a)(2) (relating to the total dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions).

“(4) The amount referred to in section 521(a)(5) (relating to the aggregate amount of contributions a participating candidate may accept from any individual with respect to an election).

“(5) The amount referred to in section 521(b)(1)(A) (relating to the amount of personal funds that may be used by a candidate who is certified as a participating candidate).

“(6) The amounts referred to in section 524(a)(2) (relating to the amount of unspent funds a candidate may retain for use in the next election cycle).

“(7) The amount referred to in section 532(a)(3) (relating to the total dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions for a candidate seeking an additional payment under subtitle D).

“(8) The amount referred to in section 533(b) (relating to the limit on the amount of an additional payment made to a candidate under subtitle D).

“SEC. 547. ELECTION CYCLE DEFINED.

“In this title, the term ‘election cycle’ means, with respect to an election for an office, the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent general election for that office (or, if the general election resulted in a runoff election, the date of the

runoff election) and ending on the date of the next general election for that office (or, if the general election resulted in a runoff election, the date of the runoff election).”.

SEC. 5112. CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE AND POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES ON BEHALF OF PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

(a) AUTHORIZING CONTRIBUTIONS ONLY FROM SEPARATE ACCOUNTS CONSISTING OF QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—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) In the case of a multicandidate political committee or any political committee of a political party, the committee may make a contribution to a candidate who is a participating candidate under title V with respect to an election only if the contribution is paid from a separate, segregated account of the committee which consists solely of contributions which meet the following requirements:

“(A) Each such contribution is in an amount which meets the requirements for the amount of a qualified small dollar contribution under section 504(a)(1) with respect to the election involved.

“(B) Each such contribution is made by an individual who is not otherwise prohibited from making a contribution under this Act.

“(C) The individual who makes the contribution does not make contributions to the committee during the year in an aggregate amount that exceeds the limit described in section 504(a)(1).”.

(b) PERMITTING UNLIMITED COORDINATED EXPENDITURES FROM SMALL DOLLAR SOURCES BY POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 315(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “The national committee” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (6), the national committee”; and

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

“(6) The limits described in paragraph (3) do not apply in the case of expenditures in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress who is a participating candidate under title V with respect to the election, but only if—

“(A) the expenditures are paid from a separate, segregated account of the committee which is described in subsection (a)(9); and

“(B) the expenditures are the sole source of funding provided by the committee to the candidate.”.

SEC. 5113. PROHIBITING USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN CAMPAIGN FOR ELECTION.

Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) RESTRICTIONS ON PERMITTED USES OF FUNDS BY CANDIDATES RECEIVING SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a), if a candidate for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress is certified as a participating candidate under title V with respect to the election, any contribution which the candidate is permitted to accept under such title may be used only for authorized expenditures in connection with the candidate’s campaign for such office, subject to section 503(b).”.

SEC. 5114. ASSESSMENTS AGAINST FINES AND PENALTIES.

(a) ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3015. Special assessments for Freedom From Influence Fund

“(a) ASSESSMENTS.—

“(1) CONVICTIONS OF CRIMES.—In addition to any assessment imposed under this chapter, the court shall assess on any organizational defendant or any defendant who is a corporate officer or person with equivalent authority in any other organization who is convicted of a criminal offense under Federal law an amount equal to 2.75 percent of any fine imposed on that defendant in the sentence imposed for that conviction.

“(2) SETTLEMENTS.—The court shall assess on any organizational defendant or defendant who is a corporate officer or person with equivalent authority in any other organization who has entered into a settlement agreement or consent decree with the United States in satisfaction of any allegation that the defendant committed a criminal offense under Federal law an amount equal to 2.75 percent of the amount of the settlement.

“(b) MANNER OF COLLECTION.—An amount assessed under subsection (a) shall be collected in the manner in which fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(c) TRANSFERS.—In a manner consistent with section 3302(b) of title 31, there shall be transferred from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Freedom From Influence Fund under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3015. Special assessments for Freedom From Influence Fund.”.

(b) ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 9707. Special assessments for Freedom From Influence Fund

“(a) ASSESSMENTS.—

“(1) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Any entity of the Federal Government which is authorized under any law, rule, or regulation to impose a civil penalty shall assess on each person, other than a natural person who is not a corporate officer or person with equivalent authority in any other organization, on whom such a penalty is imposed an amount equal to 2.75 percent of the amount of the penalty.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES.—Any entity of the Federal Government which is authorized under any law, rule, or regulation to impose an administrative penalty shall assess on each person, other than a natural person who is not a corporate officer or person with equivalent authority in any other organization, on whom such a penalty is imposed an amount equal to 2.75 percent of the amount of the penalty.

“(3) SETTLEMENTS.—Any entity of the Federal Government which is authorized under any law, rule, or regulation to enter into a settlement agreement or consent decree with any person, other than a natural person who is not a corporate officer or person with equivalent authority in any other organization, in satisfaction of any allegation of an action or omission by the person which would be subject to a civil penalty or administrative penalty shall assess on such person an amount equal to 2.75 percent of the amount of the settlement.

“(b) MANNER OF COLLECTION.—An amount assessed under subsection (a) shall be collected—

“(1) in the case of an amount assessed under paragraph (1) of such subsection, in the manner in which civil penalties are collected by the entity of the Federal Government involved; and

“(2) in the case of an amount assessed under paragraph (2) of such subsection, in the manner in which administrative penalties are collected by the entity of the Federal Government involved.

“(3) in the case of an amount assessed under paragraph (3) of such subsection, in the manner in which amounts are collected pursuant to settlement agreements or consent decrees entered into by the entity of the Federal Government involved;

“(c) TRANSFERS.—In a manner consistent with section 3302(b) of this title, there shall be transferred from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Freedom From Influence Fund under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section.

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR PENALTIES AND SETTLEMENTS UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No assessment shall be made under subsection (a) with respect to any civil or administrative penalty imposed, or any settlement agreement or consent decree entered into, under the authority of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) CROSS REFERENCE.—For application of special assessments for the Freedom From Influence Fund with respect to certain penalties under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, see section 6761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“9707. Special assessments for Freedom From Influence Fund.”

(c) ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 68 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

“Subchapter D—Special Assessments for Freedom From Influence Fund

“SEC. 6761. SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each person required to pay a covered penalty shall pay an additional amount equal to 2.75 percent of the amount of such penalty.

“(b) COVERED PENALTY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘covered penalty’ means any addition to tax, additional amount, penalty, or other liability provided under subchapter A or B.

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is an individual, subsection (a) shall not apply to any covered penalty if such taxpayer is an exempt taxpayer for the taxable year for which such covered penalty is assessed.

“(2) EXEMPT TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, a taxpayer is an exempt taxpayer for any taxable year if the taxable income of such taxpayer for such taxable year does not exceed the dollar amount at which begins the highest rate bracket in effect under section 1 with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year.

“(d) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the additional amount determined under subsection (a) shall be treated for purposes of this title in the same manner as the covered penalty to which such additional amount relates.

“(e) TRANSFER TO FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND.—The Secretary shall deposit any

additional amount under subsection (a) in the General Fund of the Treasury and shall transfer from such General Fund to the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 an amount equal to the amounts so deposited (and, notwithstanding subsection (d), such additional amount shall not be the basis for any deposit, transfer, credit, appropriation, or any other payment, to any other trust fund or account). Rules similar to the rules of section 9601 shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 68 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“SUBCHAPTER D—SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to convictions, agreements, and penalties which occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to covered penalties assessed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5115. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as may otherwise be provided in this part and in the amendments made by this part, this part and the amendments made by this part shall apply with respect to elections occurring during 2026 or any succeeding year, without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated the final regulations necessary to carry out this part and the amendments made by this part by the deadline set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than June 30, 2024, the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part and the amendments made by this part.

Subtitle C—Presidential Elections

SEC. 5200. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Empower Act of 2019”.

PART 1—PRIMARY ELECTIONS

SEC. 5201. INCREASE IN AND MODIFICATIONS TO MATCHING PAYMENTS.

(a) INCREASE AND MODIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of section 9034(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “an amount equal to the amount of each contribution” and inserting “an amount equal to 600 percent of the amount of each matchable contribution (disregarding any amount of contributions from any person to the extent that the total of the amounts contributed by such person for the election exceeds \$200)”; and

(B) by striking “authorized committees” and all that follows through “\$250” and inserting “authorized committees”.

(2) MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 9034 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a); and

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

“(c) MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section and section 9033(b)—

“(1) MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘matchable contribution’ means, with respect to the nomination for election to the office of President of the United States, a contribution by an individual to a candidate or an authorized committee of a candidate with respect to which the candidate has certified in writing that—

“(A) the individual making such contribution has not made aggregate contributions (including such matchable contribution) to such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate in excess of \$1,000 for the election;

“(B) such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate will not accept contributions from such individual (including such matchable contribution) aggregating more than the amount described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) such contribution was a direct contribution.

“(2) CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘contribution’ means a gift of money made by a written instrument which identifies the individual making the contribution by full name and mailing address, but does not include a subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value or anything described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of section 9032(4).

“(3) DIRECT CONTRIBUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘direct contribution’ means, with respect to a candidate, a contribution which is made directly by an individual to the candidate or an authorized committee of the candidate and is not—

“(i) forwarded from the individual making the contribution to the candidate or committee by another person; or

“(ii) received by the candidate or committee with the knowledge that the contribution was made at the request, suggestion, or recommendation of another person.

“(B) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the term ‘person’ does not include an individual (other than an individual described in section 304(i)(7) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), a political committee of a political party, or any political committee which is not a separate segregated fund described in section 316(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and which does not make contributions or independent expenditures, does not engage in lobbying activity under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and is not established by, controlled by, or affiliated with a registered lobbyist under such Act, an agent of a registered lobbyist under such Act, or an organization which retains or employs a registered lobbyist under such Act; and

“(ii) a contribution is not ‘made at the request, suggestion, or recommendation of another person’ solely on the grounds that the contribution is made in response to information provided to the individual making the contribution by any person, so long as the candidate or authorized committee does not know the identity of the person who provided the information to such individual.”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 9032(4) of such Code is amended by striking “section 9034(a)” and inserting “section 9034”.

(B) Section 9033(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “matching contributions” and inserting “matchable contributions”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PAYMENT LIMITATION.—Section 9034(b) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “The total” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The total”;

(2) by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$250,000,000.”, and

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

“(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any applicable period beginning after 2029, the dollar

amount in paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year following the year which such applicable period begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2028’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable period’ means the 4-year period beginning with the first day following the date of the general election for the office of President and ending on the date of the next such general election.

“(C) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (1) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10,000.”

SEC. 5202. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR MATCHING PAYMENTS.

(a) AMOUNT OF AGGREGATE CONTRIBUTIONS PER STATE; DISREGARDING OF AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED IN EXCESS OF \$200.—Section 9033(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$25,000”; and

(2) by striking “20 States” and inserting the following: “20 States (disregarding any amount of contributions from any such resident to the extent that the total of the amounts contributed by such resident for the election exceeds \$200)”.

(b) CONTRIBUTION LIMIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 9033(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(4) the candidate and the authorized committees of the candidate will not accept aggregate contributions from any person with respect to the nomination for election to the office of President of the United States in excess of \$1,000 for the election.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 9033(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“For purposes of paragraph (4), the term ‘contribution’ has the meaning given such term in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”

(B) Section 9032(4) of such Code, as amended by section 5201(a)(3)(A), is amended by inserting “or 9033(b)” after “9034”.

(c) PARTICIPATION IN SYSTEM FOR PAYMENTS FOR GENERAL ELECTION.—Section 9033(b) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “, and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) if the candidate is nominated by a political party for election to the office of President, the candidate will apply for and accept payments with respect to the general election for such office in accordance with chapter 95.”

(d) PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.—Section 9033(b) of such Code, as amended by subsection (c), is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) the candidate will not establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than another authorized committee of the candidate, except that candidate established a joint fundraising committee with respect to a prior election for which the candidate was not eligible to receive payments under section 9037 and the

candidate does not terminate the committee, the candidate shall not be considered to be in violation of this paragraph so long as that joint fundraising committee does not receive any contributions or make any disbursements during the election cycle for which the candidate is eligible to receive payments under such section.”

SEC. 5203. REPEAL OF EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 9035 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PERSONAL EXPENDITURE LIMITATION.—No candidate shall knowingly make expenditures from his personal funds, or the personal funds of his immediate family, in connection with his campaign for nomination for election to the office of President in excess of, in the aggregate, \$50,000.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 9033(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) the candidate will comply with the personal expenditure limitation under section 9035.”

SEC. 5204. PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF MATCHING PAYMENTS.

Section 9032(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “the beginning of the calendar year in which a general election for the office of President of the United States will be held” and inserting “the date that is 6 months prior to the date of the earliest State primary election”.

SEC. 5205. EXAMINATION AND AUDITS OF MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 9038(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “and matchable contributions accepted by” after “qualified campaign expenses of”.

SEC. 5206. MODIFICATION TO LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY CANDIDATES.

Section 315(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(6)) is amended by striking “calendar year” and inserting “four-year election cycle”.

SEC. 5207. USE OF FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND AS SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 96 of subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9043. USE OF FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND AS SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, effective with respect to the Presidential election held in 2028 and each succeeding Presidential election, all payments made to candidates under this chapter shall be made from the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘Fund’).

“(b) MANDATORY REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS IN CASE OF INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND.—

“(1) ADVANCE AUDITS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 90 days before the first day of each Presidential election cycle (beginning with the cycle for the election held in 2028), the Commission shall—

“(A) audit the Fund to determine whether, after first making payments to participating candidates under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and then making payments to States under the My Voice Voucher Program under the Government by the People Act of 2019, the amounts remaining in the Fund will be sufficient to make payments to candidates under this chapter in the amounts provided under this chapter during such election cycle; and

“(B) submit a report to Congress describing the results of the audit.

“(2) REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—

“(A) AUTOMATIC REDUCTION ON PRO RATA BASIS.—If, on the basis of the audit described in paragraph (1), the Commission determines that the amount anticipated to be available in the Fund with respect to the Presidential election cycle involved is not, or may not be, sufficient to satisfy the full entitlements of candidates to payments under this chapter for such cycle, the Commission shall reduce each amount which would otherwise be paid to a candidate under this chapter by such pro rata amount as may be necessary to ensure that the aggregate amount of payments anticipated to be made with respect to the cycle will not exceed the amount anticipated to be available for such payments in the Fund with respect to such cycle.

“(B) RESTORATION OF REDUCTIONS IN CASE OF AVAILABILITY OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS DURING ELECTION CYCLE.—If, after reducing the amounts paid to candidates with respect to an election cycle under subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that there are sufficient amounts in the Fund to restore the amount by which such payments were reduced (or any portion thereof), to the extent that such amounts are available, the Commission may make a payment on a pro rata basis to each such candidate with respect to the election cycle in the amount by which such candidate’s payments were reduced under subparagraph (A) (or any portion thereof, as the case may be).

“(C) NO USE OF AMOUNTS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—In any case in which the Commission determines that there are insufficient moneys in the Fund to make payments to candidates under this chapter, moneys shall not be made available from any other source for the purpose of making such payments.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—This section does not apply to the transfer of funds under section 9008(1).

“(4) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CYCLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Presidential election cycle’ means, with respect to a Presidential election, the period beginning on the day after the date of the previous Presidential general election and ending on the date of the Presidential election.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9043. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.”

PART 2—GENERAL ELECTIONS

SEC. 5211. MODIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC FINANCING.

Subsection (a) of section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible to receive any payments under section 9006, the candidates of a political party in a Presidential election shall meet the following requirements:

“(1) PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY PAYMENT SYSTEM.—The candidate for President received payments under chapter 96 for the campaign for nomination for election to be President.

“(2) AGREEMENTS WITH COMMISSION.—The candidates, in writing—

“(A) agree to obtain and furnish to the Commission such evidence as it may request of the qualified campaign expenses of such candidates,

“(B) agree to keep and furnish to the Commission such records, books, and other information as it may request, and

“(C) agree to an audit and examination by the Commission under section 9007 and to pay any amounts required to be paid under such section.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.—

“(A) PROHIBITION.—The candidate certifies in writing that the candidates will not establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than another authorized committee of the candidate.

“(B) STATUS OF EXISTING COMMITTEES FOR PRIOR ELECTIONS.—If a candidate established a joint fundraising committee described in subparagraph (A) with respect to a prior election for which the candidate was not eligible to receive payments under section 9006 and the candidate does not terminate the committee, the candidate shall not be considered to be in violation of subparagraph (A) so long as that joint fundraising committee does not receive any contributions or make any disbursements with respect to the election for which the candidate is eligible to receive payments under section 9006.”.

SEC. 5212. REPEAL OF EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS AND USE OF QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) USE OF QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS WITHOUT EXPENDITURE LIMITS; APPLICATION OF SAME REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR, MINOR, AND NEW PARTIES.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

“(b) USE OF QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEFRAY EXPENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible to receive any payments under section 9006, the candidates of a party in a Presidential election shall certify to the Commission, under penalty of perjury, that—

“(A) such candidates and their authorized committees have not and will not accept any contributions to defray qualified campaign expenses other than—

“(i) qualified campaign contributions, and

“(ii) contributions to the extent necessary to make up any deficiency payments received out of the fund on account of the application of section 9006(c), and

“(B) such candidates and their authorized committees have not and will not accept any contribution to defray expenses which would be qualified campaign expenses but for subparagraph (C) of section 9002(11).

“(2) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—The candidate shall make the certification required under this subsection at the same time the candidate makes the certification required under subsection (a)(3).”.

(b) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION.—Section 9002 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(13) QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘qualified campaign contribution’ means, with respect to any election for the office of President of the United States, a contribution from an individual to a candidate or an authorized committee of a candidate which—

“(A) does not exceed \$1,000 for the election; and

“(B) with respect to which the candidate has certified in writing that—

“(i) the individual making such contribution has not made aggregate contributions (including such qualified contribution) to such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate in excess of the amount described in subparagraph (A), and

“(ii) such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate will not accept contributions from such individual (including such qualified contribution) aggregating more than the amount described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such election.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF EXPENDITURE LIMITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315(c) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(c)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “, (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by striking “subsections (b) and (d)” and inserting “subsection (d)”.

(2) REPEAL OF REPAYMENT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9007(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9007(b) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended—

(i) by striking “a major party” and inserting “a party”;

(ii) by inserting “qualified contributions and” after “contributions (other than”;

(iii) by striking “(other than qualified campaign expenses with respect to which payment is required under paragraph (2))”.

(3) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(A) REPEAL OF PENALTY FOR EXCESS EXPENSES.—Section 9012 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (a).

(B) PENALTY FOR ACCEPTANCE OF DISALLOWED CONTRIBUTIONS; APPLICATION OF SAME PENALTY FOR CANDIDATES OF MAJOR, MINOR, AND NEW PARTIES.—Subsection (b) of section 9012 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) ACCEPTANCE OF DISALLOWED CONTRIBUTIONS.—It shall be unlawful for an eligible candidate of a party in a Presidential election or any of his authorized committees knowingly and willfully to accept—

“(A) any contribution other than a qualified campaign contribution to defray qualified campaign expenses, except to the extent necessary to make up any deficiency in payments received out of the fund on account of the application of section 9006(c); or

“(B) any contribution to defray expenses which would be qualified campaign expenses but for subparagraph (C) of section 9002(11).

“(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. In the case of a violation by an authorized committee, any officer or member of such committee who knowingly and willfully consents to such violation shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”.

SEC. 5213. MATCHING PAYMENTS AND OTHER MODIFICATIONS TO PAYMENT AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS; APPLICATION OF SAME AMOUNT FOR CANDIDATES OF MAJOR, MINOR, AND NEW PARTIES.—Subsection (a) of section 9004 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, the eligible candidates of a party in a Presidential election shall be entitled to equal payment under section 9006 in an amount equal to 600 percent of the amount of each matchable contribution received by such candidate or by the candidate’s authorized committees (disregarding any amount of contributions from any person to the extent that the total of the amounts contributed by such person for the election exceeds \$200), except that total amount to which a candidate is entitled under this paragraph shall not exceed \$250,000,000.”.

(2) REPEAL OF SEPARATE LIMITATIONS FOR CANDIDATES OF MINOR AND NEW PARTIES; IN-

FLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 9004 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any applicable period beginning after 2029, the \$250,000,000 dollar amount in subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount; multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year following the year which such applicable period begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2028’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘applicable period’ means the 4-year period beginning with the first day following the date of the general election for the office of President and ending on the date of the next such general election.

“(3) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10,000.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9005(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Commission shall make such additional certifications as may be necessary to receive payments under section 9004.”.

(b) MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTION.—Section 9002 of such Code, as amended by section 5212(b), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘matchable contribution’ means, with respect to the election to the office of President of the United States, a contribution by an individual to a candidate or an authorized committee of a candidate with respect to which the candidate has certified in writing that—

“(A) the individual making such contribution has not made aggregate contributions (including such matchable contribution) to such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate in excess of \$1,000 for the election;

“(B) such candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate will not accept contributions from such individual (including such matchable contribution) aggregating more than the amount described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such election; and

“(C) such contribution was a direct contribution (as defined in section 9034(c)(3)).”.

SEC. 5214. INCREASE IN LIMIT ON COORDINATED PARTY EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(d)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) The national committee of a political party may not make any expenditure in connection with the general election campaign of any candidate for President of the United States who is affiliated with such party which exceeds \$100,000,000.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) any expenditure made by or on behalf of a national committee of a political party and in connection with a Presidential election shall be considered to be made in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for President of the United States who is affiliated with such party; and

“(ii) any communication made by or on behalf of such party shall be considered to be made in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for President of the United States who is affiliated with such party if any portion of the communication is in connection with such election.

“(C) Any expenditure under this paragraph shall be in addition to any expenditure by a

national committee of a political party serving as the principal campaign committee of a candidate for the office of President of the United States.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TIMING OF COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(c)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(d)” and inserting “(d)(2)”; and

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

“(D) In any calendar year after 2028—

“(i) the dollar amount in subsection (d)(2) shall be increased by the percent difference determined under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) the amount so increased shall remain in effect for the calendar year; and

“(iii) if the amount after adjustment under clause (i) is not a multiple of \$100, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100.”.

(2) BASE YEAR.—Section 315(c)(2)(B) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(c)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “(d)” and inserting “(d)(3)”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

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

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

“(iii) for purposes of subsection (d)(2), calendar year 2027.”.

SEC. 5215. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM DATE FOR RELEASE OF PAYMENTS.

(a) DATE FOR PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9006(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—If the Secretary of the Treasury receives a certification from the Commission under section 9005 for payment to the eligible candidates of a political party, the Secretary shall pay to such candidates out of the fund the amount certified by the Commission on the later of—

“(1) the last Friday occurring before the first Monday in September; or

“(2) 24 hours after receiving the certifications for the eligible candidates of all major political parties.

Amounts paid to any such candidates shall be under the control of such candidates.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The first sentence of section 9006(c) of such Code is amended by striking “the time of a certification by the Commission under section 9005 for payment” and inserting “the time of making a payment under subsection (b)”.

(b) TIME FOR CERTIFICATION.—Section 9005(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “10 days” and inserting “24 hours”.

SEC. 5216. AMOUNTS IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.

Section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In making a determination of whether there are insufficient moneys in the fund for purposes of the previous sentence, the Secretary shall take into account in determining the balance of the fund for a Presidential election year the Secretary’s best estimate of the amount of moneys which will be deposited into the fund during the year, except that the amount of the estimate may not exceed the average of the annual amounts deposited in the fund during the previous 3 years.”.

SEC. 5217. USE OF GENERAL ELECTION PAYMENTS FOR GENERAL ELECTION LEGAL AND ACCOUNTING COMPLIANCE.

Section 9002(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For purposes of subparagraph (A), an expense incurred by a

candidate or authorized committee for general election legal and accounting compliance purposes shall be considered to be an expense to further the election of such candidate.”.

SEC. 5218. USE OF FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND AS SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9013. USE OF FREEDOM FROM INFLUENCE FUND AS SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, effective with respect to the Presidential election held in 2028 and each succeeding Presidential election, all payments made under this chapter shall be made from the Freedom From Influence Fund established under section 541 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

“(b) MANDATORY REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS IN CASE OF INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND.—

“(1) ADVANCE AUDITS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 90 days before the first day of each Presidential election cycle (beginning with the cycle for the election held in 2028), the Commission shall—

“(A) audit the Fund to determine whether, after first making payments to participating candidates under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and then making payments to States under the My Voice Voucher Program under the Government by the People Act of 2019 and then making payments to candidates under chapter 96, the amounts remaining in the Fund will be sufficient to make payments to candidates under this chapter in the amounts provided under this chapter during such election cycle; and

“(B) submit a report to Congress describing the results of the audit.

“(2) REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—

“(A) AUTOMATIC REDUCTION ON PRO RATA BASIS.—If, on the basis of the audit described in paragraph (1), the Commission determines that the amount anticipated to be available in the Fund with respect to the Presidential election cycle involved is not, or may not be, sufficient to satisfy the full entitlements of candidates to payments under this chapter for such cycle, the Commission shall reduce each amount which would otherwise be paid to a candidate under this chapter by such pro rata amount as may be necessary to ensure that the aggregate amount of payments anticipated to be made with respect to the cycle will not exceed the amount anticipated to be available for such payments in the Fund with respect to such cycle.

“(B) RESTORATION OF REDUCTIONS IN CASE OF AVAILABILITY OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS DURING ELECTION CYCLE.—If, after reducing the amounts paid to candidates with respect to an election cycle under subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that there are sufficient amounts in the Fund to restore the amount by which such payments were reduced (or any portion thereof), to the extent that such amounts are available, the Commission may make a payment on a pro rata basis to each such candidate with respect to the election cycle in the amount by which such candidate’s payments were reduced under subparagraph (A) (or any portion thereof, as the case may be).

“(C) NO USE OF AMOUNTS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—In any case in which the Commission determines that there are insufficient moneys in the Fund to make payments to candidates under this chapter, moneys shall not be made available from any other source for the purpose of making such payments.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—This section does not apply to the transfer of funds under section 9008(i).

“(4) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CYCLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Presidential election cycle’ means, with respect to a Presidential election, the period beginning on the day after the date of the previous Presidential general election and ending on the date of the Presidential election.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9013. Use of Freedom From Influence Fund as source of payments.”.

PART 3—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 5221. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to the Presidential election held in 2028 and each succeeding Presidential election, without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated the final regulations necessary to carry out this part and the amendments made by this part by the deadline set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than June 30, 2026, the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part and the amendments made by this part.

Subtitle D—Personal Use Services as Authorized Campaign Expenditures

SEC. 5301. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the “Help America Run Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Everyday Americans experience barriers to entry before they can consider running for office to serve their communities.

(2) Current law states that campaign funds cannot be spent on everyday expenses that would exist whether or not a candidate were running for office, like childcare and food. While the law seems neutral, its actual effect is to privilege the independently wealthy who want to run, because given the demands of running for office, candidates who must work to pay for childcare or to afford health insurance are effectively being left out of the process, even if they have sufficient support to mount a viable campaign.

(3) Thus current practice favors those prospective candidates who do not need to rely on a regular paycheck to make ends meet. The consequence is that everyday Americans who have firsthand knowledge of the importance of stable childcare, a safety net, or great public schools are less likely to get a seat at the table. This governance by the few is antithetical to the democratic experiment, but most importantly, when lawmakers do not share the concerns of everyday Americans, their policies reflect that.

(4) These circumstances have contributed to a Congress that does not always reflect everyday Americans. The New York Times reported in 2019 that fewer than 5 percent of representatives cite blue-collar or service jobs in their biographies. A 2015 survey by the Center for Responsive Politics showed that the median net worth of lawmakers was just over \$1 million in 2013, or 18 times the wealth of the typical American household.

(5) These circumstances have also contributed to a governing body that does not reflect the nation it serves. For instance, women are 51% of the American population. Yet even with a record number of women serving in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, the Pew Research Center notes that more than three out of four Members of this Congress are male. The Center for American Women And Politics found that one third of women legislators surveyed had been actively discouraged from running for office,

often by political professionals. This type of discouragement, combined with the prohibitions on using campaign funds for domestic needs like childcare, burdens that still fall disproportionately on American women, particularly disadvantages working mothers. These barriers may explain why only 10 women in history have given birth while serving in Congress, in spite of the prevalence of working parents in other professions. Yet working mothers and fathers are best positioned to create policy that reflects the lived experience of most Americans.

(6) Working mothers, those caring for their elderly parents, and young professionals who rely on their jobs for health insurance should have the freedom to run to serve the people of the United States. Their networks and net worth are simply not the best indicators of their strength as prospective public servants. In fact, helping ordinary Americans to run may create better policy for all Americans.

(c) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subtitle to ensure that all Americans who are otherwise qualified to serve this Nation are able to run for office, regardless of their economic status. By expanding permissible uses of campaign funds and providing modest assurance that testing a run for office will not cost one's livelihood, the Help America Run Act will facilitate the candidacy of representatives who more accurately reflect the experiences, challenges, and ideals of everyday Americans.

SEC. 5302. TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR CHILD CARE AND OTHER PERSONAL USE SERVICES AS AUTHORIZED CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE.

(a) PERSONAL USE SERVICES AS AUTHORIZED CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE.—Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 5113, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR CHILD CARE AND OTHER PERSONAL USE SERVICES AS AUTHORIZED CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE.—

“(1) AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of subsection (a), the payment by an authorized committee of a candidate for any of the personal use services described in paragraph (3) shall be treated as an authorized expenditure if the services are necessary to enable the participation of the candidate in campaign-connected activities.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) LIMIT ON TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—The total amount of payments made by an authorized committee of a candidate for personal use services described in paragraph (3) may not exceed the limit which is applicable under any law, rule, or regulation on the amount of payments which may be made by the committee for the salary of the candidate (without regard to whether or not the committee makes payments to the candidate for that purpose).

“(B) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF SALARY PAID TO CANDIDATE.—To the extent that an authorized committee of a candidate makes payments for the salary of the candidate, any limit on the amount of such payments which is applicable under any law, rule, or regulation shall be reduced by the amount of any payments made to or on behalf of the candidate for personal use services described in paragraph (3), other than personal use services described in subparagraph (E) of such paragraph.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF CANDIDATES WHO ARE OFFICEHOLDERS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to an authorized committee of a candidate who is a holder of Federal office.

“(3) PERSONAL USE SERVICES DESCRIBED.—The personal use services described in this paragraph are as follows:

- “(A) Child care services.
- “(B) Elder care services.

“(C) Services similar to the services described in subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) which are provided on behalf of any dependent who is a qualifying relative under section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(D) Health insurance premiums.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle E—Severability

SEC. 5401. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE VI—CAMPAIGN FINANCE OVERSIGHT

Subtitle A—Restoring Integrity to America's Elections

Sec. 6001. Short title.

Sec. 6002. Membership of Federal Election Commission.

Sec. 6003. Assignment of powers to Chair of Federal Election Commission.

Sec. 6004. Revision to enforcement process.

Sec. 6005. Permitting appearance at hearings on requests for advisory opinions by persons opposing the requests.

Sec. 6006. Permanent extension of administrative penalty authority.

Sec. 6007. Restrictions on ex parte communications.

Sec. 6008. Effective date; transition.

Subtitle B—Stopping Super PAC-Candidate Coordination

Sec. 6101. Short title.

Sec. 6102. Clarification of treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates.

Sec. 6103. Clarification of ban on fundraising for super PACs by Federal candidates and officeholders.

Subtitle C—Severability

Sec. 6201. Severability.

Subtitle A—Restoring Integrity to America's Elections

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Restoring Integrity to America's Elections Act”.

SEC. 6002. MEMBERSHIP OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS; REMOVAL OF SECRETARY OF SENATE AND CLERK OF HOUSE AS EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL; QUORUM.—Section 306(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30106(a)(1)) is amended by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following: “The Commission is composed of 5 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom no more than 2 may be affiliated with the same political party. A member shall be treated as affiliated with a political party if the member was affiliated, including as a registered voter, employee, consultant, donor, officer, or attorney, with such political party or any of its candidates or elected public officials at any time during the 5-year period ending on the date on which such individual is nominated to be a member of the Commission. A majority of the number of members of the Commission who are serving at the time shall constitute a quorum, except that 3 members shall constitute a quorum if there are 4 members serving at the time.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—(A) The

second sentence of section 306(c) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(c)) is amended by striking “affirmative vote of 4 members of the Commission” and inserting “affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Commission who are serving at the time”.

(B) Such Act is further amended by striking “affirmative vote of 4 of its members” and inserting “affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Commission who are serving at the time” each place it appears in the following sections:

(i) Section 309(a)(2) (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(2)).

(ii) Section 309(a)(4)(A)(i) (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(4)(A)(i)).

(iii) Section 309(a)(5)(C) (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(5)(C)).

(iv) Section 309(a)(6)(A) (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(6)(A)).

(v) Section 311(b) (52 U.S.C. 30111(b)).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO REMOVAL OF EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—Section 306(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(a)) is amended by striking “(other than the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives)” each place it appears in paragraphs (4) and (5).

(b) TERMS OF SERVICE.—Section 306(a)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) TERMS OF SERVICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission shall serve for a single term of 6 years.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Of the members first appointed to serve terms that begin in January 2022, the President shall designate 2 to serve for a 3-year term.

“(C) NO REAPPOINTMENT PERMITTED.—An individual who served a term as a member of the Commission may not serve for an additional term, except that—

“(i) an individual who served a 3-year term under subparagraph (B) may also be appointed to serve a 6-year term under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) for purposes of this subparagraph, an individual who is appointed to fill a vacancy under subparagraph (D) shall not be considered to have served a term if the portion of the unexpired term the individual fills is less than 50 percent of the period of the term.

“(D) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. Except as provided in subparagraph (C), an individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring other than by the expiration of a term of office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member he or she succeeds.

“(E) LIMITATION ON SERVICE AFTER EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A member of the Commission may continue to serve on the Commission after the expiration of the member's term for an additional period, but only until the earlier of—

“(i) the date on which the member's successor has taken office as a member of the Commission; or

“(ii) the expiration of the 1-year period that begins on the last day of the member's term.”.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—Section 306(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may select an individual for service as a member of the Commission if the individual has experience in election law and has a demonstrated record of integrity, impartiality, and good judgment.

“(B) ASSISTANCE OF BLUE RIBBON ADVISORY PANEL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the regularly scheduled expiration of the term of a member of the Commission and upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the membership of the Commission prior to the expiration of a term, the President shall convene a Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel, consisting of an odd number of individuals selected by the President from retired Federal judges, former law enforcement officials, or individuals with experience in election law, except that the President may not select any individual to serve on the panel who holds any public office at the time of selection.

“(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—With respect to each member of the Commission whose term is expiring or each vacancy in the membership of the Commission (as the case may be), the Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel shall recommend to the President at least one but not more than 3 individuals for nomination for appointment as a member of the Commission.

“(iii) PUBLICATION.—At the time the President submits to the Senate the nominations for individuals to be appointed as members of the Commission, the President shall publish the Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel’s recommendations for such nominations.

“(iv) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to a Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel convened under this subparagraph.

“(C) PROHIBITING ENGAGEMENT WITH OTHER BUSINESS OR EMPLOYMENT DURING SERVICE.—A member of the Commission shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any individual who is engaging in any other business, vocation, or employment at the time of his or her appointment to the Commission shall terminate or liquidate such activity no later than 90 days after such appointment.”

SEC. 6003. ASSIGNMENT OF POWERS TO CHAIR OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR BY PRESIDENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 306(a)(5) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30106(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) CHAIR.—

“(A) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Of the members first appointed to serve terms that begin in January 2022, one such member (as designated by the President at the time the President submits nominations to the Senate) shall serve as Chair of the Commission.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT APPOINTMENTS.—Any individual who is appointed to succeed the member who serves as Chair of the Commission for the term beginning in January 2022 (as well as any individual who is appointed to fill a vacancy if such member does not serve a full term as Chair) shall serve as Chair of the Commission.

“(C) VICE CHAIR.—The Commission shall select, by majority vote of its members, one of its members to serve as Vice Chair, who shall act as Chair in the absence or disability of the Chair or in the event of a vacancy in the position of Chair.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 309(a)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(2)) is amended by striking “through its chairman or vice chairman” and inserting “through the Chair”.

(b) POWERS.—

(1) ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN POWERS TO CHAIR.—Section 307(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) DISTRIBUTION OF POWERS BETWEEN CHAIR AND COMMISSION.—

“(1) POWERS ASSIGNED TO CHAIR.—

“(A) ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS.—The Chair of the Commission shall be the chief administrative officer of the Commission and shall have the authority to administer the Com-

mission and its staff, and (in consultation with the other members of the Commission) shall have the power—

“(i) to appoint and remove the staff director of the Commission;

“(ii) to request the assistance (including personnel and facilities) of other agencies and departments of the United States, whose heads may make such assistance available to the Commission with or without reimbursement; and

“(iii) to prepare and establish the budget of the Commission and to make budget requests to the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Congress.

“(B) OTHER POWERS.—The Chair of the Commission shall have the power—

“(i) to appoint and remove the general counsel of the Commission with the concurrence of at least 2 other members of the Commission;

“(ii) to require by special or general orders, any person to submit, under oath, such written reports and answers to questions as the Chair may prescribe;

“(iii) to administer oaths or affirmations;

“(iv) to require by subpoena, signed by the Chair, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

“(v) in any proceeding or investigation, to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Chair, and shall have the power to administer oaths and, in such instances, to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under clause (iv); and

“(vi) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

“(2) POWERS ASSIGNED TO COMMISSION.—The Commission shall have the power—

“(A) to initiate (through civil actions for injunctive, declaratory, or other appropriate relief), defend (in the case of any civil action brought under section 309(a)(8) of this Act) or appeal (including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari) any civil action in the name of the Commission to enforce the provisions of this Act and chapter 95 and chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, through its general counsel;

“(B) to render advisory opinions under section 308 of this Act;

“(C) to develop such prescribed forms and to make, amend, and repeal such rules, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and chapter 95 and chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(D) to conduct investigations and hearings expeditiously, to encourage voluntary compliance, and to report apparent violations to the appropriate law enforcement authorities; and

“(E) to transmit to the President and Congress not later than June 1 of each year a report which states in detail the activities of the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act, and which includes any recommendations for any legislative or other action the Commission considers appropriate.

“(3) PERMITTING COMMISSION TO EXERCISE OTHER POWERS OF CHAIR.—With respect to any investigation, action, or proceeding, the Commission, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members who are serving at the time, may exercise any of the powers of the Chair described in paragraph (1)(B).”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PERSONNEL AUTHORITY.—Section 306(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(f)) is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (1) to read as follows: “The Commission shall have a staff director who shall be appointed by the Chair of the Commission in consultation with the other members and a general counsel who shall be appointed by the Chair with the concurrence of at least two other members.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “With the approval of the Commission” and inserting “With the approval of the Chair of the Commission”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO BUDGET SUBMISSION.—Section 307(d)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30107(d)(1)) is amended by striking “the Commission submits any budget” and inserting “the Chair (or, pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the Commission) submits any budget”.

(4) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 306(c) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30106(c)) is amended by striking “All decisions” and inserting “Subject to section 307(a), all decisions”.

(5) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 307 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30107) is amended by striking “THE COMMISSION” and inserting “THE CHAIR AND THE COMMISSION”.

SEC. 6004. REVISION TO ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.

(a) STANDARD FOR INITIATING INVESTIGATIONS AND DETERMINING WHETHER VIOLATIONS HAVE OCCURRED.—

(1) REVISION OF STANDARDS.—Section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) The general counsel, upon receiving a complaint filed with the Commission under paragraph (1) or upon the basis of information ascertained by the Commission in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities, shall make a determination as to whether or not there is reason to believe that a person has committed, or is about to commit, a violation of this Act or chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and as to whether or not the Commission should either initiate an investigation of the matter or that the complaint should be dismissed. The general counsel shall promptly provide notification to the Commission of such determination and the reasons therefore, together with any written response submitted under paragraph (1) by the person alleged to have committed the violation. Upon the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the general counsel provides such notification, the general counsel’s determination shall take effect, unless during such 30-day period the Commission, by vote of a majority of the members of the Commission who are serving at the time, overrules the general counsel’s determination. If the determination by the general counsel that the Commission should investigate the matter takes effect, or if the determination by the general counsel that the complaint should be dismissed is overruled as provided under the previous sentence, the general counsel shall initiate an investigation of the matter on behalf of the Commission.

“(B) If the Commission initiates an investigation pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Commission, through the Chair, shall notify the subject of the investigation of the alleged violation. Such notification shall set forth the factual basis for such alleged violation. The Commission shall make an investigation of such alleged violation, which may include a field investigation or audit, in accordance with the provisions of this section. The general counsel shall provide notification to the Commission of any intent to issue a subpoena or conduct any other form

of discovery pursuant to the investigation. Upon the expiration of the 15-day period which begins on the date the general counsel provides such notification, the general counsel may issue the subpoena or conduct the discovery, unless during such 15-day period the Commission, by vote of a majority of the members of the Commission who are serving at the time, prohibits the general counsel from issuing the subpoena or conducting the discovery.

“(3)(A) Upon completion of an investigation under paragraph (2), the general counsel shall promptly submit to the Commission the general counsel’s recommendation that the Commission find either that there is probable cause or that there is not probable cause to believe that a person has committed, or is about to commit, a violation of this Act or chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and shall include with the recommendation a brief stating the position of the general counsel on the legal and factual issues of the case.

“(B) At the time the general counsel submits to the Commission the recommendation under subparagraph (A), the general counsel shall simultaneously notify the respondent of such recommendation and the reasons therefore, shall provide the respondent with an opportunity to submit a brief within 30 days stating the position of the respondent on the legal and factual issues of the case and replying to the brief of the general counsel. The general counsel and shall promptly submit such brief to the Commission upon receipt.

“(C) Not later than 30 days after the general counsel submits the recommendation to the Commission under subparagraph (A) (or, if the respondent submits a brief under subparagraph (B), not later than 30 days after the general counsel submits the respondent’s brief to the Commission under such subparagraph), the Commission shall approve or disapprove the recommendation by vote of a majority of the members of the Commission who are serving at the time.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO INITIAL RESPONSE TO FILING OF COMPLAINT.—Section 309(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the third sentence, by striking “the Commission” and inserting “the general counsel”; and

(B) by amending the fourth sentence to read as follows: “Not later than 15 days after receiving notice from the general counsel under the previous sentence, the person may provide the general counsel with a written response that no action should be taken against such person on the basis of the complaint.”

(b) REVISION OF STANDARD FOR REVIEW OF DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 309(a)(8) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

“(8)(A)(i) Any party aggrieved by an order of the Commission dismissing a complaint filed by such party after finding either no reason to believe a violation has occurred or no probable cause a violation has occurred may file a petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Any petition under this subparagraph shall be filed within 60 days after the date on which the party received notice of the dismissal of the complaint.

“(ii) In any proceeding under this subparagraph, the court shall determine by de novo review whether the agency’s dismissal of the complaint is contrary to law. In any matter in which the penalty for the alleged violation is greater than \$50,000, the court should disregard any claim or defense by the Commission of prosecutorial discretion as a basis for dismissing the complaint.

“(B)(i) Any party who has filed a complaint with the Commission and who is aggrieved by a failure of the Commission, within one year after the filing of the complaint, to either dismiss the complaint or to find reason to believe a violation has occurred or is about to occur, may file a petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

“(ii) In any proceeding under this subparagraph, the court shall treat the failure to act on the complaint as a dismissal of the complaint, and shall determine by de novo review whether the agency’s failure to act on the complaint is contrary to law.

“(C) In any proceeding under this paragraph the court may declare that the dismissal of the complaint or the failure to act is contrary to law, and may direct the Commission to conform with such declaration within 30 days, failing which the complainant may bring, in the name of such complainant, a civil action to remedy the violation involved in the original complaint.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply—

(A) in the case of complaints which are dismissed by the Federal Election Commission, with respect to complaints which are dismissed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) in the case of complaints upon which the Federal Election Commission failed to act, with respect to complaints which were filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6005. PERMITTING APPEARANCE AT HEARINGS ON REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS BY PERSONS OPPOSING THE REQUESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 308 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30108) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) To the extent that the Commission provides an opportunity for a person requesting an advisory opinion under this section (or counsel for such person) to appear before the Commission to present testimony in support of the request, and the person (or counsel) accepts such opportunity, the Commission shall provide a reasonable opportunity for an interested party who submitted written comments under subsection (d) in response to the request (or counsel for such interested party) to appear before the Commission to present testimony in response to the request.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to requests for advisory opinions under section 308 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 which are made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6006. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AUTHORITY.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 309(a)(4)(C)(v) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(4)(C)(v)), as amended by Public Law 115-386, is amended by striking “, and that end on or before December 31, 2023”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on December 31, 2018.

SEC. 6007. RESTRICTIONS ON EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 306(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30106(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(e) The Commission” and inserting “(e)(1) The Commission”; and

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

“(2) Members and employees of the Commission shall be subject to limitations on ex parte communications, as provided in the regulations promulgated by the Commission regarding such communications which are in

effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph.”

SEC. 6008. EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this subtitle shall apply beginning January 1, 2022.

(b) TRANSITION.—

(1) TERMINATION OF SERVICE OF CURRENT MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the term of any individual serving as a member of the Federal Election Commission as of December 31, 2021, shall expire on that date.

(2) NO EFFECT ON EXISTING CASES OR PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing in this subtitle or in any amendment made by this subtitle shall affect any of the powers exercised by the Federal Election Commission prior to December 31, 2021, including any investigation initiated by the Commission prior to such date or any proceeding (including any enforcement action) pending as of such date.

Subtitle B—Stopping Super PAC-Candidate Coordination

SEC. 6101. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Stop Super PAC-Candidate Coordination Act”.

SEC. 6102. CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF COORDINATED EXPENDITURES AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES.

(a) TREATMENT AS CONTRIBUTION TO CANDIDATE.—Section 301(8)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(8)(A)) is amended—

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

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

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

“(iii) any payment made by any person (other than a candidate, an authorized committee of a candidate, or a political committee of a political party) for a coordinated expenditure (as such term is defined in section 326) which is not otherwise treated as a contribution under clause (i) or clause (ii).”

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Title III of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.), as amended by section 4702(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 326. PAYMENTS FOR COORDINATED EXPENDITURES.

“(a) COORDINATED EXPENDITURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 301(8)(A)(iii), the term ‘coordinated expenditure’ means—

“(A) any expenditure, or any payment for a covered communication described in subsection (d), which is made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate, an authorized committee of a candidate, a political committee of a political party, or agents of the candidate or committee, as defined in subsection (b); or

“(B) any payment for any communication which republishes, disseminates, or distributes, in whole or in part, any video or broadcast or any written, graphic, or other form of campaign material prepared by the candidate or committee or by agents of the candidate or committee (including any excerpt or use of any video from any such broadcast or written, graphic, or other form of campaign material).

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—A payment for a communication described in subsection (d) shall not be treated as a coordinated expenditure under this subsection if—

“(A) the communication appears in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate; or

“(B) the communication constitutes a candidate debate or forum conducted pursuant to regulations adopted by the Commission pursuant to section 304(f)(3)(B)(iii), or which solely promotes such a debate or forum and is made by or on behalf of the person sponsoring the debate or forum.

“(b) COORDINATION DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a payment is made ‘in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request or suggestion of,’ a candidate, an authorized committee of a candidate, a political committee of a political party, or agents of the candidate or committee, if the payment, or any communication for which the payment is made, is not made entirely independently of the candidate, committee, or agents. For purposes of the previous sentence, a payment or communication not made entirely independently of the candidate or committee includes any payment or communication made pursuant to any general or particular understanding with, or pursuant to any communication with, the candidate, committee, or agents about the payment or communication.

“(2) NO FINDING OF COORDINATION BASED SOLELY ON SHARING OF INFORMATION REGARDING LEGISLATIVE OR POLICY POSITION.—For purposes of this section, a payment shall not be considered to be made by a person in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate or committee, solely on the grounds that the person or the person’s agent engaged in discussions with the candidate or committee, or with any agent of the candidate or committee, regarding that person’s position on a legislative or policy matter (including urging the candidate or committee to adopt that person’s position), so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee, or any agent of the candidate or committee, regarding the candidate’s or committee’s campaign advertising, message, strategy, policy, polling, allocation of resources, fundraising, or other campaign activities.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON PARTY COORDINATION STANDARD.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the determination of coordination between a candidate and a political committee of a political party for purposes of section 315(d).

“(4) NO SAFE HARBOR FOR USE OF FIREWALL.—A person shall be determined to have made a payment in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate or committee, in accordance with this section without regard to whether or not the person established and used a firewall or similar procedures to restrict the sharing of information between individuals who are employed by or who are serving as agents for the person making the payment.

“(c) PAYMENTS BY COORDINATED SPENDERS FOR COVERED COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(1) PAYMENTS MADE IN COOPERATION, CONSULTATION, OR CONCERT WITH CANDIDATES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(A), if the person who makes a payment for a covered communication, as defined in subsection (d), is a coordinated spender under paragraph (2) with respect to the candidate as described in subsection (d)(1), the payment for the covered communication is made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with the candidate.

“(2) COORDINATED SPENDER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘coordinated spender’ means, with respect to a candidate or an authorized committee of a candidate, a person (other than a political committee of a political party) for which any of the following applies:

“(A) During the 4-year period ending on the date on which the person makes the pay-

ment, the person was directly or indirectly formed or established by or at the request or suggestion of, or with the encouragement of, the candidate (including an individual who later becomes a candidate) or committee or agents of the candidate or committee, including with the approval of the candidate or committee or agents of the candidate or committee.

“(B) The candidate or committee or any agent of the candidate or committee solicits funds, appears at a fundraising event, or engages in other fundraising activity on the person’s behalf during the election cycle involved, including by providing the person with names of potential donors or other lists to be used by the person in engaging in fundraising activity, regardless of whether the person pays fair market value for the names or lists provided. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘election cycle’ means, with respect to an election for Federal office, the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent general election for that office (or, if the general election resulted in a runoff election, the date of the runoff election) and ending on the date of the next general election for that office (or, if the general election resulted in a runoff election, the date of the runoff election).

“(C) The person is established, directed, or managed by the candidate or committee or by any person who, during the 4-year period ending on the date on which the person makes the payment, has been employed or retained as a political, campaign media, or fundraising adviser or consultant for the candidate or committee or for any other entity directly or indirectly controlled by the candidate or committee, or has held a formal position with the candidate or committee (including a position as an employee of the office of the candidate at any time the candidate held any Federal, State, or local public office during the 4-year period).

“(D) The person has retained the professional services of any person who, during the 2-year period ending on the date on which the person makes the payment, has provided or is providing professional services relating to the campaign to the candidate or committee, without regard to whether the person providing the professional services used a firewall. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘professional services’ includes any services in support of the candidate’s or committee’s campaign activities, including advertising, message, strategy, policy, polling, allocation of resources, fundraising, and campaign operations, but does not include accounting or legal services.

“(E) The person is established, directed, or managed by a member of the immediate family of the candidate, or the person or any officer or agent of the person has had more than incidental discussions about the candidate’s campaign with a member of the immediate family of the candidate. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘immediate family’ has the meaning given such term in section 9004(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(d) COVERED COMMUNICATION DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘covered communication’ means, with respect to a candidate or an authorized committee of a candidate, a public communication (as defined in section 301(22)) which—

“(A) expressly advocates the election of the candidate or the defeat of an opponent of the candidate (or contains the functional equivalent of express advocacy);

“(B) promotes or supports the election of the candidate, or attacks or opposes the election of an opponent of the candidate (regardless of whether the communication expressly advocates the election or defeat of a can-

didate or contains the functional equivalent of express advocacy); or

“(C) refers to the candidate or an opponent of the candidate but is not described in subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B), but only if the communication is disseminated during the applicable election period.

“(2) APPLICABLE ELECTION PERIOD.—In paragraph (1)(C), the ‘applicable election period’ with respect to a communication means—

“(A) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate in a general, special, or runoff election, the 120-day period which ends on the date of the election; or

“(B) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate in a primary or preference election, or convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate, the 60-day period which ends on the date of the election or convention or caucus.

“(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR COMMUNICATIONS INVOLVING CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.—For purposes of this subsection, a public communication shall not be considered to be a covered communication with respect to a candidate for election for an office other than the office of President or Vice President unless it is publicly disseminated or distributed in the jurisdiction of the office the candidate is seeking.

“(e) PENALTY.—

“(1) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of this Act by making a contribution which consists of a payment for a coordinated expenditure shall be fined an amount equal to the greater of—

“(A) in the case of a person who makes a contribution which consists of a payment for a coordinated expenditure in an amount exceeding the applicable contribution limit under this Act, 300 percent of the amount by which the amount of the payment made by the person exceeds such applicable contribution limit; or

“(B) in the case of a person who is prohibited under this Act from making a contribution in any amount, 300 percent of the amount of the payment made by the person for the coordinated expenditure.

“(2) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Any director, manager, or officer of a person who is subject to a penalty under paragraph (1) shall be jointly and severally liable for any amount of such penalty that is not paid by the person prior to the expiration of the 1-year period which begins on the date the Commission imposes the penalty or the 1-year period which begins on the date of the final judgment following any judicial review of the Commission’s action, whichever is later.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REPEAL OF EXISTING REGULATIONS ON COORDINATION.—Effective upon the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) the regulations on coordinated communications adopted by the Federal Election Commission which are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act (as set forth in 11 CFR Part 109, Subpart C, under the heading “Coordination”) are repealed; and

(B) the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate new regulations on coordinated communications which reflect the amendments made by this Act.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to payments made on or after the expiration of the 120-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations in accordance with paragraph (1)(B) as of the expiration of such period.

SEC. 6103. CLARIFICATION OF BAN ON FUND-RAISING FOR SUPER PACS BY FEDERAL CANDIDATES AND OFFICE-HOLDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 323(e)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30125(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A);

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

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

“(C) solicit, receive, direct, or transfer funds to or on behalf of any political committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act (or to or on behalf of any account of a political committee which is established for the purpose of accepting such donations or contributions), or to or on behalf of any political organization under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which accepts such donations or contributions (other than a committee of a State or local political party or a candidate for election for State or local office).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1, 2020.

Subtitle C—Severability

SEC. 6201. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

DIVISION C—ETHICS

TITLE VII—ETHICAL STANDARDS

Subtitle A—Supreme Court Ethics

Sec. 7001. Code of conduct for Federal judges.

Subtitle B—Foreign Agents Registration

Sec. 7101. Establishment of FARA investigation and enforcement unit within Department of Justice.

Sec. 7102. Authority to impose civil money penalties.

Sec. 7103. Disclosure of transactions involving things of financial value conferred on officeholders.

Sec. 7104. Ensuring online access to registration statements.

Subtitle C—Lobbying Disclosure Reform

Sec. 7201. Expanding scope of individuals and activities subject to requirements of Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

Subtitle D—Recusal of Presidential Appointees

Sec. 7301. Recusal of appointees.

Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 7401. Severability.

Subtitle A—Supreme Court Ethics

SEC. 7001. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR FEDERAL JUDGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 57 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 964. Code of conduct

“Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Judicial Conference shall issue a code of conduct, which applies to each justice and judge of the United States, except that the code of conduct may include provisions that are applicable only to certain categories of judges or justices.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 57 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item related to section 963 the following: “964. Code of conduct.”.

Subtitle B—Foreign Agents Registration

SEC. 7101. ESTABLISHMENT OF FARA INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT UNIT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Section 8 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 618) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) DEDICATED ENFORCEMENT UNIT.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall establish a unit within the counterespionage section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice with responsibility for the enforcement of this Act.

“(2) POWERS.—The unit established under this subsection is authorized to—

“(A) take appropriate legal action against individuals suspected of violating this Act; and

“(B) coordinate any such legal action with the United States Attorney for the relevant jurisdiction.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—In operating the unit established under this subsection, the Attorney General shall, as appropriate, consult with the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities of the unit established under this subsection \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each succeeding fiscal year.”.

SEC. 7102. AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.

(a) ESTABLISHING AUTHORITY.—Section 8 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 618) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.—

“(1) REGISTRATION STATEMENTS.—Whoever fails to file timely or complete a registration statement as provided under section 2(a) shall be subject to a civil money penalty of not more than \$10,000 per violation.

“(2) SUPPLEMENTS.—Whoever fails to file timely or complete supplements as provided under section 2(b) shall be subject to a civil money penalty of not more than \$1,000 per violation.

“(3) OTHER VIOLATIONS.—Whoever knowingly fails to—

“(A) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such defect by the Attorney General; or

“(B) comply with any other provision of this Act, shall upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil money penalty of not more than \$200,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

“(4) NO FINES PAID BY FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—A civil money penalty paid under paragraph (1) may not be paid, directly or indirectly, by a foreign principal.

“(5) USE OF FINES.—All civil money penalties collected under this subsection shall be used to defray the cost of the enforcement unit established under subsection (i).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7103. DISCLOSURE OF TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING THINGS OF FINANCIAL VALUE CONFERRED ON OFFICE-HOLDERS.

(a) REQUIRING AGENTS TO DISCLOSE KNOWN TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (11) and (12); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) To the extent that the registrant has knowledge of any transaction which occurred in the preceding 60 days and in which the foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting as an agent conferred on a Federal or State officeholder any thing of financial value, including a gift, profit, salary, favorable regulatory treatment, or any other direct or indirect economic or financial benefit, a detailed statement describing each such transaction.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to statements filed on or after the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE FOR CURRENT REGISTRANTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, each registrant who (prior to the expiration of such period) filed a registration statement with the Attorney General under section 2(a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(a)) and who has knowledge of any transaction described in paragraph (10) of section 2(a) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)(1)) which occurred at any time during which the registrant was an agent of the foreign principal involved, shall file with the Attorney General a supplement to such statement under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, containing a detailed statement describing each such transaction.

SEC. 7104. ENSURING ONLINE ACCESS TO REGISTRATION STATEMENTS.

(a) REQUIRING STATEMENTS FILED BY REGISTRANTS TO BE IN DIGITIZED FORMAT.—Section 2(g) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(g)) is amended by striking “in electronic form” and inserting “in a digitized format which will enable the Attorney General to meet the requirements of section 6(d)(1) (relating to public access to an electronic database of statements and updates)”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRONIC DATABASE OF REGISTRATION STATEMENTS AND UPDATES.—Section 6(d)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 616(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to the extent technically practicable,”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “includes the information” and inserting “includes in a digitized format the information”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to statements filed on or after the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Lobbying Disclosure Reform

SEC. 7201. EXPANDING SCOPE OF INDIVIDUALS AND ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995.

(a) COVERAGE OF INDIVIDUALS PROVIDING COUNSELING SERVICES.—

(1) TREATMENT OF COUNSELING SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF LOBBYING CONTACTS AS LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—Section 3(7) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1602(7)) is amended—

(A) by striking “efforts” and inserting “any efforts”; and

(B) by striking “research and other background work” and inserting the following: “counseling in support of such preparation and planning activities, research, and other background work”.

(2) TREATMENT OF LOBBYING CONTACT MADE WITH SUPPORT OF COUNSELING SERVICES AS LOBBYING CONTACT MADE BY INDIVIDUAL PROVIDING SERVICES.—Section 3(8) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1602(8)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) TREATMENT OF PROVIDERS OF COUNSELING SERVICES.—Any individual, with authority to direct or substantially influence a lobbying contact or contacts made by another individual, and for financial or other compensation provides counseling services in support of preparation and planning activities which are treated as lobbying activities under paragraph (7) for that other individual’s lobbying contact or contacts and who has knowledge that the specific lobbying contact or contacts were made, shall be considered to have made the same lobbying contact at the same time and in the same manner to the covered executive branch official or covered legislative branch official involved.”

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

Subtitle D—Recusal of Presidential Appointees

SEC. 7301. RECUSAL OF APPOINTEES.

Section 208 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) Any officer or employee appointed by the President shall recuse himself or herself from any particular matter involving specific parties in which a party to that matter is—

“(A) the President who appointed the officer or employee, which shall include any entity in which the President has a substantial interest; or

“(B) the spouse of the President who appointed the officer or employee, which shall include any entity in which the spouse of the President has a substantial interest.

“(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), if an officer or employee is recused under paragraph (1), a career appointee in the agency of the officer or employee shall perform the functions and duties of the officer or employee with respect to the matter.

“(B)(i) In this subparagraph, the term ‘Commission’ means a board, commission, or other agency for which the authority of the agency is vested in more than 1 member.

“(ii) If the recusal of a member of a Commission from a matter under paragraph (1) would result in there not being a statutorily required quorum of members of the Commission available to participate in the matter, notwithstanding such statute or any other provision of law, the members of the Commission not recused under paragraph (1) may—

“(I) consider the matter without regard to the quorum requirement under such statute;

“(II) delegate the authorities and responsibilities of the Commission with respect to the matter to a subcommittee of the Commission; or

“(III) designate an officer or employee of the Commission who was not appointed by the President who appointed the member of the Commission recused from the matter to exercise the authorities and duties of the recused member with respect to the matter.

“(3) Any officer or employee who violates paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in section 216.

“(4) For purposes of this section, the term ‘particular matter’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 207(i).”

Subtitle E—Severability

SEC. 7401. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a

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

TITLE VIII—ETHICS REFORMS FOR THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Subtitle A—Executive Branch Conflict of Interest

Sec. 8001. Short title.

Sec. 8002. Restrictions on private sector payment for government service.

Sec. 8003. Requirements relating to slowing the revolving door.

Sec. 8004. Prohibition of procurement officers accepting employment from government contractors.

Sec. 8005. Revolving door restrictions on employees moving into the private sector.

Subtitle B—Presidential Conflicts of Interest

Sec. 8011. Short title.

Sec. 8012. Divestiture of personal financial interests of the President and Vice President that pose a potential conflict of interest.

Sec. 8013. Initial financial disclosure.

Sec. 8014. Contracts by the President or Vice President.

Subtitle C—White House Ethics Transparency

Sec. 8021. Short title.

Sec. 8022. Procedure for waivers and authorizations relating to ethics requirements.

Subtitle D—Executive Branch Ethics Enforcement

Sec. 8031. Short title.

Sec. 8032. Reauthorization of the Office of Government Ethics.

Sec. 8033. Tenure of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

Sec. 8034. Duties of Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

Sec. 8035. Agency Ethics Officials Training and Duties.

Subtitle E—Conflicts From Political Fundraising

Sec. 8041. Short title.

Sec. 8042. Disclosure of certain types of contributions.

Subtitle F—Transition Team Ethics

Sec. 8051. Short title.

Sec. 8052. Presidential transition ethics programs.

Subtitle G—Ethics Pledge For Senior Executive Branch Employees

Sec. 8061. Short title.

Sec. 8062. Ethics pledge requirement for senior executive branch employees.

Subtitle H—Severability

Sec. 8071. Severability.

Subtitle A—Executive Branch Conflict of Interest

SEC. 8001. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Executive Branch Conflict of Interest Act”.

SEC. 8002. RESTRICTIONS ON PRIVATE SECTOR PAYMENT FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE.

Section 209 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a),

(A) by striking “any salary” and inserting “any salary (including a bonus)”; and

(B) by striking “as compensation for his services” and inserting “at any time, as compensation for serving”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(b)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), a pension, retirement, group life, health or accident insurance, profit-sharing, stock bonus, or other employee welfare or benefit plan that makes payment of any portion of compensation contingent on accepting a position in the United States Government shall not be considered bona fide.”

SEC. 8003. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLOWING THE REVOLVING DOOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VI—ENHANCED REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

“§ 601. Definitions

“In this title:

“(1) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’—

“(A) means an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, the Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, but does not include the Government Accountability Office or the Government of the District of Columbia; and

“(B) shall include the Executive Office of the President.

“(2) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ means an officer or employee referred to in paragraph (2) of section 207(c) or paragraph (1) of section 207(d) of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

“(4) EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The term ‘executive branch’ has the meaning given that term in section 109.

“(5) FORMER CLIENT.—The term ‘former client’—

“(A) means a person for whom a covered employee served personally as an agent, attorney, or consultant during the 2-year period ending on the date before the date on which the covered employee begins service in the Federal Government; and

“(B) does not include any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

“(6) FORMER EMPLOYER.—The term ‘former employer’—

“(A) means a person for whom a covered employee served as an employee, officer, director, trustee, agent, attorney, consultant, or contractor during the 2 year period ending on the date before the date on which the covered employee begins service in the Federal Government; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) an entity in the Federal Government, including an executive branch agency;

“(ii) a State or local government;

“(iii) the District of Columbia;

“(iv) an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304); or

“(v) the government of a territory or possession of the United States.

“(7) PARTICULAR MATTER.—The term ‘particular matter’ has the meaning given that term in section 207(i) of title 18, United States Code.

“§ 602. Conflict of interest and eligibility standards

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered employee may not participate personally and substantially in a particular matter in which the covered employee knows or reasonably should have known that a former employer or former client of the covered employee has a financial interest.

“(b) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) AGENCY HEADS.—With respect to the head of a covered agency who is a covered

employee, the Designated Agency Ethics Official for the Executive Office of the President, in consultation with the Director, may grant a written waiver of the restrictions under subsection (a) before the head engages in the action otherwise prohibited by such subsection if the Designated Agency Ethics Official for the Executive Office of the President determines and certifies in writing that, in light of all the relevant circumstances, the interest of the Federal Government in the head's participation outweighs the concern that a reasonable person may question the integrity of the agency's programs or operations.

“(B) OTHER COVERED EMPLOYEES.—With respect to any covered employee not covered by subparagraph (A), the head of the covered agency employing the covered employee, in consultation with the Director, may grant a written waiver of the restrictions under subsection (a) before the covered employee engages in the action otherwise prohibited by such subsection if the head of the covered agency determines and certifies in writing that, in light of all the relevant circumstances, the interest of the Federal Government in the covered employee's participation outweighs the concern that a reasonable person may question the integrity of the agency's programs or operations.

“(2) PUBLICATION.—For any waiver granted under paragraph (1), the individual who granted the waiver shall—

“(A) provide a copy of the waiver to the Director not less than 48 hours after the waiver is granted; and

“(B) publish the waiver on the website of the applicable agency within 30 calendar days after granting such waiver.

“(3) REVIEW.—Upon receiving a written waiver under paragraph (1)(A), the Director shall—

“(A) review the waiver to determine whether the Director has any objection to the issuance of the waiver; and

“(B) if the Director so objects—

“(i) provide reasons for the objection in writing to the head of the agency who granted the waiver not less than 15 calendar days after the waiver was granted; and

“(ii) publish the written objection on the website of the Office of Government Ethics not less than 30 calendar days after the waiver was granted.

“§ 603. Penalties and injunctions

“(a) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates section 602 shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

“(2) WILLFUL VIOLATIONS.—Any person who willfully violates section 602 shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States against any person who violates, or whom the Attorney General has reason to believe is engaging in conduct that violates, section 602.

“(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that a person violated section 602, the court shall impose a civil penalty of not more than the greater of—

“(i) \$100,000 for each violation; or

“(ii) the amount of compensation the person received or was offered for the conduct constituting the violation.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A civil penalty under this subsection may be in addition to any other criminal or civil statutory, common law, or administrative remedy available to the United States or any other person.

“(3) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1) against a person, the Attorney General may petition the court for an order prohibiting the person from engaging in conduct that violates section 602.

“(B) STANDARD.—The court may issue an order under subparagraph (A) if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the conduct of the person violates section 602.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The filing of a petition seeking injunctive relief under this paragraph shall not preclude any other remedy that is available by law to the United States or any other person.”.

SEC. 8004. PROHIBITION OF PROCUREMENT OFFICERS ACCEPTING EMPLOYMENT FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS.

(a) EXPANSION OF PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE BY FORMER OFFICIALS OF COMPENSATION FROM CONTRACTORS.—Section 2104 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “or consultant” and inserting “attorney, consultant, subcontractor, or lobbyist”; and

(ii) by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “personally made for the Federal agency” and inserting “participated personally and substantially in”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION FROM AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS.—A former official responsible for a Government contract referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) may not accept compensation for 2 years after awarding the contract from any division, affiliate, or subcontractor of the contractor.”.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PROCUREMENT OFFICERS TO DISCLOSE JOB OFFERS MADE ON BEHALF OF RELATIVES.—Section 2103(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting after “that official” the following: “, or for a relative (as defined in section 3110 of title 5) of that official.”.

(c) REQUIREMENT ON AWARD OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO FORMER EMPLOYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 21 of division B of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2108. Prohibition on involvement by certain former contractor employees in procurements

“An employee of the Federal Government may not participate personally and substantially in any award of a contract to, or the administration of a contract awarded to, a contractor that is a former employer of the employee during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the employee leaves the employment of the contractor.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2108. Prohibition on involvement by certain former contractor employees in procurements.”.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Government Ethics, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall promulgate regulations to carry out and ensure the enforcement of chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(e) MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with designated agency ethics officials (as that term is defined in section 109(3) of

the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)), shall monitor compliance with such chapter 21 by individuals and agencies.

SEC. 8005. REVOLVING DOOR RESTRICTIONS ON EMPLOYEES MOVING INTO THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “ONE-YEAR” and inserting “TWO-YEAR”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “1 year” in each instance and inserting “2 years”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “1-year” and inserting “2-year”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any individual covered by subsection (c) of section 207 of title 18, United States Code, separating from the civil service on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Presidential Conflicts of Interest

SEC. 8011. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Presidential Conflicts of Interest Act of 2019”.

SEC. 8012. DIVESTITURE OF PERSONAL FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT THAT POSE A POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding after title VI (as added by section 8003) the following:

“TITLE VII—DIVESTITURE OF FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

“§ 701. Divestiture of financial interests posing a conflict of interest

“(a) APPLICABILITY TO THE PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.—The President and Vice-President shall, within 30 days of assuming office, divest of all financial interests that pose a conflict of interest because the President or Vice President, the spouse, dependent child, or general partner of the President or Vice President, or any person or organization with whom the President or Vice President is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest, by—

“(1) converting each such interest to cash or other investment that meets the criteria established by the Director of the Office of Government Ethics through regulation as being an interest so remote or inconsequential as not to pose a conflict; or

“(2) placing each such interest in a qualified blind trust as defined in section 102(f)(3) or a diversified trust under section 102(f)(4)(B).

“(b) DISCLOSURE EXEMPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the President or Vice President complies with section 102.”.

(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES.—Section 102(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) With respect to any such report filed by the President or Vice President, for any corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise in which the President, Vice President, or the spouse or dependent child of the President or Vice President, has a significant financial interest—

“(A) the name of each other person who holds a significant financial interest in the firm, partnership, association, corporation, or other entity;

“(B) the value, identity, and category of each liability in excess of \$10,000; and

“(C) a description of the nature and value of any assets with a value of \$10,000 or more.”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics

shall promulgate regulations to define the criteria required by section 701(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (as added subsection (a)) and the term “significant financial interest” for purposes of section 102(a)(9) of the Ethics in Government Act (as added by subsection (b)).

SEC. 8013. INITIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE.

Subsection (a) of section 101 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “position” and adding at the end the following: “position, with the exception of the President and Vice President, who must file a new report.”.

SEC. 8014. CONTRACTS BY THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 431 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “the President, Vice President, or a” after “Contracts by”; and

(2) in the first undesignated paragraph, by inserting “the President or Vice President,” after “Whoever, being”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 431 and inserting the following:

“431. Contracts by the President, Vice President, or a Member of Congress.”.

Subtitle C—White House Ethics Transparency

SEC. 8021. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “White House Ethics Transparency Act of 2019”.

SEC. 8022. PROCEDURE FOR WAIVERS AND AUTHORIZATIONS RELATING TO ETHICS REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 30 days after an officer or employee issues or approves a waiver or authorization pursuant to section 3 of Executive Order 13770 (82 Fed. Reg. 9333), or any subsequent similar order, such officer or employee shall—

(1) transmit a written copy of such waiver or authorization to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics; and

(2) make a written copy of such waiver or authorization available to the public on the website of the employing agency of the covered employee.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—In the case of a waiver or authorization described in subsection (a) issued during the period beginning on January 20, 2017, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, the issuing officer or employee of such waiver or authorization shall comply with the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a written copy of a waiver or authorization under subsection (a)(1), the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall make such waiver or authorization available to the public on the website of the Office of Government Ethics.

(d) DEFINITION OF COVERED EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term “covered employee”—

(1) means a non-career Presidential or Vice Presidential appointee, non-career appointee in the Senior Executive Service (or other SES-type system), or an appointee to a position that has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of being of a confidential or policymaking character (Schedule C and other positions excepted under comparable criteria) in an executive agency; and

(2) does not include any individual appointed as a member of the Senior Foreign

Service or solely as a uniformed service commissioned officer.

Subtitle D—Executive Branch Ethics Enforcement

SEC. 8031. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Executive Branch Comprehensive Ethics Enforcement Act of 2019”.

SEC. 8032. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.

Section 405 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2007” and inserting “fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 8033. TENURE OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.

Section 401(b) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, subject to removal only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. The Director may continue to serve beyond the expiration of the term until a successor is appointed and has qualified, except that the Director may not continue to serve for more than one year after the date on which the term would otherwise expire under this subsection.”.

SEC. 8034. DUTIES OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in paragraph (1) by striking “, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.”.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR.—Section 402(b) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “developing, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Office of Personnel Management, rules and regulations to be promulgated by the President or the Director” and inserting “developing and promulgating rules and regulations”; and

(B) by striking “title II” and inserting “title I”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) providing mandatory education and training programs for designated agency ethics officials, which may be delegated to each agency or the White House Counsel as deemed appropriate by the Director.”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “title II” and inserting “title I”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “problems” and inserting “issues”;

(5) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “issued by the President or the Director”; and

(B) by striking “problems” and inserting “issues”;

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “, when requested.”; and

(B) by striking “conflict of interest problems” and inserting “conflicts of interest, as well as other ethics issues”;

(7) in paragraph (9)—

(A) by striking “ordering” and inserting “receiving allegations of violations of this Act or regulations of the Office of Government Ethics and, when necessary, investigating an allegation to determine whether a violation occurred, and ordering”; and

(B) by inserting before the semi-colon the following: “, and recommending appropriate disciplinary action”;

(8) in paragraph (12)—

(A) by striking “evaluating, with the assistance of” and inserting “promulgating, with input from”; and

(B) by striking “the need for”;

(C) by striking “conflict of interest and ethical problems” and inserting “conflict of interest and ethics issues”;

(9) in paragraph (13)—

(A) by striking “with the Attorney General” and inserting “with the Inspectors General and the Attorney General”;

(B) by striking “violations of the conflict of interest laws” and inserting “conflict of interest issues and allegations of violations of ethics laws and regulations and this Act”; and

(C) by striking “, as required by section 535 of title 28, United States Code”;

(10) in paragraph (14), by striking “and” at the end;

(11) in paragraph (15)—

(A) by striking “, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.”;

(B) by striking “title II” and inserting “title I”; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(12) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) directing and providing final approval, when determined appropriate by the Director, for designated agency ethics officials regarding the resolution of conflicts of interest as well as any other ethics issues under the purview of this Act in individual cases; and

“(17) reviewing and approving, when determined appropriate by the Director, any recusals, exemptions, or waivers from the conflicts of interest and ethics laws, rules, and regulations and making approved recusals, exemptions, and waivers made publicly available by the relevant agency available in a central location on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics.”.

(c) WRITTEN PROCEDURES.—Paragraph (1) of section 402(d) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking “, by the exercise of any authority otherwise available to the Director under this title.”;

(2) by striking “the agency is”; and

(3) by inserting after “filed by” the following: “, or written documentation of recusals, waivers, or ethics authorizations relating to.”.

(d) CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.—Section 402(f) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in clause (i) of subparagraph (A), by striking “of such agency”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting at the end “and determine that a violation of this Act has occurred and issue appropriate administrative or legal remedies as prescribed in paragraph (2)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) in subclause (I)—

(aa) by inserting “to the President or the President’s designee if the matter involves employees of the Executive Office of the President or” after “may recommend”;

(bb) by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) in subclause (II)—

(aa) by inserting “President or” after “determines that the”; and

(bb) by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subclause (II) of clause (iii)—

(I) by striking “notify, in writing,” and inserting “advise the President or order”;

(II) by inserting “to take appropriate disciplinary action including reprimand, suspension, demotion, or dismissal against the officer or employee (provided, however, that any order issued by the Director shall not affect an employee’s right to appeal a disciplinary action under applicable law, regulation, collective bargaining agreement, or contractual provision)” after “employee’s agency”; and

(III) by striking “of the officer’s or employee’s noncompliance, except that, if the

officer or employee involved is the agency head, the notification shall instead be submitted to the President and Congress and"; and

- (iii) by striking clause (iv);
- (B) in subparagraph (B)(i)—
- (i) by striking "subparagraph (A)(iii) or (iv)" and inserting "subparagraph (A)";
- (ii) by inserting "(I)" before "In order to"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:
 "(II)(aa) The Director may secure directly from any agency information necessary to enable the Director to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Director, the head of such agency shall furnish that information to the Director.

"(bb) The Director may require by subpoena the production of all information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data in any medium and documentary evidence necessary in the performance of the functions assigned by this Act, which subpoena, in the case of refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate United States district court.";

- (C) in subparagraph (B)(ii)(I)—
- (i) by striking "Subject to clause (iv) of this subparagraph, before" and inserting "Before"; and
- (ii) by striking "subparagraphs (A) (iii) or (iv)" and inserting "subparagraph (A)(iii)";
- (D) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking "Subject to clause (iv) of this subparagraph, before" and inserting "Before"; and
- (E) in subparagraph (B)(iv)—
- (i) by striking "title 2" and inserting "title I"; and

(ii) by striking "section 206" and inserting "section 106"; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "(iv)".

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Section 402 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) For purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'agency' shall include the Executive Office of the President; and

"(2) the term 'officer or employee' shall include any individual occupying a position, providing any official services, or acting in an advisory capacity, in the White House or the Executive Office of the President.

"(h) In this title, a reference to the head of an agency shall include the President or the President's designee.

"(i) The Director shall not be required to obtain the prior approval, comment, or review of any officer or agency of the United States, including the Office of Management and Budget, before submitting to Congress, or any committee or subcommittee thereof, any information, reports, recommendations, testimony, or comments, if such submissions include a statement indicating that the views expressed therein are those of the Director and do not necessarily represent the views of the President."

SEC. 8035. AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIALS TRAINING AND DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 403 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding a period at the end of the matter following paragraph (2); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c)(1) All designated agency ethics officials and alternate designated agency ethics officials shall register with the Director as well as with the appointing authority of the official.

"(2) The Director shall provide ethics education and training to all designated and alternate designated agency ethics officials in a time and manner deemed appropriate by the Director.

"(3) Each designated agency ethics official and each alternate designated agency ethics

official shall biannually attend ethics education and training, as provided by the Director under paragraph (2).

"(d) Each Designated Agency Ethics Official, including the Designated Agency Ethics Official for the Executive Office of the President—

"(1) shall provide to the Director, in writing, in a searchable, sortable, and downloadable format, all approvals, authorizations, certifications, compliance reviews, determinations, directed divestitures, public financial disclosure reports, notices of deficiency in compliance, records related to the approval or acceptance of gifts, recusals, regulatory or statutory advisory opinions, waivers, including waivers under section 207 or 208 of title 18, United States Code, and any other records designated by the Director, unless disclosure is prohibited by law;

"(2) shall, for all information described in paragraph (1) that is permitted to be disclosed to the public under law, make the information available to the public by publishing the information on the website of the Office of Government Ethics, providing a link to download an electronic copy of the information, or providing printed paper copies of such information to the public; and

"(3) may charge a reasonable fee for the cost of providing paper copies of the information pursuant to paragraph (2).

"(e)(1) For all information that is provided by an agency to the Director under paragraph (1) of subsection (d), the Director shall make the information available to the public in a searchable, sortable, downloadable format by publishing the information on the website of the Office of Government Ethics or providing a link to download an electronic copy of the information.

"(2) The Director may, upon request, provide printed paper copies of the information published under paragraph (1) and charge a reasonable fee for the cost of printing such copies."

(b) REPEAL.—Section 408 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is hereby repealed.

Subtitle E—Conflicts From Political Fundraising

SEC. 8041. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Conflicts from Political Fundraising Act of 2019".

SEC. 8042. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN TYPES OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (19) as paragraphs (5) through (22), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) 'covered contribution' means a payment, advance, forbearance, rendering, or deposit of money, or any thing of value—

"(A)(i) that—

"(I) is—

"(aa) made by or on behalf of a covered individual; or

"(bb) solicited in writing by or at the request of a covered individual; and

"(II) is made—

"(aa) to a political organization, as defined in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(bb) to an organization—

"(AA) that is described in paragraph (4) or (6) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

"(BB) that promotes or opposes changes in Federal laws or regulations that are (or would be) administered by the agency in which the covered individual has been nomi-

nated for appointment to a covered position or is serving in a covered position; or

"(ii) that is—

"(I) solicited in writing by or on behalf of a covered individual; and

"(II) made—

"(aa) by an individual or entity the activities of which are subject to Federal laws or regulations that are (or would be) administered by the agency in which the covered individual has been nominated for appointment to a covered position or is serving in a covered position; and

"(bb) to—

"(AA) a political organization, as defined in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(BB) an organization that is described in paragraph (4) or (6) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

"(B) that is made to an organization described in item (aa) or (bb) of clause (i)(II) or clause (ii)(II)(bb) of subparagraph (A) for which the total amount of such payments, advances, forbearances, renderings, or deposits of money, or any thing of value, during the calendar year in which it is made is not less than the contribution limitation in effect under section 315(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(1)(A)) for elections occurring during such calendar year;

"(3) 'covered individual' means an individual who has been nominated or appointed to a covered position; and

"(4) 'covered position'—

"(A) means—

"(i) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code;

"(ii) a position placed in level IV or V of the Executive Schedule under section 5317 of title 5, United States Code;

"(iii) a position as a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(iv) a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and

"(B) does not include a position if the individual serving in the position has been excluded from the application of section 101(f)(5);"

"(i) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code;

"(ii) a position placed in level IV or V of the Executive Schedule under section 5317 of title 5, United States Code;

"(iii) a position as a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(iv) a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and

"(B) does not include a position if the individual serving in the position has been excluded from the application of section 101(f)(5);"

(b) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 101—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "(1)" before "Within";

(ii) by striking "unless" and inserting

"and, if the individual is assuming a covered position, the information described in section 102(j), except that, subject to paragraph (2), the individual shall not be required to file a report if"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) If an individual has left a position described in subsection (f) that is not a covered position and, within 30 days, assumes a position that is a covered position, the individual shall, within 30 days of assuming the covered position, file a report containing the information described in section 102(j)(2)(A).";

(B) in subsection (b)(1), in the first sentence, by inserting "and the information required by section 102(j)" after "described in section 102(b)";

(C) in subsection (d), by inserting "and, if the individual is serving in a covered position, the information required by section 102(j)(2)(A)" after "described in section 102(a)"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), in the first sentence, by inserting "and the information required by section 102(j)" after "described in section 102(b)";

(C) in subsection (d), by inserting "and, if the individual is serving in a covered position, the information required by section 102(j)(2)(A)" after "described in section 102(a)"; and

(D) in subsection (e), by inserting “and, if the individual was serving in a covered position, the information required by section 102(j)(2)(A)” after “described in section 102(a)”; and

(2) in section 102—

(A) in subsection (g), by striking “Political campaign funds” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (j), political campaign funds”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘applicable period’ means—

“(i) with respect to a report filed pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 101, the year of filing and the 4 calendar years preceding the year of the filing; and

“(ii) with respect to a report filed pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) of section 101, the preceding calendar year; and

“(B) the term ‘covered gift’ means a gift that—

“(i) is made to a covered individual, the spouse of a covered individual, or the dependent child of a covered individual;

“(ii) is made by an entity described in item (aa) or (bb) of section 109(2)(A)(i)(II); and

“(iii) would have been required to be reported under subsection (a)(2) if the covered individual had been required to file a report under section 101(d) with respect to the calendar year during which the gift was made.

“(2)(A) A report filed pursuant to subsection (a), (b), (d), or (e) of section 101 by a covered individual shall include, for each covered contribution during the applicable period—

“(i) the date on which the covered contribution was made;

“(ii) if applicable, the date or dates on which the covered contribution was solicited;

“(iii) the value of the covered contribution;

“(iv) the name of the person making the covered contribution; and

“(v) the name of the person receiving the covered contribution.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), a covered contribution made by or on behalf of, or that was solicited in writing by or on behalf of, a covered individual shall constitute a conflict of interest, or an appearance thereof, with respect to the official duties of the covered individual.

“(ii) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics may exempt a covered contribution from the application of clause (i) if the Director determines the circumstances of the solicitation and making of the covered contribution do not present a risk of a conflict of interest and the exemption of the covered contribution would not affect adversely the integrity of the Government or the public’s confidence in the integrity of the Government.

“(3) A report filed pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 101 by a covered individual shall include the information described in subsection (a)(2) with respect to each covered gift received during the applicable period.”.

(c) **PROVISION OF REPORTS AND ETHICS AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.**—Section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Not later than 30 days after receiving a written request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of a committee or subcommittee of either House of Congress, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall provide to the Chairman and Ranking Member each report filed under this title by the covered individual and any ethics agreement entered into between the agency and the covered individual.”.

(d) **RULES ON ETHICS AGREEMENTS.**—The Director of the Office of Government Ethics

shall promptly issue rules regarding how an agency in the executive branch shall address information required to be disclosed under the amendments made by this subtitle in drafting ethics agreements between the agency and individuals appointed to positions in the agency.

(e) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(A) in section 101(f)—

(i) in paragraph (9), by striking “section 109(12)” and inserting “section 109(15)”;

(ii) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 109(13)” and inserting “section 109(16)”;

(iii) in paragraph (11), by striking “section 109(10)” and inserting “section 109(13)”;

(iv) in paragraph (12), by striking “section 109(8)” and inserting “section 109(11)”;

(B) in section 103(l)—

(i) in paragraph (9), by striking “section 109(12)” and inserting “section 109(15)”;

(ii) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 109(13)” and inserting “section 109(16)”;

(C) in section 105(b)(3)(A), by striking “section 109(8) or 109(10)” and inserting “section 109(11) or 109(13)”.

(2) Section 3(4)(D) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602(4)(D)) is amended by striking “section 109(13)” and inserting “section 109(16)”.

(3) Section 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “section 109(11) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(11))” and inserting “section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “section 109(8) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(8))” and inserting “section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “section 109(10) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(10))” and inserting “section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)”.

(4) Section 499(j)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290b(j)(2)) is amended by striking “section 109(16) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978” and inserting “section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)”.

Subtitle F—Transition Team Ethics

SEC. 8051. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Transition Team Ethics Improvement Act”.

SEC. 8052. PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ETHICS PROGRAMS.

The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) in section 3(f), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) Not later than 10 days after submitting an application for a security clearance for any individual, and not later than 10 days after any such individual is granted a security clearance (including an interim clearance), each eligible candidate (as that term is described in subsection (h)(4)(A)) or the President-elect (as the case may be) shall submit a report containing the name of such individual to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.”;

(2) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the term ‘nonpublic information’—

“(A) means information from the Federal Government that a transition team member obtains as part of the employment of such member that the member knows or reasonably should know has not been made available to the general public; and

“(B) includes information that has not been released to the public that a transition team member knows or reasonably should know—

“(i) is exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, or otherwise protected from disclosure by law; and

“(ii) is not authorized by the appropriate agency or official to be released to the public; and”;

(B) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “November” and inserting “October”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ETHICS PLAN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1) shall include an agreement that the eligible candidate will implement and enforce an ethics plan to guide the conduct of the transition beginning on the date on which the eligible candidate becomes the President-elect.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—The ethics plan shall include, at a minimum—

“(i) a description of the ethics requirements that will apply to all transition team members, including specific requirements for transition team members who will have access to nonpublic or classified information;

“(ii) a description of how the transition team will—

“(I) address the role on the transition team of—

“(aa) registered lobbyists under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and individuals who were formerly registered lobbyists under that Act;

“(bb) persons registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), foreign nationals, and other foreign agents; and

“(cc) transition team members with sources of income or clients that are not disclosed to the public;

“(II) prohibit a transition team member with personal financial conflicts of interest as described in section 208 of title 18, United States Code, from working on particular matters involving specific parties that affect the interests of such member; and

“(III) address how the covered eligible candidate will address their own personal financial conflicts of interest during a Presidential term if the covered eligible candidate becomes the President-elect;

“(iii) a Code of Ethical Conduct, to which each transition team member will sign and be subject to, that reflects the content of the ethics plans under this paragraph and at a minimum requires each transition team member to—

“(I) seek authorization from transition team leaders or their designees before seeking, on behalf of the transition, access to any nonpublic information;

“(II) keep confidential any nonpublic information provided in the course of the duties of the member with the transition and exclusively use such information for the purposes of the transition; and

“(III) not use any nonpublic information provided in the course of transition duties, in any manner, for personal or private gain for the member or any other party at any time during or after the transition; and

“(iv) a description of how the transition team will enforce the Code of Ethical Conduct, including the names of the transition team members responsible for enforcement, oversight, and compliance.

“(C) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.—The transition team shall make the ethics plan described in this paragraph publicly available on the website of the General Services Administration the earlier of—

“(i) the day on which the memorandum of understanding is completed; or

“(ii) October 1.”; and

(3) in section 6(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a list of all positions each transition team member has held outside the Federal Government for the previous 12-month period, including paid and unpaid positions;

“(D) sources of compensation for each transition team member exceeding \$5,000 a year for the previous 12-month period;

“(E) a description of the role of each transition team member, including a list of any policy issues that the member expects to work on, and a list of agencies the member expects to interact with, while serving on the transition team;

“(F) a list of any issues from which each transition team member will be recused while serving as a member of the transition team pursuant to the transition team ethics plan outlined in section 4(g)(3); and

“(G) an affirmation that no transition team member has a financial conflict of interest that precludes the member from working on the matters described in subparagraph (E).”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “not later than 2 business days” after “public”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The head of a Federal department or agency, or their designee, shall not permit access to the Federal department or agency, or employees of such department or agency, that would not be provided to a member of the public for any transition team member who does not make the disclosures listed under paragraph (1).”.

Subtitle G—Ethics Pledge For Senior Executive Branch Employees

SEC. 8061. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Ethics in Public Service Act”.

SEC. 8062. ETHICS PLEDGE REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.

The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after title I the following new title:

“TITLE II—ETHICS PLEDGE

“SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

“For the purposes of this title, the following definitions apply:

“(1) The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, and includes the Executive Office of the President, the United States Postal Service, and Postal Regulatory Commission, but does not include the Government Accountability Office.

“(2) The term ‘appointee’ means any non-career Presidential or Vice-Presidential appointee, noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service (or other SES-type system), or appointee to a position that has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of being of a confidential or policymaking character (Schedule C and other positions excepted under comparable criteria) in an executive agency, but does not include any individual appointed as a member of the Senior Foreign Service or solely as a uniformed service commissioned officer.

“(3) The term ‘gift’—

“(A) has the meaning given that term in section 2635.203(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

“(B) does not include those items excluded by sections 2635.204(b), (c), (e)(1), (e)(3), (j), (k), and (l) of such title 5.

“(4) The term ‘covered executive branch official’ and ‘lobbyist’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602).

“(5) The term ‘registered lobbyist or lobbying organization’ means a lobbyist or an organization filing a registration pursuant to section 4(a) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(a)), and in the case of an organization filing such a registration, ‘registered lobbyist’ includes each of the lobbyists identified therein.

“(6) The term ‘lobby’ and ‘lobbied’ mean to act or have acted as a registered lobbyist.

“(7) The term ‘former employer’—

“(A) means a person or entity for whom an appointee served as an employee, officer, director, trustee, partner, agent, attorney, consultant, or contractor during the 2-year period ending on the date before the date on which the covered employee begins service in the Federal Government; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(ii) a State or local government;

“(iii) the District of Columbia;

“(iv) an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304); or

“(v) the government of a territory or possession of the United States.

“(8) The term ‘former client’ means a person or entity for whom an appointee served personally as agent, attorney, or consultant during the 2-year period ending on the date before the date on which the covered employee begins service in the Federal Government, but does not include an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(9) The term ‘directly and substantially related to my former employer or former clients’ means matters in which the appointee’s former employer or a former client is a party or represents a party.

“(10) The term ‘participate’ means to participate personally and substantially.

“(11) The term ‘post-employment restrictions’ includes the provisions and exceptions in section 207(c) of title 18, United States Code, and the implementing regulations.

“(12) The term ‘Government official’ means any employee of the executive branch.

“(13) The term ‘Administration’ means all terms of office of the incumbent President serving at the time of the appointment of an appointee covered by this title.

“(14) The term ‘pledge’ means the ethics pledge set forth in section 202 of this title.

“(15) All references to provisions of law and regulations shall refer to such provisions as in effect on the date of enactment of this title.

“SEC. 202. ETHICS PLEDGE.

“Each appointee in every executive agency appointed on or after the date of enactment of this section shall be required to sign an ethics pledge upon appointment. The pledge shall be signed and dated within 30 days of taking office and shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

“‘As a condition, and in consideration, of my employment in the United States Government in a position invested with the public trust, I commit myself to the following obligations, which I understand are binding on me and are enforceable under law:

“(1) Lobbyist Gift Ban.—I will not accept gifts from registered lobbyists or lobbying

organizations for the duration of my service as an appointee.

“(2) Revolving Door Ban; Entering Government.—

“(A) All Appointees Entering Government.—I will not, for a period of 2 years from the date of my appointment, participate in any particular matter involving specific party or parties that is directly and substantially related to my former employer or former clients, including regulations and contracts.

“(B) Lobbyists Entering Government.—If I was a registered lobbyist within the 2 years before the date of my appointment, in addition to abiding by the limitations of subparagraph (A), I will not for a period of 2 years after the date of my appointment:

“(i) participate in any particular matter on which I lobbied within the 2 years before the date of my appointment;

“(ii) participate in the specific issue area in which that particular matter falls; or

“(iii) seek or accept employment with any executive agency that I lobbied within the 2 years before the date of my appointment.

“(3) Revolving Door Ban; Appointees Leaving Government.—

“(A) All Appointees Leaving Government.—If, upon my departure from the Government, I am covered by the post-employment restrictions on communicating with employees of my former executive agency set forth in section 207(c) of title 18, United States Code, I agree that I will abide by those restrictions for a period of 2 years following the end of my appointment.

“(B) Appointees Leaving Government to Lobby.—In addition to abiding by the limitations of subparagraph (A), I also agree, upon leaving Government service, not to lobby any covered executive branch official or non-career Senior Executive Service appointee for the remainder of the Administration.

“(4) Employment Qualification Commitment.—I agree that any hiring or other employment decisions I make will be based on the candidate’s qualifications, competence, and experience.

“(5) Assent to Enforcement.—I acknowledge that title II of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, which I have read before signing this document, defines certain of the terms applicable to the foregoing obligations and sets forth the methods for enforcing them. I expressly accept the provisions of that title as a part of this agreement and as binding on me. I understand that the terms of this pledge are in addition to any statutory or other legal restrictions applicable to me by virtue of Federal Government service.”.

“SEC. 203. WAIVER.

“(a) The President or the President’s designee may grant to any current or former appointee a written waiver of any restrictions contained in the pledge signed by such appointee if, and to the extent that, the President or the President’s designee certifies (in writing) that, in light of all the relevant circumstances, the interest of the Federal Government in the employee’s participation outweighs the concern that a reasonable person may question the integrity of the agency’s programs or operations.

“(b) Any waiver under this section shall take effect when the certification is signed by the President or the President’s designee.

“(c) For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the public interest shall include exigent circumstances relating to national security or to the economy. De minimis contact with an executive agency shall be cause for a waiver of the restrictions contained in paragraph (2)(B) of the pledge.

“(d) For any waiver granted under this section, the individual who granted the waiver shall—

“(1) provide a copy of the waiver to the Director not less than 48 hours after the waiver is granted; and

“(2) publish the waiver on the website of the applicable agency within 30 calendar days after granting such waiver.

“(e) Upon receiving a written waiver under subsection (d), the Director shall—

“(1) review the waiver to determine whether the Director has any objection to the issuance of the waiver; and

“(2) if the Director so objects—

“(A) provide reasons for the objection in writing to the head of the agency who granted the waiver not less than 15 calendar days after the waiver was granted; and

“(B) publish the written objection on the website of the Office of Government Ethics not less than 30 calendar days after the waiver was granted.

“SEC. 204. ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) The head of each executive agency shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, establish such rules or procedures (conforming as nearly as practicable to the agency’s general ethics rules and procedures, including those relating to designated agency ethics officers) as are necessary or appropriate to ensure—

“(1) that every appointee in the agency signs the pledge upon assuming the appointed office or otherwise becoming an appointee;

“(2) that compliance with paragraph (2)(B) of the pledge is addressed in a written ethics agreement with each appointee to whom it applies;

“(3) that spousal employment issues and other conflicts not expressly addressed by the pledge are addressed in ethics agreements with appointees or, where no such agreements are required, through ethics counseling; and

“(4) compliance with this title within the agency.

“(b) With respect to the Executive Office of the President, the duties set forth in subsection (a) shall be the responsibility of the Counsel to the President.

“(c) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall—

“(1) ensure that the pledge and a copy of this title are made available for use by agencies in fulfilling their duties under subsection (a);

“(2) in consultation with the Attorney General or the Counsel to the President, when appropriate, assist designated agency ethics officers in providing advice to current or former appointees regarding the application of the pledge;

“(3) adopt such rules or procedures as are necessary or appropriate—

“(A) to carry out the responsibilities assigned by this subsection;

“(B) to apply the lobbyist gift ban set forth in paragraph 1 of the pledge to all executive branch employees;

“(C) to authorize limited exceptions to the lobbyist gift ban for circumstances that do not implicate the purposes of the ban;

“(D) to make clear that no person shall have violated the lobbyist gift ban if the person properly disposes of a gift;

“(E) to ensure that existing rules and procedures for Government employees engaged in negotiations for future employment with private businesses that are affected by their official actions do not affect the integrity of the Government’s programs and operations; and

“(F) to ensure, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, that the requirement set forth in paragraph (4) of the pledge is honored by every employee of the executive branch;

“(4) in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, report

to the President, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on whether full compliance is being achieved with existing laws and regulations governing executive branch procurement lobbying disclosure and on steps the executive branch can take to expand to the fullest extent practicable disclosure of such executive branch procurement lobbying and of lobbying for presidential pardons, and to include in the report both immediate action the executive branch can take and, if necessary, recommendations for legislation; and

“(5) provide an annual public report on the administration of the pledge and this title.

“(d) All pledges signed by appointees, and all waiver certifications with respect thereto, shall be filed with the head of the appointee’s agency for permanent retention in the appointee’s official personnel folder or equivalent folder.”.

Subtitle H—Severability

SEC. 8071. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or any amendment made by this title, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title, and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

TITLE IX—CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS REFORM

Subtitle A—Requiring Members of Congress to Reimburse Treasury for Amounts Paid as Settlements and Awards Under Congressional Accountability Act of 1995

Sec. 9001. Requiring Members of Congress to reimburse Treasury for amounts paid as settlements and awards under Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 in all cases of employment discrimination acts by Members.

Subtitle B—Conflicts of Interests

Sec. 9101. Prohibiting Members of House of Representatives from serving on boards of for-profit entities.

Sec. 9102. Conflict of interest rules for Members of Congress and congressional staff.

Sec. 9103. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

Subtitle C—Campaign Finance and Lobbying Disclosure

Sec. 9201. Short title.

Sec. 9202. Requiring disclosure in certain reports filed with Federal Election Commission of persons who are registered lobbyists.

Sec. 9203. Effective date.

Subtitle D—Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports

Sec. 9301. Short title.

Sec. 9302. Definitions.

Sec. 9303. Establishment of online portal for congressionally mandated reports.

Sec. 9304. Federal agency responsibilities.

Sec. 9305. Removing and altering reports.

Sec. 9306. Relationship to the Freedom of Information Act.

Sec. 9307. Implementation.

Subtitle E—Severability

Sec. 9401. Severability.

Subtitle A—Requiring Members of Congress to Reimburse Treasury for Amounts Paid as Settlements and Awards Under Congressional Accountability Act of 1995

SEC. 9001. REQUIRING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO REIMBURSE TREASURY FOR AMOUNTS PAID AS SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS UNDER CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995 IN ALL CASES OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION ACTS BY MEMBERS.

(a) REQUIRING REIMBURSEMENT.—Clause (i) of section 415(d)(1)(C) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415(d)(1)(C)), as amended by section 111(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(i) a violation of section 201(a) or section 206(a); or”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO NOTIFICATION OF POSSIBILITY OF REIMBURSEMENT.—Clause (i) of section 402(b)(2)(B) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1402(b)(2)(B)), as amended by section 102(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(i) a violation of section 201(a) or section 206(a); or”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act.

Subtitle B—Conflicts of Interests

SEC. 9101. PROHIBITING MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM SERVING ON BOARDS OF FOR-PROFIT ENTITIES.

Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause 19 as clause 20; and

(2) by inserting after clause 18 the following new clause:

“9. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not serve on the board of directors of any for-profit entity.”.

SEC. 9102. CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.

No Member, officer, or employee of a committee or Member of either House of Congress may knowingly use his or her official position to introduce or aid the progress or passage of legislation, a principal purpose of which is to further only his or her pecuniary interest, only the pecuniary interest of his or her immediate family, or only the pecuniary interest of a limited class of persons or enterprises, when he or she, or his or her immediate family, or enterprises controlled by them, are members of the affected class.

SEC. 9103. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The provisions of this subtitle are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Subtitle C—Campaign Finance and Lobbying Disclosure

SEC. 9201. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Connecting Lobbyists and Electeds for Accountability and Reform Act” or the “CLEAR Act”.

SEC. 9202. REQUIRING DISCLOSURE IN CERTAIN REPORTS FILED WITH FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION OF PERSONS WHO ARE REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.

(a) **REPORTS FILED BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES.**—Section 304(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(b)) is amended—

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

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

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

“(9) if any person identified in subparagraph (A), (E), (F), or (G) of paragraph (3) is a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, a separate statement that such person is a registered lobbyist under such Act.”.

(b) **REPORTS FILED BY PERSONS MAKING INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES.**—Section 304(c)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(D) if the person filing the statement, or a person whose identification is required to be disclosed under subparagraph (C), is a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, a separate statement that such person is a registered lobbyist under such Act.”.

(c) **REPORTS FILED BY PERSONS MAKING DISBURSEMENTS FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.**—Section 304(f)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) If the person making the disbursement, or a contributor described in subparagraph (E) or (F), is a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, a separate statement that such person or contributor is a registered lobbyist under such Act.”.

(d) **REQUIRING COMMISSION TO ESTABLISH LINK TO WEBSITES OF CLERK OF HOUSE AND SECRETARY OF SENATE.**—Section 304 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104), as amended by section 4308(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) **REQUIRING INFORMATION ON REGISTERED LOBBYISTS TO BE LINKED TO WEBSITES OF CLERK OF HOUSE AND SECRETARY OF SENATE.**—

“(1) **LINKS TO WEBSITES.**—The Commission shall ensure that the Commission’s public database containing information described in paragraph (2) is linked electronically to the websites maintained by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives containing information filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

“(2) **INFORMATION DESCRIBED.**—The information described in this paragraph is each of the following:

“(A) Information disclosed under paragraph (9) of subsection (b).

“(B) Information disclosed under subparagraph (D) of subsection (c)(2).

“(C) Information disclosed under subparagraph (G) of subsection (f)(2).”.

SEC. 9203. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to reports required to be filed under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 on or after the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle D—Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports

SEC. 9301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act”.

SEC. 9302. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORT.**—The term “congressionally mandated report”—

(A) means a report that is required to be submitted to either House of Congress or any committee of Congress, or subcommittee thereof, by a statute, resolution, or conference report that accompanies legislation enacted into law; and

(B) does not include a report required under part B of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Government Publishing Office.

(3) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term “Federal agency” has the meaning given that term under section 102 of title 40, United States Code, but does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(4) **OPEN FORMAT.**—The term “open format” means a file format for storing digital data based on an underlying open standard that—

(A) is not encumbered by any restrictions that would impede reuse; and

(B) is based on an underlying open data standard that is maintained by a standards organization.

(5) **REPORTS ONLINE PORTAL.**—The term “reports online portal” means the online portal established under section (3)(a).

SEC. 9303. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONLINE PORTAL FOR CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH ONLINE PORTAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish and maintain an online portal accessible by the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place. The Director may publish other reports on the online portal.

(2) **EXISTING FUNCTIONALITY.**—To the extent possible, the Director shall meet the requirements under paragraph (1) by using existing online portals and functionality under the authority of the Director.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out this subtitle, the Director shall consult with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Librarian of Congress regarding the requirements for and maintenance of congressionally mandated reports on the reports online portal.

(b) **CONTENT AND FUNCTION.**—The Director shall ensure that the reports online portal includes the following:

(1) Subject to subsection (c), with respect to each congressionally mandated report, each of the following:

(A) A citation to the statute, conference report, or resolution requiring the report.

(B) An electronic copy of the report, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, in an open format that is platform independent and that is available to the public without restrictions, including restrictions that would impede the re-use of the information in the report.

(C) The ability to retrieve a report, to the extent practicable, through searches based on each, and any combination, of the following:

(i) The title of the report.

(ii) The reporting Federal agency.

(iii) The date of publication.

(iv) Each congressional committee receiving the report, if applicable.

(v) The statute, resolution, or conference report requiring the report.

(vi) Subject tags.

(vii) A unique alphanumeric identifier for the report that is consistent across report editions.

(viii) The serial number, Superintendent of Documents number, or other identification number for the report, if applicable.

(ix) Key words.

(x) Full text search.

(xi) Any other relevant information specified by the Director.

(D) The date on which the report was required to be submitted, and on which the report was submitted, to the reports online portal.

(E) Access to the report not later than 30 calendar days after its submission to Congress.

(F) To the extent practicable, a permanent means of accessing the report electronically.

(2) A means for bulk download of all congressionally mandated reports.

(3) A means for downloading individual reports as the result of a search.

(4) An electronic means for the head of each Federal agency to submit to the reports online portal each congressionally mandated report of the agency, as required by section 4.

(5) In tabular form, a list of all congressionally mandated reports that can be searched, sorted, and downloaded by—

(A) reports submitted within the required time;

(B) reports submitted after the date on which such reports were required to be submitted; and

(C) reports not submitted.

(c) **NONCOMPLIANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **REPORTS NOT SUBMITTED.**—If a Federal agency does not submit a congressionally mandated report to the Director, the Director shall to the extent practicable—

(A) include on the reports online portal—

(i) the information required under clauses (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of subsection (b)(1)(C); and

(ii) the date on which the report was required to be submitted; and

(B) include the congressionally mandated report on the list described in subsection (b)(5)(C).

(2) **REPORTS NOT IN OPEN FORMAT.**—If a Federal agency submits a congressionally mandated report that is not in an open format, the Director shall include the congressionally mandated report in another format on the reports online portal.

(d) **FREE ACCESS.**—The Director may not charge a fee, require registration, or impose any other limitation in exchange for access to the reports online portal.

(e) **UPGRADE CAPABILITY.**—The reports online portal shall be enhanced and updated as necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

SEC. 9304. FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF REPORTS.**—Concurrently with the submission to Congress of each congressionally mandated report, the head of the Federal agency submitting the congressionally mandated report shall submit to the Director the information required under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 3(b)(1) with respect to the congressionally mandated report. Nothing in this subtitle shall relieve a Federal agency of any other requirement to publish the congressionally mandated report on the online portal of the Federal agency or otherwise submit the congressionally mandated report to Congress or specific committees of Congress, or subcommittees thereof.

(b) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director, shall issue guidance to agencies on the implementation of this Act.

(c) **STRUCTURE OF SUBMITTED REPORT DATA.**—The head of each Federal agency shall ensure that each congressionally mandated report submitted to the Director complies with the open format criteria established by the Director in the guidance issued under subsection (b).

(d) **POINT OF CONTACT.**—The head of each Federal agency shall designate a point of contact for congressionally mandated report.

(e) **LIST OF REPORTS.**—As soon as practicable each calendar year (but not later than April 1), and on a rolling basis during the year if feasible, the Librarian of Congress shall submit to the Director a list of congressionally mandated reports from the previous calendar year, in consultation with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which shall—

- (1) be provided in an open format;
- (2) include the information required under clauses (i), (ii), (iv), (v) of section 3(b)(1)(C) for each report;
- (3) include the frequency of the report;
- (4) include a unique alphanumeric identifier for the report that is consistent across report editions;
- (5) include the date on which each report is required to be submitted; and
- (6) be updated and provided to the Director, as necessary.

SEC. 9305. REMOVING AND ALTERING REPORTS.

A report submitted to be published to the reports online portal may only be changed or removed, with the exception of technical changes, by the head of the Federal agency concerned if—

- (1) the head of the Federal agency consults with each congressional committee to which the report is submitted; and
- (2) Congress enacts a joint resolution authorizing the changing or removal of the report.

SEC. 9306. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to—

- (1) require the disclosure of information or records that are exempt from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; or
- (2) to impose any affirmative duty on the Director to review congressionally mandated reports submitted for publication to the reports online portal for the purpose of identifying and redacting such information or records.

(b) **REDACTION OF INFORMATION.**—The head of a Federal agency may redact information required to be disclosed under this Act if the information would be properly withheld from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall—

- (1) redact information required to be disclosed under this subtitle if disclosure of such information is prohibited by law;
- (2) redact information being withheld under this subsection prior to submitting the information to the Director;
- (3) redact only such information properly withheld under this subsection from the submission of information or from any congressionally mandated report submitted under this subtitle;
- (4) identify where any such redaction is made in the submission or report; and
- (5) identify the exemption under which each such redaction is made.

SEC. 9307. IMPLEMENTATION.

Except as provided in section 9304(b), this subtitle shall be implemented not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to congressionally mandated reports submitted to Congress on or after the date that is 1 year after such date of enactment.

sionally mandated reports submitted to Congress on or after the date that is 1 year after such date of enactment.

Subtitle E—Severability

SEC. 9401. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE X—PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 10001. Presidential and Vice Presidential tax transparency.

SEC. 10001. PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) The term “covered candidate” means a candidate of a major party in a general election for the office of President or Vice President.

(2) The term “major party” has the meaning given the term in section 9002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) The term “income tax return” means, with respect to an individual, any return (as such term is defined in section 6103(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, except that such term shall not include declarations of estimated tax) of—

- (A) such individual, other than information returns issued to persons other than such individual, or
- (B) of any corporation, partnership, or trust in which such individual holds, directly or indirectly, a significant interest as the sole or principal owner or the sole or principal beneficial owner (as such terms are defined in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate).

(4) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the delegate of the Secretary.

(b) **DISCLOSURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.**—Not later than the date that is 15 days after the date on which an individual becomes a covered candidate, the individual shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the individual’s income tax returns for the 10 most recent taxable years for which a return has been filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

(B) **PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.**—With respect to an individual who is the President or Vice President, not later than the due date for the return of tax for each taxable year, such individual shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the individual’s income tax returns for the taxable year and for the 9 preceding taxable years.

(C) **TRANSITION RULE FOR SITTING PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS.**—Not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, an individual who is the President or Vice President on such date of enactment shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the income tax returns for the 10 most recent taxable years for which a return has been filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

(2) **FAILURE TO DISCLOSE.**—If any requirement under paragraph (1) to submit an income tax return is not met, the chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall submit to the Secretary a written request that the Secretary provide the Federal Election Commission with the income tax return.

(3) **PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.**—The chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall make

publicly available each income tax return submitted under paragraph (1) in the same manner as a return provided under section 6103(1)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section).

(4) **TREATMENT AS A REPORT UNDER THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.**—For purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, any income tax return submitted under paragraph (1) or provided under section 6103(1)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall, after redaction under paragraph (3) or subparagraph (B)(ii) of such section, be treated as a report filed under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(c) **DISCLOSURE OF RETURNS OF PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS AND CERTAIN CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6103(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) **DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION OF PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS AND CERTAIN CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon written request by the chairman of the Federal Election Commission under section 10001(b)(2) of the For the People Act of 2019, not later than the date that is 15 days after the date of such request, the Secretary shall provide copies of any return which is so requested to officers and employees of the Federal Election Commission whose official duties include disclosure or redaction of such return under this paragraph.

“(B) **DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall make publicly available any return which is provided under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) **REDACTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—Before making publicly available under clause (i) any return, the chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall redact such information as the Federal Election Commission and the Secretary jointly determine is necessary for protecting against identity theft, such as social security numbers.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “or (22)” and inserting “(22), or (23)”, and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(ii) by striking “or (22)” and inserting “(22), or (23)”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to disclosures made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116–16 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 172.

Each further amendment printed in part B of the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of

amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SUOZZI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, 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 323, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 4103. 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.), as amended by section 1821, is further amended by inserting after section 319A the following new section:

“SEC. 319B. 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.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, before I speak about our bipartisan amendment, I would like to thank Representatives SARBANES and LOFGREN for their hard work on H.R. 1.

I would also like to commend Chairman MCGOVERN and his staff on the Rules Committee—and the entire Rules Committee—for making our amendment in order and for working with the Problem Solvers Caucus and other pragmatic Members to foster an inclusive process.

Our bipartisan amendment No. 1 to H.R. 1, with 24 Democrats and 20 Republican cosponsors, would require the Federal Election Commission to conduct an audit after each Federal election cycle to determine any incidence of illicit foreign money in the election.

The reason we have such a bipartisan-supported amendment is because of the hard work of the Problem Solvers Caucus, chaired by my friends Chairman REED for the Republicans and Chairman GOTTHEIMER for the Democrats.

In January, our colleagues on the Problem Solvers Caucus worked with the leadership to negotiate the 20-20 rule as part of our Break the Gridlock proposal.

This amendment is the first amendment to receive preferential treatment under the 20-20 rule by the Rules Committee, and we are happy to see our addition to the rules package has worked its way to encourage transparency and bipartisanship in the 116th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, campaign finance law has loopholes, leaving the American electoral process susceptible to illicit funding from foreign nationals, corporations, and governments.

Foreign money easily influences our elections by passing funds through shell corporations, U.S. subsidiaries, investments, trade associations, and shell companies. Under our proposed amendment, within 180 days of an election, the FEC will submit to Congress a report containing audit results and recommendations to address the presence of illicit foreign money.

I urge the Members of this Congress to continue to utilize the 20-20 rule and gain some muscle memory of working in a bipartisan way to work for the American people.

Confidence in our electoral process is essential to faith in our government institutions, and I urge the passage of this bipartisan amendment to H.R. 1.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Chair, I seek the Republican response time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start by thanking my colleague, Mr. SUOZZI from New York, as well as our Republican colleague, Mr. FITZPATRICK, who led the charge on this amendment process in this amendment before you.

I would also take a moment to thank my co-chair on the Problem Solvers Caucus, Mr. GOTTHEIMER from New Jersey.

Though we may disagree on the fundamental bill before us, Mr. Chairman,

I am pleased to be able to report to the American people today that there are still Members here that are looking to find common ground.

In the amendment before you that has been put forward in this new mechanism in the Rules Committee to encourage bipartisan debate, we have found that common ground in regards to the transparency and the requirements that this amendment calls for in regards to making sure that, if foreign money is in our election process, we do what we can in order to root that out and bring sunshine to that issue for all Americans to see.

I encourage my colleagues on our side of the aisle to support this amendment because this is that common ground that, even though we may fundamentally disagree on some of the final conclusions of H.R. 1 and the issue and the debate that we have already seen on display here today, this is something that common sense dictates that we come together for as Democrats and Republicans, working together to find that common ground to advance the American cause.

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this amendment to H.R. 1.

I speak today as someone who has spent my career in public service identifying foreign threats to the safety and security of the American people. As a former CIA officer, I worked to identify threats to our country, our fellow Americans, and threats that would leave our Nation vulnerable to attack, espionage, or foreign influence.

As Congress acts this week to restore transparency to our government and regain trust from the people we serve, we must take steps to prevent foreign influence in our democratic process. I support efforts to push back against the very real threat of foreign financial influence. I know nefarious actors are out there. I know they are tireless in their commitment to target our foundational institutions, including our voting process.

The American people shouldn't have to worry about the ability of foreign governments or entities to influence our elections and our citizens, but senseless loopholes in our campaign finance system have left our electoral process vulnerable to spending by foreign governments, corporations, and foreign nationals. These foreign entities should not have the ability to exert influence over the issues that impact Americans most, including the national defense, healthcare, and our financial services sector. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this much-needed, bipartisan amendment.

This amendment would strengthen the integrity of our elections by encouraging our government to ensure

that our campaign finance system is not falling prey to signs of foreign money in our politics. It would require the FEC to conduct an audit to look for foreign money in our elections and then require the FEC to report its findings.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), Democratic co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, in the spirit of bipartisanship and in the effort to find common ground.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, TOM REED, for his leadership.

Mr. Chair, thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of this important bipartisan amendment to H.R. 1. I also want to thank Congresswoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES for their leadership on this legislation. And my colleagues who offered this amendment, my very good friend Congressman SUOZZI and Congressman FITZPATRICK, I thank them for their work on this bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus initiative, which I know will further help improve H.R. 1 by stopping the flow of foreign money into our elections.

This amendment was developed with strong support from the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, utilizing the new Break the Gridlock rules reforms that the caucus helped put in place in the new Congress.

This is the first time the 20-20 rule is being utilized for broad, bipartisan support legislation, and an amendment like this sends exactly the right signal to the American people that we can work together to move legislation.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which will help strengthen voting rights in our country, help clean corruption out of our politics, and protect free and fair elections, which is the bedrock of our democracy.

Civil rights means everyone in our great Nation has equal rights and, therefore, equal speech. Dark money in our politics flies in the face of that American ideal, from wherever it comes. Even worse is dark foreign money.

Loopholes in our campaign finance system have left our electoral process vulnerable to unlimited spending by foreign governments, corporations, and foreign nationals in our elections. We have seen that foreign entities are able to spend undisclosed amounts of money to influence U.S. elections by using subsidiaries, shell corporations, or advocacy groups to hide their influence.

In 2016, American Pacific International Capital, a company owned by Chinese nationals, used these loopholes to donate \$1.3 million to a super-PAC in the Presidential election.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Even in this most recent election in 2018, Iran,

China, and Russia all attempted to influence American voters and policy.

Americans on both sides of the aisle agree this is a critically important issue that we must do something about. The adoption of this amendment will further codify the intent of Congress to end unchecked foreign spending, which is the scourge of our democracy.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to more support for 20-20 legislative amendments.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, I reserve the remainder of my time to close.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chair, I have no other speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we wrap up the debate on this amendment, I hope we have demonstrated that there is common ground to be found in this Chamber.

I would like to take a moment to thank, again, my colleagues, but also the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN and his staff, for working with us in regards to this new reform of the rules process that will reward and encourage bipartisan behavior and bipartisan common ground-finding efforts.

I encourage all Members on both sides of the aisle: Utilize this new rule path to bring forth ideas that benefit the American people in a bipartisan way.

At the end of the day, this amendment is something we should all support for the reasons articulated by my colleagues on the other side and as articulated, hopefully, by myself today in regards to supporting this reform that goes at the issue of foreign money in our elections.

Mr. Chair, I encourage our Members to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud my colead on this bill, this bipartisan bill, Congressman FITZPATRICK, a Republican from Pennsylvania, who couldn't be here today, but he worked very hard on this, as did the other colleagues who have spoken here already.

The people of America are hungering for bipartisanship. They are hungering for people to work together to try and solve the problems in this country.

We hope that the use of the 20-20 rule and this amendment, with 24 Democrats and 20 Republicans, is one small step in that process to demonstrate that people can work together to solve problems.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CÁRDENAS). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, strike lines 6 through 11 and insert the following:

“(C) LOCATION OF POLLING PLACES.—

“(1) PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.—To the greatest extent practicable, a State shall ensure that each polling place which allows voting during an early voting period under subsection (a) is located within walking distance of a stop on a public transportation route.

“(2) AVAILABILITY IN RURAL AREAS.—The State shall ensure that polling places which allow voting during an early voting period under subsection (a) will be located in rural areas of the State, and shall ensure that such polling places are located in communities which will provide the greatest opportunity for residents of rural areas to vote during the early voting period.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to improve early voting in rural communities.

My amendment would ensure that early voting locations in rural communities are placed strategically in communities to provide the greatest access to rural voters seeking to cast their ballots.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, gets to the heart of what we have been trying to do here today with H.R. 1, and that is to make voting easier.

My amendment builds on the underlying text of H.R. 1 that directs States to locate early voting locations within walking distance of stops on public transportation routes by recognizing that rural communities face very different challenges to voting as compared to voters in urban communities.

In many rural communities, Mr. Chairman, like the ones that I represent in eastern North Carolina, there is no public transportation in many of those communities, so polling locations in these communities need to be located where these voters will have the best chance to let their voices be heard in our elections, and my amendment would simply ensure that that happens.

Mr. Chairman, rural communities are facing many challenges, but their ability to participate in our elections should not be one of those challenges. I think all of us on both sides of the aisle can agree on this.

During the markup at the committee, I got a good feeling about it, and I hoped my friend from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) would be willing to work with me in getting this amendment passed.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend and colleague from North Carolina's assertion that we have to be cognizant of what is happening in rural America and how, maybe a top-down approach from Washington may not be the best approach when we might not have public transportation opportunities in many of the rural areas that he and I both serve.

But, as Mr. BUTTERFIELD is a member of the House Administration Committee, I would have hoped that this amendment would have been offered during the committee markup, the markup, the only markup that was held on this 622-page bill. We offered 28 amendments on the Republican side and not a single one was accepted.

These are the types of amendments I would have loved to have seen have bipartisan support in the committee process because I am from a rural area. I understand it is sometimes difficult for people in rural areas to vote.

But we have got to leave it up to the States and localities to be able to determine where these polling places are going to go, especially in the rural areas.

We have a hard enough time having somebody here in Washington figure out where everybody is going to be in an office every 2 years. Can you imagine somebody in a concrete building out here in Washington, D.C., determining where a polling place should or should not be in a town that I represent in central Illinois?

That is my problem with this bill; it is a top-down approach that takes away the ability for locals to really truly get polling places in areas that are accessible for every voter to be able to cast their vote.

Mr. Chairman, I want every single American to be able to vote. Every vote, every single vote in every American vote deserves to be counted and protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois would remember that at the subcommittee markup, or the full committee markup, we did have a very healthy conversation about this topic. I acknowledge that no amendment was offered at the committee, but I felt a consensus, Mr. DAVIS, when we discussed it at the committee, and I thought that it would be accepted by the other side.

But suffice it to say that rural communities deserve to have polling locations that are convenient to all of its citizens. We are talking about Federal elections, not local elections, so I would ask my colleagues to reconsider and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his work on House Administration. I know, as well, that Congressman ANTHONY BROWN helped with this particular amendment.

This is really critical. This is all about, and H.R. 1, in large part, is about the journey to the ballot box, and how do we make that journey easier for people; how do we make sure that they can get there without too much of an undue burden; and that is what this would do for rural voters.

This would require that States ensure that the polling places are located in rural areas. So this idea that somebody in Washington is going to be deciding where the location is, that is preposterous. We are just saying make sure that the State figures it out; and so each State can decide what makes the most sense in terms of placing these voting places for rural voters.

So it is a very, very commonsense amendment. I want to thank the gentleman for introducing it and, definitely, I support it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from North Carolina is right. We had a good, healthy discussion on how rural voters could be adversely impacted by the original language that was in the bill that would have required polling places to be next to areas of mass transit.

Well, as we both know, there are many areas we serve that don't have access to mass transit. My problem is not with what this amendment does. My problem, again, is with the process.

My problem is how are we going to determine—and my biggest fear is that if Washington is determining where polling places should go, maybe we are not allowing the locals to determine best how to ensure that voters get easiest access to being able to cast their vote.

I want to work with the gentleman from North Carolina to address many rural needs, especially when it comes to our oversight responsibility of elections. And I certainly hope—I do believe this amendment will pass—and I certainly hope, if it becomes a law, which I don't believe H.R. 1 will become law, but I would really encourage us to be able to work together after this is done and maybe work in a separate fashion to address rural voting communities' needs. And I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I know we have a lot of amendments, so I will go ahead and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentleman for his comments and thank him for his friendship. The gentleman is right; we do serve on the House Administration Committee together. He is the ranking member of the committee and Ms. LOFGREN is the chair. We will have many opportunities to work together, and I look forward to working with the gentleman and all of the committee on

very important issues as we go forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, 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 383, after line 19, add the following new section:

SEC. 4502. ASSESSMENT OF SHAREHOLDER PREFERENCES FOR DISBURSEMENTS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10D the following:

“SEC. 10E. ASSESSMENT OF SHAREHOLDER PREFERENCES FOR DISBURSEMENTS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES.

“(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED BEFORE MAKING A DISBURSEMENT FOR A POLITICAL PURPOSE.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—An issuer with an equity security listed on a national securities exchange may not make a disbursement for a political purpose unless—

“(A) the issuer has in place procedures to assess the preferences of the shareholders of the issuer with respect to making such disbursements; and

“(B) such an assessment has been made within the 1-year period ending on the date of such disbursement.

“(2) TREATMENT OF ISSUERS WHOSE SHAREHOLDERS ARE PROHIBITED FROM EXPRESSING PREFERENCES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an issuer described under such paragraph with procedures in place to assess the preferences of its shareholders with respect to making disbursements for political purposes shall not be considered to meet the requirements of such paragraph if a majority of the number of the outstanding equity securities of the issuer are held by persons who are prohibited from expressing partisan or political preferences by law, contract, or the requirement to meet a fiduciary duty.

“(b) ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS.—The assessment described under subsection (a) shall assess—

“(1) which types of disbursements for a political purpose the shareholder believes the issuer should make;

“(2) whether the shareholder believes that such disbursements should be made in support of, or in opposition to, Republican, Democratic, Independent, or other political party candidates and political committees;

“(3) whether the shareholder believes that such disbursements should be made with respect to elections for Federal, State, or local office; and

“(4) such other information as the Commission may specify, by rule.

“(c) DISBURSEMENT FOR A POLITICAL PURPOSE DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘disbursement for a political purpose’ means any of the following:

“(A) A disbursement for an independent expenditure, as defined in section 301(17) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(17)).

“(B) A disbursement for an electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)

of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)).

“(C) A disbursement for any public communication, as defined in section 301(22) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(22))—

“(i) which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office, or is the functional equivalent of express advocacy because, when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate for election for Federal office; or

“(ii) which refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and which promotes or support a candidate for that office, or attacks or opposes a candidate for that office, without regard to whether the communication expressly advocates a vote for or against a candidate for that office.

“(D) Any other disbursement which is made for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election for a public office.

“(E) Any transfer of funds to another person which is made with the intent that such person will use the funds to make a disbursement described in subparagraphs (A) through (D), or with the knowledge that the person will use the funds to make such a disbursement.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘disbursement for a political purpose’ does not include any of the following:

“(A) Any disbursement made from a separate segregated fund of the corporation under section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30118).

“(B) Any transfer of funds to another person which is made in a commercial transaction in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the corporation or in the form of investments made by the corporation.

“(C) Any transfer of funds to another person which is subject to a written prohibition against the use of the funds for a disbursement for a political purpose.

“(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section, each of the terms ‘candidate’, ‘election’, ‘political committee’, and ‘political party’ has the meaning given such term under section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971 TO PROHIBIT DISBURSEMENTS BY CORPORATIONS FAILING TO ASSESS PREFERENCES.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30118) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PROHIBITING DISBURSEMENTS BY CORPORATIONS FAILING TO ASSESS SHAREHOLDER PREFERENCES.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a corporation to make a disbursement for a political purpose unless the corporation has in place procedures to assess the preferences of its shareholders with respect to making such disbursements, as provided in section 10E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘disbursement for a political purpose’ has the meaning given such term in section 10E(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after December 31, 2019.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to offer this amendment to H.R. 1.

For decades, the law prevented business corporations from engaging in campaign spending. But the Supreme Court destroyed that prohibition with its watershed decision in 2010, in the Citizens United case, which, for the first time, defined for-profit business corporations as political membership associations and, thereby, unleashed billions of dollars in corporate treasury money into the political system.

Since then, corporations have taken advantage of this newfound constitutional identity and political freedom by investing hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps billions, in campaign expenditures and the torrent of “dark money” now coursing through the political system.

But who are these corporations speaking for?

Well, according to the court, they are speaking for the shareholders. Writing for the majority, Justice Kennedy took the position that corporate political campaigning is on behalf of the shareholders, an association of individuals who have taken on the corporate form.

But, in reality, we know that CEOs engage in political spending without the knowledge, much less the consent of the shareholders whose First Amendment rights are allegedly being exercised.

Anyone who has a retirement fund with money invested in corporate equities will know that they have never been asked whether they want a portion of their retirement money invested in Republican or Democratic or other campaigns. The CEOs just do it without their participation.

What can be done to stop shareholders’ money from being spent on campaigns without their knowledge or consent?

Most Americans want a constitutional amendment to reverse Citizens United and restore the definition of corporations as economic entities barred from politics. But there is something that we can do right now, short of that, simply by enforcing Citizens United on its own terms. Justice Kennedy said the main check against abuse of this new right would be exercised by the “shareholders through the procedures of corporate democracy.”

Justice Kennedy assumed a world of comprehensive and immediate disclosure. He wrote: “Shareholder objections raised through the procedures of corporate democracy can be more effective today because modern technology makes disclosures rapid and informative. With the advent of the Internet, prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable . . . citizens can see whether elected officials are in the pocket of so-called moneyed interests.”

But the current system provides nothing like that kind of transparency

and accountability. This amendment, the Shareholders United Act of 2019, will begin to change the secrecy, darkness, and oligarchical implications of the current system.

It would require publicly-traded corporations to get shareholder buy-in on the front end before their money is channeled into political campaigns. Companies would have to develop a process to assess shareholder preferences for political spending, and make any such spending within a year of assessing the majority’s preferences.

Moreover, the amendment recognizes that some shareholders are institutional investors, like pension funds, States, and cities, mutual funds, universities or charities, which are categorically forbidden from expressing partisan political preferences.

If this type of investor holds a majority of corporate shares, the corporation would not be able to make expenditures from the general treasury because the CEO, at that point, would paradoxically be speaking for institutional shareholders that may not themselves speak in politics.

Citizens are begging for this kind of commonsense regulation and promotion of corporate democracy. People invest in the stock market to save for retirement, or to send their kids to college, not to support their favorite political candidates, much less their most disfavored ones.

I know that I would be mad as hell to learn that my retirement money was being spent, being given away to Donald Trump and the RNC; just as I assume my GOP friends don’t want their pension dollars going to the DNC or to help ELIZABETH WARREN’s Presidential campaign.

People who invest in the stock market should not be used as the pawns for the political designs of CEOs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment called for by Justice Kennedy’s opinion in Citizens United.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, again, as I mentioned earlier, I would have liked to have seen these amendments offered during our House Administration markup as my good friend from Maryland is also a member of the House Administration Committee.

There was some discussion on issues like this and I was under the impression, during that markup process, that provisions like my opponent put into this amendment were already part of the bill.

But let me add, this amendment would turn businesses and corporations into partisan political entities and shareholder meetings and votes into political conventions.

It would require corporations to poll their shareholders on whether the corporation’s political spending should be

made in support of, in opposition to Republican, Democratic, Independent, or other political party candidates and political committees.

Business decisions drive corporations' political spending. This would inject partisan political considerations into corporate political spending.

And let me remind the American people, corporations are banned by law currently to be able to give directly to candidates or to organizations that will directly support or oppose candidates during an election cycle. This is going to further polarize our political environment.

This amendment also relies on unconstitutionally vague and intent-based standards for what corporate spending is covered by the shareholder preference assessment requirement. It is going to encourage the current practice of activists taking hold of proxy advisory firms to socially engineer public policies through proxy shareholder votes. There is no transparency to proxy advisory firms.

I am opposed to this amendment because it is vague and impractical, and would, again, infringe upon free speech. It is not clear what speech is covered under this amendment and that is, perhaps, the worst part.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that the companies would not have shareholder elections under this new standard. Many would probably stop paying dues to trade associations because the language might be construed to cover that. That would be a bomb on many of the largest and most important trade groups. No similar requirement for other organizations as part of this bill, of course.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for those thoughtful comments. The ranking member of the House Administration Committee contends that we talked about this in the House Administration Committee which, indeed, we did, and it was precisely that discussion which led to the formation of the amendment.

I am afraid there he is just protesting against the character of the legislative process. We have a discussion; we learn things; we develop new amendments. And for a moment there it sounded like he wanted to vote for it, but then he turns to say that the problem with this amendment is that it would politicize the corporation, which is quite an astounding argument to make against it, when the entire purpose of our amendment is to prevent corporations from engaging in political expenditures and dark-money spending without the consent and the knowledge of the shareholders.

If you object to corporations being engaged in partisan political activity, then you should support this amendment, because it is precisely this amendment that will prevent it from happening if the shareholders don't want it to.

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

□ 1730

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, look, I don't own too many stocks outside of mutual funds, but I do have one that I get statements to ask me to cast a vote for those members who are currently members of the board of directors or running to be. What I do is use the disclosure database OpenSecrets. I find out the political spending of these individuals who are going to determine the outcome of the stock that I have invested in that, hopefully, will grow in value, because that is why people invest in the stock market, and that is why people invest in corporate entities that may be publicly traded.

The problem I have with this amendment is I thought corporate money wasn't supposed to go to candidates. I don't take corporate dollars. Frankly, I am probably one of the ones standing in this institution tonight who had many of these super-PAC dollars spent against me in the last election. They can't take corporate dollars.

But the issue at hand is, in another part of the bill where this new Freedom From Influence Fund is put together, they are now going to use corporate dollars to create a fund that is flowing through the Federal Treasury that should be going to infrastructure, should be going to pediatric cancer research. Instead, it is going to flow into this new shell that is going to have corporate money go directly to congressional candidates, which is illegal now.

That, to me, is the biggest problem with this bill, and that, to me, is a problem with this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to a discussion on many other amendments throughout this long evening.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, that I have offered with my good friend from my

neighboring district, Congressman TED DEUTCH.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 140, insert after line 19 the following:

“(3) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of a Federal election cycle, each chief State election official shall submit to Congress a report containing the following information for the applicable Federal election cycle in the State:

“(i) The number of ballots invalidated due to a discrepancy under this subsection.

“(ii) Description of attempts to contact voters to provide notice as required by this subsection.

“(iii) Description of the cure process developed by such State pursuant to this subsection, including the number of ballots determined valid as a result of such process.

“(B) FEDERAL ELECTION CYCLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘Federal election cycle’ means the period beginning on January 1 of any odd numbered year and ending on December 31 of the following year.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, the right to vote is sacred and fundamental. Yet across this country, in particular in my home State of Florida, voters were denied their right to vote because of penmanship.

In the wake of the 2018 midterms, Florida's signature matching law was deemed unconstitutional because it allowed county election officials to reject vote-by-mail ballots for mismatched signatures, with no standards, an illusory cure process, and no process to challenge the rejection.

Ballots being rejected because of perceived signature mismatch heavily affect voters already at the margins: trans and gender-nonconforming people, people with disabilities, people for whom English is a second language, military personnel, and women.

I am very pleased to see that H.R. 1 would protect voters' due process rights when it comes to signature matching laws by requiring proper notice and an opportunity to cure.

My amendment, amendment No. 4, builds on that by requiring States to submit a report to Congress after the end of a Federal election cycle regarding the number of ballots invalidated due to a discrepancy in a voter's signature, the attempts to contact voters to provide notice that a discrepancy exists between the signature on the ballot and the signature of the voter on the official list of registered voters, and the cure process and results.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, while I appreciate my good friend from Florida's amendment, this amendment doesn't go far enough. It does nothing to stem the practice of ballot harvesting.

Ballot harvesting is a practice of States allowing any person to collect any number of absentee ballots and then deliver them to the polls. It could be even after election day.

This practice, of course, is ripe for fraud, and we saw most recently in North Carolina how it can be abused to the advantage of political campaigns.

In North Carolina's Ninth District, the individual who harvested ballots for a Republican, where we will now have a special election, was caught because the practice is illegal. It is unlikely that he would have been caught in a State like California, because the practice is perfectly legal.

Take the current law in California. A signature is invalid if the ballot turned in by a harvester doesn't match a signature in the voter file, but the campaign can cure this by getting the voter in question to submit an affidavit that they voted. Then that signature only has to match the signature in the voter file, not the signature on the ballot.

A harvester could theoretically take a bunch of ballots, submit them with forged signatures, and then collect signatures afterward, since the campaigns would later get a list of the signatures that were rejected.

Loose standards relating to providing notice to voters whose signatures were mismatched, as well as a lengthy cure process without any safeguards, disenfranchises voters who showed up and cast votes before or on election day.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend's suggestions, but this is my amendment. I didn't have anything to do with ballot harvesting, and I imagine that there are others who are going to address that particular subject.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chairman of the committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would just note that the ballot harvesting issue, I think, has very little to do with the amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS and that the remedy that has been suggested by my friend, Mr. DAVIS, was to use the system that was in place in North Carolina. Obviously, that didn't work. The remedy to fraud is prosecution, which is what is happening in North Carolina.

I would note that, as we mentioned at the Rules Committee last night, in California, you can give your ballot that is sealed not only to your son, but to your next-door neighbor. You might be an elderly person who doesn't have family around.

There has been no credible allegation of fraud, and we had monitors from

both the Republican and Democratic parties, people from House Administration. There was no credible allegation of a problem.

Mr. Chair, let's not compare apples and oranges. Let's support Mr. HASTINGS' amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle G of title IV.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment that will maintain current law. Beginning with the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 and continuing to appropriation processes for every fiscal year since, I sponsored an amendment that barred the government from requiring Federal contractors to disclose campaign contributions as a condition for submitting a bid on a Federal contract. The amendment was adopted by the House on at least four separate occasions on a bipartisan basis and was signed into law by President Obama.

Since H.R. 1 would remove this prohibition, I offer this amendment today to ensure that this ban remains in law. I have strong concerns that H.R. 1 attempts to repeal this provision.

If the Federal Government would require contractors to disclose campaign contributions, it is only human nature that information like that would influence decisions on Federal contracts, regardless of what the law requires and what a contracting office is required to do. If we are interested in enshrining a pay-to-play culture as part of the contracting process, the Democratic proposal will do just that.

Mr. Chairman, it has never been a good idea to mix politics and contracting. The danger of that is obvious. The information that could be required of contractors in the absence of this protection is not necessary to evaluate a bid made by a Federal contractor. It raises legitimate fears of political retaliation. If the information isn't necessary for the bid or the evaluation of

the bid, then it is not necessary for the government to have it in the first place and run the risk that it might be misused.

All that I am asking, Mr. Chairman, is that we leave the law as it is, the disclosure requirements as they are, and ensure that political contributions do not become a new litmus test to receive a government contract.

Mr. Chair, for those reasons, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The gentleman's amendment to H.R. 1 would keep in place a provision of law that was inserted into must-pass pieces of legislation over the past few years. It makes it harder for voters to follow the money when it comes to government contractors and political spending.

The amendment is anathema to the purposes of H.R. 1, which is to bolster confidence and trust in the American Government and shine a light on secret spending in elections. The gentleman's amendment would further the status quo of dark money in our elections, and it would protect a culture of pay-to-play politics that Americans reject.

Republicans in Congress, as Mr. COLE has mentioned, first included this language in the 2012 appropriations bill, then the 2014 appropriations bill, and finally in the 2015 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

H.R. 1, in title IV, subtitle G, repeals the restriction on requiring disclosure of campaign-related spending by those submitting an offer for a Federal contract. Repealing this restriction will curb the appearance of corruption that can go along with campaign-related money in government contracts. It will shine a light on dark money in politics.

Americans have a right to know who is trying to influence them with political advertisements and campaign spending and what big campaign spenders want from the government in return.

The Federal Government spends hundreds of billions of dollars a year on Federal contracts. Campaign-related spending should have nothing to do with influencing a contract, and disclosure will protect the integrity of the process and curb any appearance of corruption.

After the Supreme Court decided *Citizens United* in 2010, undisclosed sources have spent more than \$950 million in dark money to influence Federal elections, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics. The money flows through a complex web of corporations, dark money, nonprofit organizations, super-PACs, and other groups. When money from

government contractors enters this web, it poses the exact type of threat to the integrity of our democratic system that our campaign finance laws are intended to protect against.

While Federal law prohibits contracting entities from contributing to political candidates and parties, their directors, officers, and other affiliates could still give unlimited sums of dark money to groups that do not disclose their campaign-related donors, and that is why H.R. 1 would repeal the restriction on disclosure.

□ 1745

The court held 8 to 1 in *Citizens United* that “The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages.”

The public has a right to follow the money, including money from government contractors to dark-money groups that did not disclose their spending.

H.R. 1 ensures disclosure and transparency, both of which are critical to open and responsive democracy that protects the public interest. And this amendment, although I am sure well-intentioned, takes us in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), my good friend.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a contractor. We do business and we build projects. If you want to see something that is going to skyrocket cost, the fact of asking what party and where they donate money has nothing to do with transparency. It just has to do with what political affiliation you have and it could weigh heavily in who is selected for a job, which has nothing to do with the job that you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Congressman COLE’s amendment to maintain the status quo and prevent the government from using politics as a litmus test when evaluating bids from contractors.

When the government buys goods or services, the only concern should be getting the best job at the best price, not who the company did or did not donate to in the last election. Companies should compete on value, not party loyalty.

We see what happens when politics influences who receives government money. Let me give you an example.

In December 2011, The Washington Post released a bombshell report finding “Obama’s green technology program was infused with politics at every level.”

The Post found, through its review of thousands of memos and emails, that

“Political considerations were raised repeatedly by company investors, Energy Department bureaucrats, and White House officials.”

Do you know what the result was? \$500 million of taxpayer money went to a solar company, Solyndra, which went bankrupt. We can’t let that happen again, but that is what requiring companies bidding on contracts to disclose their political activity as part of the bid process would lead to.

Also troubling about this provision of H.R. 1 is that it repeals something we all just agreed to less than 1 month ago. If this amendment isn’t adopted, H.R. 1 will repeal a provision of the funding bill we just passed.

Two hundred and thirteen Democrats voted for the funding bill. I know this is a town of evolving political positions and flip-flopping, but I think that might just set a new record. I can’t believe this body would vote for something like this and a month after to repeal it. Back home they call that a bait and switch.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that when a rider is added to the appropriations bill, you have to vote for the whole package to keep the government open.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, as you know from the discussion today, we obviously feel very strongly that there needs to be as much disclosure as possible and transparency and accountability when it comes to how money flows into the political arena. I think the public has a particular apprehension about how insidious spending can be when it has to do with government contractors. The public deserves to know who is spending in their politics and, particularly, if contractors—who are the ones who are going to get these government contracts—are spending in a way that could potentially influence the contracting decisions. In a sense, what is happening is people are leaning on the government potentially using money and influence in a way that cuts against what the public interests might be.

That is why prohibiting the executive branch from even considering—that is what this rider does. It actually prohibits the executive branch from even sitting down and considering whether there should be certain rules that should govern what happens in the contractor space in terms of political spending. That doesn’t make any sense. That doesn’t make common sense that the executive branch ought to be able to figure out some rules so that that transparency is in place.

That is why we want to repeal it. That is why we have that in H.R. 1. I oppose this amendment that would strike the repeal.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to disagree very profoundly with my friend.

Frankly, what this amendment does is keep politics out of contracting. My friends want to put politics back into contracting. The decisions, as my friend, Mr. NORMAN, mentioned, on contracts, ought to be made on the basis of the quality of the bid and the quality of the job. There is no reason to ask for political information when you are evaluating whether or not a bridge should be built or whether or not a road should be paved and who should do that.

Frankly, what we are going to do is inject politics by requiring the list of political contributors. If you don’t think that will matter, I think you are being painfully naive.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, 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 311, insert after line 8 the following new subtitle (and conform the succeeding subtitles accordingly):

Subtitle F—Election Security Grants Advisory Committee

SEC. 3501. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20921 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART 4—ELECTION SECURITY GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

“SEC. 225. ELECTION SECURITY GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established an advisory committee (hereinafter in this part referred to as the ‘Committee’) to assist the Commission with respect to the award of grants to States under this Act for the purpose of election security.

“(b) DUTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall, with respect to an application for a grant received by the Commission—

“(A) review such application; and

“(B) recommend to the Commission whether to award the grant to the applicant.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In reviewing an application pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the Committee shall consider—

“(A) the record of the applicant with respect to—

“(i) compliance of the applicant with the requirements under subtitle A of title III; and

“(ii) adoption of voluntary guidelines issued by the Commission under subtitle B of title III; and

“(B) the goals and requirements of election security as described in title III of the For the People Act of 2019.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of 15 individuals appointed by the Executive Director of the Commission with experience and expertise in election security.

“(d) NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.—Members of the Committee shall not receive any compensation for their service, but shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment is amendment No. 6. This straightforward amendment would establish a committee of election security experts to review grant requests to ensure that funds for election security infrastructure are best spent.

This committee would be established under the Election Assistance Commission, the EAC, and act alongside the three existing Federal advisory committees that were created under the Help America Vote Act.

Currently, the three existing boards have advisory and oversight responsibilities to assist the EAC in carrying out its mission under the law and reviewing voluntary voter system guidelines. There is not, however, enough expertise within these three committees to properly determine how funds related to election security grants are best spent.

Election security is one of the critical pillars of H.R. 1, and my amendment would help ensure that the EAC has everything it needs to properly vet grants to help improve and secure voting systems across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, having read over the amendment, there are a couple of concerns I want to walk you through. And please understand, I am one of those—I co-chair the Blockchain Caucus. I have a fascination with could we ever move to encrypted blockchain security of these levels of information.

But if you actually walk through this amendment, it is a little hollow in its details. The executive director gets to appoint a 15-member, we will call it, committee. Tell me that those 15 members in this amendment can’t have relationships with a certain security firm, or with a certain vendor, or with certain things. I will argue that you are creating now functionally a fourth committee within the commission and handing an awful lot of power to the executive director without a lot of guidelines, that should actually, in many ways, make both Democrats and Republicans a bit nervous.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is to establish a committee that parallels the three existing committees and, therefore, would use the same properties as those committees for appointment, et cetera.

The gentleman who argued against the last amendment was suggesting that it would be too intrusive to interject too much specificity in the amendment, so I guess we have a flip situation here. But the idea is to parallel the three existing commissions and have the 15-person committee appointed using the same processes.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and I love the concepts of technology. I am really concerned. This should actually be a bipartisan concern, because at some point is that executive director going to be one party or another, or demonstrate certain political bias?

But if you hand sole authority to the executive director to appoint a 15-member commission that is going to establish saying, here is how we are going to review these grants and what sort of grants and direction, I am sorry, but you are creating all sorts of both policy leakage here, potentially a favoritism to certain either technologies or securities or firms.

I don’t have a problem with the attention. I think it is actually an authority that should have been given to one of the other committees instead of creating a fourth one, because we have this tendency, as Members of Congress, to sort of create bureaucracies on top of bureaucracies.

But please understand—and I am being as genuine as I can—I fear that it may not happen now, it may not happen for a few years, but you are creating, as technology changes, as there will be a time in our future where I may be voting through a blockchain technology on my phone, have you just created the very commission that actually said: Hey, here is the security mechanics. Oh, by the way, our security mechanics favor the seven people who actually have a relationship to this particular security encryption who have a friend who is a friend? I am sorry; it is just not designed with enough comfort when this is about our voting system.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that we share a common concern about our election security and an interest in using the best technology to protect that security.

The intent here is to make sure that we are spending congressional dollars wisely as there are these grants being awarded. The amendment was devised, after hearing from interested parties, that there was not sufficient expertise on the three existing committees. And I would suggest that if the dangers, which the word the gentleman has suggested, were to come to pass, that that would be an excellent opportunity for congressional oversight.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, having been here for a little while, be careful—good intentions—and when people often bring those issues and bring those—be careful. You may have good intentions. And the intentions of often those who bring us a thought or an issue, until we have vetted whether they have particular potential economic interests—I am just sharing my concern—the amendment, just as it is designed right now, our side is going to have to vote no because we create a fourth level. We don’t create enough definitions. We hand so much power to the executive director.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to talk to the gentlewoman about election encryption and my personal fixation on blockchain technology. But for this one, I think we may miss the mark.

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

□ 1800

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the much more experienced gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding, and I thank her for her amendment.

I would just say very quickly, I think this is a good amendment that actually improves the bill. And to the point of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), it is because technology is changing quickly all the time and one has to kind of keep ahead of the curve on that to make sure the decisions are made in a sensible way, that having a committee that can assemble the kind of expertise that you need to bring to bear on a decision like this makes perfect sense. It can allow the EAC to function better.

Evaluating these security grants, I think, makes a lot of sense, and they can keep up-to-date on what the changing technology is so that the EAC can benefit from that input.

So I think it is an outstanding amendment. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms.

SCANLON) for introducing it. I support it.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I have a second amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 454, insert after line 23 the following (and conform the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 5114. STUDY AND REPORT ON SMALL DOLLAR FINANCING PROGRAM.

(a) **STUDY AND REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the completion of the first election cycle in which the program established under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 5111, is in effect, the Federal Election Commission shall—

(1) assess—

(A) the amount of payment referred to in section 501 of such Act; and

(B) the amount of a qualified small dollar contribution referred to in section 504(a)(1) of such Act; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that discusses whether such amounts are sufficient to meet the goals of the program.

(b) **UPDATE.**—The Commission shall update and revise the study and report required by subsection (a) on a biennial basis.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The requirements of this section shall terminate ten years after the date on which the first study and report required by subsection (a) is submitted to Congress.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, my next amendment is Amendment No. 7.

The amendment would require the Federal Election Commission to conduct a study to specifically assess whether the small donor match cap and the 6-to-1 ratio contained in H.R. 1 is appropriately scaled for both House and Senate elections.

H.R. 1 will empower everyday Americans through each of these systems by bringing more and more people into the political fold.

This system of small donor campaign funding is relatively new to the Federal system but has been tried in States and localities nationwide to great effect. New York City has had a matching funds program in place since the 1980s, and over 80 percent of the 2015 Connecticut State Legislature was elected under the Citizens’ Election public financing program.

It is important and necessary to study these issues at the Federal level,

and my amendment would ensure that the Federal Government has all of the relevant information it needs when proceeding with any future changes to these programs.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I actually appreciate the study mechanisms, but this is actually one a little bit broader.

How many of us are from States that have actually had public funding or public matching of our State legislatures?

I am from Arizona; I have actually lived this experience. And do understand, we used to—in Arizona—refer to it as the “no new moderates” piece of legislation.

If you actually look at what happened to Arizona—and my understanding is this happened in other States—personal experience: I was 28 years old when I got elected to the Arizona Legislature.

I was there. You had to go knock on a door. You had to ask someone for a couple hundred dollars. You had to listen to them. They would look you in the eye, and if they thought you weren’t worthy, you walked out the door without anything. It turns out asking for money is part of the vetting process.

Well, a few years later—so we have had it for 25 years in Arizona—here is what happened:

You are part of the group over here on the right or you are part of this group on the left. In Arizona, you get a couple hundred people to write you a \$5 contribution, and you get elected. Within two election cycles, we wiped out half of Democrats, half of Republicans, maybe one-third of the body who were in the moderates.

So when I was in that State legislature for 4 years, half the Republicans were conservatives, half the Republicans were moderate; same thing on the Democratic side. After just functionally 4 years of public funding or public match, they were gone.

I appreciate the study of saying: Hey, this amendment is really about knowing, you know, do the dollars match, do the mechanisms match? And I don’t know if the FEC is the right place to go to say: Are we about to try to finance the bipolar—the extremisms on both ends?

In many ways, this piece of legislation—at least this mechanic right here—you have got to understand what you are doing. You are going to wipe out the middle.

This is, in many ways, the “no new moderates” piece of legislation.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The gentleman is right. There are examples of these systems across the country. Actually, Maryland has, now, two jurisdictions that have embraced public financing.

You are worried about the moderates being wiped out. In fact, what is happening is the moderates are fleeing the political town square because they feel like their vote doesn’t matter and their engagement doesn’t matter because they support people who then go to places where laws are made, and those folks are getting taken hostage by the big money and the special interests.

So the smart moderate voter out there says: What is the point? I am going to opt out of the political system.

And when they vacate the political town square, then the extremes run in and they fill the vacuum.

So, actually, if you want to bring moderates back in, if you want to bring citizens across the political spectrum back into our system, create something that makes them feel empowered. That is what this small donor matching system is all about. Then you will get these people who have run up into the hills and have said: My democracy doesn’t respect me anymore.

By the way, these are the ballasts in the ship of state, those kind of folks, engaged citizens who feel like the democracy should work for them. But the evidence they get every day is that the big money is running the show: Why don’t I just save myself, you know, my dignity, by stepping back, because why am I going to pretend that my voice actually matters, that my involvement matters?

We create a system that makes them feel like they have power again, and they will come out of the hills. They will come back down into the political town square. They will help create that moderation that you are talking about, because they are solid citizens who care about their democracy.

So this is a very important amendment because it will give us a retrospective on how the system is working. We can collect that data, and then that will inform any improvements we want to make going forward.

Mr. Chair, I congratulate the gentlewoman on her amendment, and I support it.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the thoughtful queries from the gentleman from Arizona, and that is precisely what this amendment is directed towards. It is an amendment to H.R. 1 which sets up a small dollar financing program, and this will allow us to assess how it is working going forward.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I accept this as—and I don't mean this in a mean fashion, but I accept this as one of the tenets of faith on the Democratic side.

The gentleman from Maryland—wonderfully articulate—that isn't what happened. I mean, you have 25 years in other States and other communities, particularly in legislative bodies. I thought the same thing.

But the fact of the matter is, what you do in this fashion is the person who is part of a certain leftist group, right group: I just need these folks to write me enough checks so that I get enough matching, or a good direct mail vendor who hits the ideological extreme so I get those dollars.

Those aren't the facts. And on occasion, we have to take a step back and take a look at sort of the incubators of democracy and experience, which is our State legislatures, and understand the reality of what has happened.

I am a conservative. It worked out fine for my view of the world, but understand—at least in my State legislature—within 4 years, this type of plan completely changed the character of the population that was representing the people in Arizona.

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

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I would just close by saying, once again, the intent of this is to study and make sure we have the best possible system going forward.

I know that Representative SARBANES and others have studied the existing mechanisms out there to try and implement this kind of small donor matching system. I am sorry it didn't work out in Arizona, but I think we have a great plan here going forward.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, wishes and hopes and optimism are not public policy. Be careful what you are asking for here. There are real-life examples across our country with what this did to our democracy. Understand the damage you are about to do.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. 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 24, line 24, strike "30 days" and insert "28 days".

Page 72, insert after line 2 the following:

SEC. 1052. ENSURING PRE-ELECTION REGISTRATION DEADLINES ARE CONSISTENT WITH TIMING OF LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(1) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(1)) is amended by striking "30 days" each place it appears and inserting "28 days".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment intended to make it easier to register to vote by ensuring the deadline does not fall on a public holiday.

Millions of registration applications are handled through the mail and through local Departments of Motor Vehicles. Current Federal law requires States to accept registration forms postmarked or submitted 30 days before election.

However, Mr. Chair, it just so happens, in some years, 30 days before election day falls exactly on Columbus Day, Indigenous Peoples' Day, or another public holiday. This results in a shorter window for preelection registration, and many Americans may not even realize the holiday could disrupt their plans to register. Without Postal Service or DMV hours on the holidays, some voters have been unable to get their registrations in on time.

My amendment makes a simple change. The deadline to postmark your ballots, register online or visit a government office to submit your registration will be changed from 30 days to 28 days prior to election day.

This provides voters simply more time to submit their registration without burdening local election officials with rapid turnaround time and ensures that the deadline never falls on a holiday.

Every day leading up to election day is an opportunity for thousands of Americans across the country to update their registration or register for the first time. By ensuring the cutoff for advanced registration is only 28 days before an election and ensuring that date doesn't fall on a public holiday, we can give more Americans the chance to prepare to cast their ballots.

Now, H.R. 1 already allows for same-day voter registration in every State—a policy I strongly support—as it will make it easier for every citizen to exercise their franchise. But H.R. 1 still provides for voters the option to register in advance if they so choose; and when they choose that option, this amendment will give them enough time to do so, making certain that their paperwork is not rejected for being postmarked or submitted on a public holiday.

This is a simple change, but it is one that can make voting a little easier for

Americans across the Nation, and I hope we can all agree that is a change worth making.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the ranking member for his extraordinary work, as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the sponsor of the bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTWRIGHT). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 8022 of title VIII, insert after subsection (c) the following (and redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (e)):

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall submit a report to Congress on the impact of the application of subsection (b), including the name of any individual who received a waiver or authorization described in subsection (a) and who, by operation of subsection (b), submitted the information required by such subsection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, last year, we learned that of the 59 EPA hires, roughly a third worked as registered lobbyists or lawyers for fossil fuel producers, chemical manufacturers, or other corporate clients. Several of these EPA hires have gotten waivers, allowing them to participate in actions involving their former clients. This directly impacts my district.

In my district, climate change and sea level rise aren't debated. These are not partisan issues because, for Miami, climate change is life or death. There are no climate deniers in south Florida. This is a real-life example of why these ethics waivers matter, and they matter to my constituents.

I am very pleased that H.R. 1 mandates that the executive branch promptly disclose waivers of executive branch ethics rules to the Office of Government Ethics.

My amendment will maximize transparency by highlighting who is now captured by the upgraded ethics waiver regime. We need to know who is now getting these waivers, why they are getting it, and what are the implications. We need to know the impact so

that we can simply uphold our constitutional duty as Members of Congress and hold this administration accountable and hold future administrations accountable.

Whether it impacts climate change policy, foreign policy, health policy, or any other issue, the American people deserve to know who is working behind closed doors in their government.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 as currently drafted requires the Office of Government Ethics to make ethics waivers issued to executive branch employees publicly available. The bill goes even further to mandate ethics waivers issued prior to the enactment of this legislation must also be made publicly available.

This amendment requires OGE to submit a report to Congress within 45 days of enactment regarding the implications of the retroactive applications of the ethics waiver process.

H.R. 1 already gives the Office of Government Ethics vast new authorities and vast new responsibilities. This amendment would just place an additional burden on OGE, and I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that all Members oppose the amendment from the gentlewoman from Florida.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I do not believe that this is an undue burden on the Office of Government Ethics. It is simply a request for us to apply the new waiver to see what the explanations are for the number of ethics waivers that have already been given. It is simply a transparency issue, and it is perfectly appropriate for Congress to request this information.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 10 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. 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 75, after line 25, insert the following:

PART 8—VOTER REGISTRATION EFFICIENCY ACT

SEC. 1081. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the “Voter Registration Efficiency Act”.

SEC. 1082. REQUIRING APPLICANTS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVER'S LICENSES IN NEW STATE TO INDICATE WHETHER STATE SERVES AS RESIDENCE FOR VOTER REGISTRATION PURPOSES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS FOR LICENSES.—Section 5(d) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20504(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Any change” and inserting “(1) Any change”; and

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

“(2)(A) A State motor vehicle authority shall require each individual applying for a motor vehicle driver's license in the State—

“(i) to indicate whether the individual resides in another State or resided in another State prior to applying for the license, and, if so, to identify the State involved; and

“(ii) to indicate whether the individual intends for the State to serve as the individual's residence for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office.

“(B) If pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii) an individual indicates to the State motor vehicle authority that the individual intends for the State to serve as the individual's residence for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office, the authority shall notify the motor vehicle authority of the State identified by the individual pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), who shall notify the chief State election official of such State that the individual no longer intends for that State to serve as the individual's residence for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to elections occurring in 2019 or any succeeding year.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, since the United States has a very mobile population—roughly 40 million Americans, or 14 percent of the United States population, move each year—voters rarely inform elected officials when they move, and voters can often be on the voter rolls in two or even more different States at one time. Unless States have an efficient way of communicating with one another, it is possible that they may not be able to identify an individual who is on the rolls in two different States.

This bill, H.R. 1, makes it more difficult for States to use systems provided for under the National Voter Registration Act and under HAVA. Under current law, States can send out cards and go through a process, which was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in Ohio in 2018.

What my amendment does, simply, is require that new State residents applying for a driver's license notify the State if they intend to use their new residency for the purpose of voting; and if so, the amendment would mandate that the new State notify the applicant's previous State of residence so its chief election official can update voter lists accordingly.

The amendment protects voters who are only making temporary moves to

another State, while enabling States to more efficiently manage the voter registration file for the vast majority of applicants who are making a permanent move to a new State.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, this amendment would require applicants for motor vehicle licenses to indicate whether they previously resided in a different State and which State the applicant intends to be their residence for the purpose of voter registration. I think it could be helpful in terms of preventing registrations in two States. However, it is potentially redundant with other provisions in H.R. 1.

When all States implement automatic voter registration, States will transmit change of address duplicate license information electronically and wouldn't need to collect this information from individuals.

Further, States are able to use a reliable set of data for sharing information on registered voters, called the Electronic Registration Information Center, established originally by the Pew Charitable Trusts, currently utilized by 26 States—by the way, including Arizona—so it has a very high accuracy rate.

Nevertheless, redundancy is our friend, and I certainly do not oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the motion that the Committee rise.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I withdraw my motion for the Committee to rise.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After subtitle G of title VIII, insert the following (and redesignate subtitle H as subtitle I):

Subtitle H—Travel on Private Aircraft by Senior Political Appointees

SECTION 8081. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Stop Waste And Misuse by Presidential Flyers Landing Yet Evading Rules and Standards” or the “SWAMP FLYERS”.

SEC. 8082. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRAVEL ON PRIVATE AIRCRAFT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of this subtitle, no Federal funds appropriated or otherwise made available in any fiscal year may be used to pay the travel expenses of any senior political appointee for travel on official business on a non-commercial, private, or chartered flight.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) if no commercial flight was available for the travel in question, consistent with subsection (c); or

(2) to any travel on aircraft owned or leased by the Government.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any senior political appointee who travels on a non-commercial, private, or chartered flight under the exception provided in subsection (b)(1) shall, not later than 30 days after the date of such travel, submit a written statement to Congress certifying that no commercial flight was available.

(2) **PENALTY.**—Any statement submitted under paragraph (1) shall be considered a statement for purposes of applying section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) **DEFINITION OF SENIOR POLITICAL APPOINTEE.**—In this subtitle, the term “senior political appointee” means any individual occupying—

(1) a position listed under the Executive Schedule (subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code);

(2) a Senior Executive Service position that is not a career appointee as defined under section 3132(a)(4) of such title; or

(3) a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1830

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, let me first start off by commending Representative JOHN SARBANES for H.R. 1 and everyone who has worked on behalf of this historic bill.

Today I rise in support of amendment 12 to H.R. 1. Last term, I introduced what is known as the SWAMP FLYERS Act to make sure that government officials don’t abuse taxpayer funds for their luxury travel preferences. We did not get a vote on this bill last term. I am very pleased that now I am going to be able to offer it as an amendment to H.R. 1.

This is a commonsense amendment. It would simply prevent government officials from using taxpayer funds to travel on a private, chartered, or non-commercial flight. If your official business needs you to go on one of those really expensive flights, you might want to think twice about why you are doing it.

Eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse has long been a bipartisan mission of the U.S. Congress, and I can think of few more obvious candidates than paying for private jets for Cabinet officials to travel across the country. As every Member of Congress knows, you can reach any district of the U.S. just flying commercial.

I think it is disturbing I even have to introduce this amendment, but let me just walk folks through some of the corruption we have seen in the last 2 years.

Former HHS Secretary Tom Price spent more than \$400,000 in travel on private jets.

Former Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke spent over \$39,000 of taxpayer funds on a helicopter tour of national monuments in Nevada. He then spent an additional \$12,000 of taxpayer funds on a private jet to go to Las Vegas, Nevada, to speak to a hockey team owned by a major donor.

Former Veterans Affairs Secretary David Shulkin spent over \$122,000 in taxpayer funds to go with his wife to Europe for the primary purpose of sightseeing.

Then we have got former EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, who spent at least \$58,000 on chartered flights.

I could go on.

If this had been law, they would not have been able to do this. Hardworking Americans deserve better. A vote against this amendment is really something that taxpayers would not appreciate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, this is duplicative of current rules. Political appointees are government employees who are held to specific travel and ethics standards already. Restrictions are there and have been there, but the Democrats seem to want more bureaucrats involved in the review.

Political appointees follow these fundamentals, among others, related to Federal travel: travel must be conducted in the most efficient and effective manner and only when necessary to accomplish the purposes of the government, and employees traveling on official business are expected to exercise the same care when incurring expenses as a prudent person would on personal business.

Current Federal travel guidelines for political appointees already limit travel flight expenses to common carrier commercial fares. The only time private company aircraft can be accepted is if no other travel arrangements are practically available or when they are offered to your spouse, but explicitly not because of the political appointee’s position. Either way, all of this would be required to be run through the White House Counsel’s office.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to note that a number of these Cabinet officials defended the use of luxury travel preferences by saying that their travel was approved.

So, clearly, there is not enough in the law to stop this abusive behavior of taxpayer funds. Again, if you just look at the abuse of travel, we know we can stop it. There is no justification for it.

Mr. Chairman, I request that my colleagues vote for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. In closing, this is a commonsense amendment. I appreciate, again, the historic nature of H.R. 1. Preventing travel abuse by Cabinet officials is something that we can all support on a bipartisan basis.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 8005 the following:

SEC. 8006. GUIDANCE ON UNPAID EMPLOYEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall issue guidance on ethical standards applicable to unpaid employees of an agency.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” includes the Executive Office of the President and the White House; and

(2) the term “unpaid employee” includes any individual occupying a position at an agency and who is unpaid by operation of section 3110 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, but does not include any employee who is unpaid due to a lapse in appropriations.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to speak on this amendment that simply requires unpaid government employees to comply with the same ethics rules as paid employees.

President Trump has exploited this ethics loophole for his daughter Ivanka Trump and his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who both work in the White House.

Requiring your daughter and your son-in-law to be subject to the same

ethics rules as everyone else is simply basic common sense. It is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue, but it is core to our democracy and our national security.

The purpose of ethics rules, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure that conflicts of interest do not interfere in the operations of our government. This is critical so that the American people trust that the people guiding our country's laws and policies are acting with the best interests of our country and the American people at heart and not foreign or business interests. But President Trump's hiring of his daughter Ivanka Trump, and son-in-law, Jared Kushner, as unpaid advisers has raised serious concerns.

Shortly after the 2016 elections, Ivanka Trump participated in her dad's meeting with the Japanese Prime Minister as her namesake clothing brand, Ivanka Trump Marks LLC, was simultaneously negotiating a licensing deal with Sanei International, a company whose largest shareholder is the Japanese Government.

In addition, her company received preliminary approvals for 16 new trademarks from China during the President's trade war with China. In one case, Ivanka Trump and Chinese President Xi dined together at Mar-a-Lago the same day that China approved the three trademarks for the First Daughter.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman said, this amendment would require the Office of Government Ethics to promulgate rules to apply ethics laws to unpaid employees of the Executive Office and President of the White House. As she also mentioned, this is clearly to go after Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump. It seems to me that this is not the kind of thing that we should be focused on.

Miss Trump has been appointed as an executive branch employee and is now covered by the ethics laws and regulations that apply to all executive branch employees. It seems to me this is congressional overreach and redundant of current ethics rules and practices of other folks who have worked in the executive branch.

As I said, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the incredible gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who has been leading this effort.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her for this amendment which is, as she says, a very commonsense amendment. I don't really understand what the objection would be.

If you don't apply the same ethical standards to unpaid staff or people who are working in the executive branch as

you do to paid, what you are left with is a gigantic loophole that could be taken advantage of, and I don't think that the average person out there could understand why you would make that kind of distinction. So this is a very logical thing to do. Just because you are not paid doesn't mean you might not have a conflict of interest.

So this is an amendment that simply directs the Office of Government Ethics to come up with some rules to make sure that senior administration officials, special governmental employees who draw no salary, are still going to abide by the ethics laws.

Again, if the job here of all of us is to meet the expectations of the public in terms of how things should function up here in Washington, abiding ethical standards and observing conflicts of interest rules, then this meets that expectation directly. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I just reiterate that what we are saying is whether you are paid or unpaid, you have to go through the same security clearances; and whether you are paid or unpaid, you have to deal with the same ethics regulations. Particularly when unpaid employees are put into serious positions where national security clearances are required and where they have access to top secret information, we need to make sure that those ethics rules apply to everybody.

Now, frankly, we didn't see this as a loophole in the past because it hasn't been exploited in the same way, but, unfortunately, that is what is happening now.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this should raise serious concerns for anybody. We need to make sure that the people who are in our government are facing the same transparent ethics rules whether you are a relative of the person in the Oval Office or not.

We have ethics laws for a reason. The United States is not a despotic country built on nepotism, and we need to make sure that it is in everyone's best interest when all of these employees are subject to ethics laws, including laws that prohibit employees from participating in matters in which they have a financial interest or from misusing their official positions.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, 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 537, insert after line 10 the following:

SEC. 7202. PROHIBITING RECEIPT OF COMPENSATION FOR LOBBYING ACTIVITIES ON BEHALF OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES VIOLATING HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 the following new section:

“SEC. 5A. PROHIBITING RECEIPT OF COMPENSATION FOR LOBBYING ACTIVITIES ON BEHALF OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES VIOLATING HUMAN RIGHTS.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no person may accept financial or other compensation for lobbying activity under this Act on behalf of a client who is a government which the President has determined is a government that engages in gross violations of human rights.

“(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF DIPLOMATIC OR CONSULAR OFFICERS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any activity of a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to lobbying activity under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 which occurs pursuant to contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop lobbyists from working on behalf of foreign governments with gross human rights violations.

Countries with human rights abuses should use the diplomatic process to express their views and not try to influence the American Government when hiding behind highly paid K Street lobbyists.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, is a historic bill that aims to restore the promise of our Nation's democracy and the culture of corruption in Washington, reduce the role of money in politics, and return power back to the American people. My amendment furthers this goal by limiting the role of dark money in our foreign policy.

Take, for instance, Mr. Chairman, Saudi Arabia. After 9/11, Saudi Arabia was implicated in the most destructive attack on American soil in our history. Yet 15 years later, the country was the leading recipient of U.S. arms sales.

For nearly 4 years, Saudi Arabia has perpetrated the worst humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen, with U.S. military participation in its bombings and complicity in a blockade that has deprived millions of food and medicine. Despite the Saudis' indiscriminate killing of civilians, Secretary of State

Mike Pompeo has certified that the country has been protecting civilians just last year.

Most recently, Saudi Arabia murdered U.S.-based journalist Jamal Khashoggi while President Trump rejected the evidence from his own intelligence agencies that Saudi Arabia's crown prince ordered the murder.

How does Saudi Arabia maintain its relationship with the United States? It shouldn't surprise anyone that Saudi Arabia spent about \$27 million on U.S. lobbying and public relations in 2017 alone.

Individuals affiliated with the Trump administration like Paul Manafort and Michael Flynn have also taken substantial sums of money from foreign countries to lobby the American Government.

Paul Manafort lobbied on behalf of pro-Russian forces in Ukraine in 2005, and prosecutors allege that Mr. Manafort was working on Ukrainian politics well into 2018, even after Special Counsel Mueller indicted him. He didn't even report the payments he was receiving for his lobbying efforts, in flagrant violation of current law.

Though not charged with lobbying illegally, Manafort has still had a long history of lobbying on behalf of the world's most brutal dictators, including Mobutu Sese Dikoko, Ferdinand Marcos, and Jonas Savimbi. He is rumored to have accepted a briefcase from a Marcos affiliate with \$10 million in cash to give to the Reagan campaign.

Finally, Michael Flynn, President Trump's former National Security Advisor, worked on a \$15 million plan to kidnap a political enemy of Turkish President Erdogan and fly him to an island prison. Mr. Flynn was paid at least \$530,000 for lobbying on behalf of the Turkish Government between August and November of 2016. Mr. Chairman, he did not retroactively register as a foreign agent with the Justice Department until March 7, 2017.

□ 1845

This is a commonsense amendment that brings transparency and ensures that we protect our system from this type of lobbying from those countries that have gross human rights violations.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, another bad amendment to a bad bill. This amendment suffers from the same defects as the underlying bill. It continues the same regrettable trend by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle of trying to silence speakers they don't like.

Portions of this bill are so radical that, as we have said several times already, even the ACLU came out today and asked Members of this body not to

vote for it. The ACLU said H.R. 1 would unconstitutionally burden free speech and associational rights. This amendment is more of the same tactics that caused the ACLU to oppose the underlying legislation.

As I said, a bad amendment to a bad bill. Put that all together, it makes everything worse.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act, which this amendment would seek to change, is about disclosure and increasing public awareness, not preventing people from undertaking a lawful profession. The decision of whether to undertake representation of a client is a personal and professional matter, not one for central government planning.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle seem not to understand is the answer to speech that they view as undesirable is more speech. It is called the First Amendment. It is called debate. The Federal Government should not and cannot constitutionally prevent the people it does not like from speaking.

And we know it has tried. Just a few years ago, it did it. And I will continue to bring this up as long as the good folks in the Fourth District will have me in Congress.

A few years ago, the IRS systematically, for a sustained period of time, went after people for their political beliefs—it happened; they did it—for the most fundamental liberty we have, our right to speak.

Think about the First Amendment, freedom to practice your faith the way you want, freedom to assemble, freedom to petition your government, freedom of the press. All those are critically important.

But your right to speak is fundamental, and your right to speak in a political fashion is what the Founders had most in mind when they talked about your free speech, First Amendment rights.

This amendment goes to restrict it just like the bill does, and that is why the ACLU is against it. That is why I am against it.

This is a bad idea to a bad piece of legislation. I mean, think about what is going on, on college campuses today: safe spaces, free speech zones, bias response teams. If you say something politically incorrect today on a college campus, you get harassed.

In the last Congress, I asked a question in committee to a professor from one of these universities that are taxpayer subsidized. I said: Can a free speech zone and a safe space on a college campus be at the same location?

He kind of chuckled. That is sort of the joke, because where is the free speech zone supposed to be in this country? Everywhere. It is called the First Amendment.

I asked this one professor: Professor, in a safe space on a college campus, could I say this sentence: "Donald Trump is President"?

Think about this. Think about this. The professor began his response with this: Well, Congressman, it depends.

I interrupted him, which I will do sometimes if I think the witness is saying something stupid.

I said: It is a fact. There is no "it depends" about it. He got elected on November 8, 2016. He is President of the United States. He lives at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a fact.

The idea that on some college campuses you can't say that because you are in some safe space is crazy. This is the absurd level that some on the left want to take us to when we are talking about the First Amendment.

Thank goodness—thank goodness—the ACLU sees it for what it is and says vote "no" on this bill.

Heck, yes, I am opposed to this amendment, just like I am opposed to the underlying legislation.

Mr. Chair, I would urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues on the other side who are just quoting the ACLU tonight are with us on everything else that the ACLU supports. I look forward to seeing that.

I got a little distracted in the last speech, so I wanted to remind people what we are talking about in this amendment, which is that we would not allow lobbyists that are working on behalf of foreign governments with gross human rights violations to actually pay a bunch of lobbyists and hide behind highly paid K Street lobbyists to get their agenda.

They should just use the diplomatic process. It is not like they are not going to have a voice. They can use their diplomatic process.

That is all this amendment is. It is a smart amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. 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:

Insert after section 8014 the following:

SEC. 8015. LEGAL DEFENSE FUNDS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Government Ethics;

(2) the term "legal defense fund" means a trust—

(A) that has only one beneficiary;

(B) that is subject to a trust agreement creating an enforceable fiduciary duty on the part of the trustee to the beneficiary, pursuant to the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the trust is established;

(C) that is subject to a trust agreement that provides for the mandatory public disclosure of all donations and disbursements;

(D) that is subject to a trust agreement that prohibits the use of its resources for any purpose other than—

(i) the administration of the trust;

(ii) the payment or reimbursement of legal fees or expenses incurred in investigative, civil, criminal, or other legal proceedings relating to or arising by virtue of service by the trust's beneficiary as an officer or employee, as defined in this section, or as an employee, contractor, consultant or volunteer of the campaign of the President or Vice President; or

(iii) the distribution of unused resources to a charity selected by the trustee that has not been selected or recommended by the beneficiary of the trust;

(E) that is subject to a trust agreement that prohibits the use of its resources for any other purpose or personal legal matters, including tax planning, personal injury litigation, protection of property rights, divorces, or estate probate; and

(F) that is subject to a trust agreement that prohibits the acceptance of donations, except in accordance with this section and the regulations of the Office of Government Ethics;

(3) the term "lobbying activity" has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602);

(4) the term "officer or employee" means—

(A) an officer (as that term is defined in section 2104 of title 5, United States Code) or employee (as that term is defined in section 2105 of such title) of the executive branch of the Government;

(B) the Vice President; and

(C) the President; and

(5) the term "relative" has the meaning given that term in section 3110 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) LEGAL DEFENSE FUNDS.—An officer or employee may not accept or use any gift or donation for the payment or reimbursement of legal fees or expenses incurred in investigative, civil, criminal, or other legal proceedings relating to or arising by virtue of the officer or employee's service as an officer or employee, as defined in this section, or as an employee, contractor, consultant or volunteer of the campaign of the President or Vice President except through a legal defense fund that is certified by the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

(c) LIMITS ON GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall promulgate regulations establishing limits with respect to gifts and donations described in subsection (b), which shall, at a minimum—

(1) prohibit the receipt of any gift or donation described in subsection (b)—

(A) from a single contributor (other than a relative of the officer or employee) in a total amount of more than \$5,000 during any calendar year;

(B) from a registered lobbyist;

(C) from a foreign government or an agent of a foreign principal;

(D) from a State government or an agent of a State government;

(E) from any person seeking official action from, or seeking to do or doing business with, the agency employing the officer or employee;

(F) from any person conducting activities regulated by the agency employing the officer or employee;

(G) from any person whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the official duties of the officer or employee;

(H) from an officer or employee of the executive branch;

(I) from any organization a majority of whose members are described in (A)–(H); or

(J) require that a legal defense fund, in order to be certified by the Director only

permit distributions to the officer or employee.

(d) WRITTEN NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee who wishes to accept funds or have a representative accept funds from a legal defense fund shall first ensure that the proposed trustee of the legal defense fund submits to the Director the following information:

(A) The name and contact information for any proposed trustee of the legal defense fund.

(B) A copy of any proposed trust document for the legal defense fund.

(C) The nature of the legal proceeding (or proceedings), investigation or other matter which give rise to the establishment of the legal defense fund.

(D) An acknowledgment signed by the officer or employee and the trustee indicating that they will be bound by the regulations and limitation under this section.

(2) APPROVAL.—An officer or employee may not accept any gift or donation to pay, or to reimburse any person for, fees or expenses described in subsection (b) of this section except through a legal defense fund that has been certified in writing by the Director following that office's receipt and approval of the information submitted under paragraph (1) and approval of the structure of the fund.

(e) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee who establishes a legal defense fund may not directly or indirectly accept distributions from a legal defense fund unless the fund has provided the Director a quarterly report for each quarter of every calendar year since the establishment of the legal defense fund that discloses, with respect to the quarter covered by the report—

(A) the source and amount of each contribution to the legal defense fund; and

(B) the amount, recipient, and purpose of each expenditure from the legal defense fund, including all distributions from the trust for any purpose.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director shall make publicly available online—

(A) each report submitted under paragraph (1) in a searchable, sortable, and downloadable form;

(B) each trust agreement and any amendment thereto;

(C) the written notice and acknowledgment required by subsection (d); and

(C) the Director's written certification of the legal defense fund.

(f) RECUSAL.—An officer or employee, other than the President and the Vice President, who is the beneficiary of a legal defense fund may not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter in which the officer or employee knows a donor of any source of a gift or donation to the legal defense fund established for the officer or employee has a financial interest, for a period of two years from the date of the most recent gift or donation to the legal defense fund.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment cleans up the so-called legal defense funds.

Many Americans don't know this, but it is perfectly legal for government employees to set up a fund to help them pay their legal bills when they are in trouble with the law. Amazingly, they can pack this slush fund with unlim-

ited donations from wealthy individuals and large corporations.

In other words, employees in the White House can fund their legal defenses with contributions from the President's campaign backers or people who want to influence the President's decisions.

Not surprisingly, this President's team has set up a legal defense fund, the Patriot Fund, to help staffers pay for their legal fees related to the Russia investigation. The Patriot Fund was cleared by the Office of Government Ethics under the Acting Director, David Apol, who was appointed by—you guessed it—President Trump.

Former Trump campaign staffer Rick Gates and former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn have also set up legal defense funds.

According to a political report from a month ago, Sheldon Adelson, who is the single largest donor to the Trump campaign, and his wife, Miriam, have each contributed \$250,000 to the Patriot Fund, for a total of half a million dollars.

The fund is flush, Mr. Chair. It is no wonder that one of Trump's former campaign staffers who has been interviewed by the House Intelligence Committee referred to the Patriot Fund as "a real blessing."

Trump lawyers have said that decisions about which staffers' legal funds are paid out of the Patriot Fund will not be related to whether the individual in question defends the President. But since the fund manager has sole discretion over who will benefit from the fund, it is almost impossible to know whether access to Patriot Fund dollars will be used to reward those who might be loyal to the President. That creates an extraordinary conflict of interest for any President, not just this one.

It is time to put a stop to this in perpetuity. That is why I have offered this amendment to direct the Office of Government Ethics to promulgate regulations on basic requirements to ensure transparency of donations to legal defense funds in the executive branch and to ensure that Federal employees cannot obtain money from prohibited sources. These regulations will be similar to rules that are already established for Members of Congress, and I think that that is just common sense.

My amendment closes loopholes and eliminates conflicts of interest in these legal defense funds in several ways.

First, it limits the gifts and donations that can be made to legal defense funds to no more than \$5,000 per person per year.

Second, it prohibits registered lobbyists, foreign governments, and individuals involved in activities that are regulated by the agency that is employing the individual who will receive the legal defense fund dollars from contributing to their legal defense fund.

Third, it clarifies that employees may not accept gifts and donations outside of legal defense funds to pay for

legal fees and expenses from civil or criminal proceedings.

And, fourth, it makes legal defense funds public by requiring that the source of contributions and the amount of those contributions be publicly disclosed.

Mr. Chair, this is a sensible amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, the Office of Government Ethics already consults with legal defense funds when prompted. OGE already published two legal advisories around legal defense funds that define gifts according to current U.S. Code and the "Standard of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch." Any legal defense fund reviewed by OGE bars the trustee from accepting donations from already prohibited sources.

Mr. Chair, I urge that Members oppose this bad amendment to an already terrible underlying piece of legislation, and, respectfully, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, in conclusion, I would say this bill, H.R. 1, is about reclaiming our democracy, ensuring transparency and accountability for the American people. For evidence of obstruction of justice, public corruption, and abuses of power for any President and the people surrounding him, we believe that this bill is essential, and this amendment is essential.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, 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 265, insert after line 9 the following (and conform the succeeding subsection accordingly):

“(d) SURPLUS APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants authorized under section 298D(a)(2) exceed the amount necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Commission shall consider the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

“(1) The record of the State in carrying out the following with respect to the administration of elections for Federal office:

“(A) Providing voting machines that are less than 10 years old.

“(B) Implementing strong chain of custody procedures for the physical security of voting equipment and paper records at all stages of the process.

“(C) Conducting pre-election testing on every voting machine and ensuring that paper ballots are available wherever electronic machines are used.

“(D) Maintaining offline backups of voter registration lists.

“(E) Providing a secure voter registration database that logs requests submitted to the database.

“(F) Publishing and enforcing a policy detailing use limitations and security safeguards to protect the personal information of voters in the voter registration process.

“(G) Providing secure processes and procedures for reporting vote tallies.

“(H) Providing a secure platform for disseminating vote totals.

“(2) Evidence of established conditions of innovation and reform in providing voting system security and the proposed plan of the State for implementing additional conditions.

“(3) Evidence of collaboration between relevant stakeholders, including local election officials, in developing the grant implementation plan described in section 298B.

“(4) The plan of the State to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out with the grant.”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, of which I am a proud cosponsor, delivers on the promise to reform American democracy by protecting voting rights and our elections, improving the transparency of campaign finance, and promoting ethics and accountability.

Key to safeguarding voting rights is ensuring that our voting system is secure and free from interference by foreign actors.

My amendment to H.R. 1 would help States implement voting system security improvements in order to enhance the integrity of our Federal election infrastructure.

Adapted from the FAST Voting Act, H.R. 1512, which I recently reintroduced with my colleague, Representative JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, this amendment to H.R. 1 would award supplementary grants to State applicants based on evidence of previous election security reforms and plans for implementing additional innovations.

This race-to-the-top model would incentivize States to adopt best practices, including providing voting machines that are less than 10 years old, maintaining offline backups of voter registration lists, and providing a secure platform for disseminating vote totals.

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, in the 2016 Federal elections, voters relied on outdated voting equipment that was more than a decade old in 43 of the 50 States, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would also instruct the Election Assistance Commission, when evaluating State grant applications, to consider evidence of collaboration between relevant stakeholders, including local election officials, in developing the grant implementation plan and the State's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its grant activities.

We now know that Russia directly targeted State voter databases and

software systems in 39 States during the 2016 Federal elections. That effort by Russia and additional foreign entities to conduct robust influence operations persisted, sadly, in the 2018 midterm elections, and the U.S. intelligence community expects such attacks to continue through the 2020 Federal elections.

Numerous witnesses before the Homeland Security Committee testified on the ongoing need for investment to protect us from such attacks. The need to strengthen the integrity of our voting system is crystal clear, Mr. Chairman. We have a moral obligation as Members of Congress to protect the sacred nature of the results of every election, and it is urgent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this simple but, I think, helpful amendment to move us toward voter security in the next election and enhance cybersecurity for all of our Federal election infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see there is no opposition here on the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, 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 617, insert after line 2 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle E—Reports on Outside Compensation Earned by Congressional Employees

SEC. 9401. REPORTS ON OUTSIDE COMPENSATION EARNED BY CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) REPORTS.—The supervisor of an individual who performs services for any Member, committee, or other office of the Senate or House of Representatives for a period in excess of four weeks and who receives compensation therefor from any source other than the Federal Government shall submit a report identifying the identity of the source, amount, and rate of such compensation to—

(1) the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate, in the case of an individual who performs services for a Member, committee, or other office of the Senate; or

(2) the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives, in the case of an individual who performs services for a Member (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress), committee, or other office of the House.

(b) TIMING.—The supervisor shall submit the report required under subsection (a) with respect to an individual—

(1) when such individual first begins performing services described in such subparagraph;

(2) at the close of each calendar quarter during which such individual is performing such services; and

(3) when such individual ceases to perform such services.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of my amendment, co-authored by Representative HARLEY ROUDA of California, which seeks to bring badly-needed transparency to sources of compensation for certain individuals staffing the legislative branch.

I would like to start by thanking my colleague from California (Mr. ROUDA) for working together in this bipartisan fashion. I am always willing to work across the aisle to find common ground, and I am glad to have found a partner in him on this issue.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention the missed opportunity for doing so on the underlying bill. This underlying legislation ran afoul of the legislative process, having gone through only one markup, despite 10 committee referrals.

Democratic leaders also rejected many Republican amendments that I support, amendments that would have terminated Congressional pensions, prohibiting pay for Congressmen when the government shuts down, and other commonsense reforms.

If we are serious about strengthening our democracy, we need to start with reforming our own Congress. Luckily, Representative ROUDA and I are doing just that through our amendment. Our amendment codifies a Senate rule that requires legislative branch offices to disclose the source of funding for Congressional fellows.

While the general public understands the need for strict regulations on campaign contributions, gifts, and other methods of influence, many Americans would be shocked to learn that the influence of personnel is escaping public notice.

The Congressional Fellows program is a great contribution to this institution on the whole, as it offers direct exposure and experience in the legislative process to people outside of the Beltway. That exposure is great for our democracy and great for the American public.

However, it goes without saying that fellows being paid by industry groups, advocacy groups, or for-profit industries shouldn't be creating any undue advantage by way of their access to this body.

In fact, there is an old saying around Congress that personnel equals policy. If that is so evident to Members of Congress, then surely we can understand the potential conflicts of interest that could arise from this influence.

It has been reported some Congressional Fellows are working on legislation pertaining to the very interest group they are being paid by to support

their work in Congress. The public would rightfully be outraged to learn that even some of the largest social media firms in this country are retaining fellows on Capitol Hill, and yet, the average citizen outside the Beltway has no way of knowing about it. This situation gives a whole new meaning to the term "social media influencer."

While House ethics rules currently bar fellowship programs from giving an "undue advantage to special interests," the House of Representatives lacks a reporting requirement to expose conflicts of interest.

Our amendment would fill this gap by mandating that legislative offices disclose the rate and source of compensation for Congressional Fellows to their Chamber's respective Ethics Committee.

The taxpayers have a right to know about the funding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, let me yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), my cosponsor for the amendment.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this bipartisan amendment, which would codify disclosure requirements for paid Congressional fellowships sponsored by nongovernment sources.

It has been a privilege to work with Congresswoman FOXX and her office on this amendment to enhance transparency in Congress, and I thank her for her attention to this matter.

I look forward to continuing to work with Congresswoman FOXX and my other colleagues across the aisle to advance bipartisan initiatives.

I am eager to work with Democrats and Republicans to find common ground and deliver practical, commonsense solutions for the American people.

By passing this bipartisan amendment, we can show our constituents that we are serious about improving transparency and accountability in the people's House.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if personnel equals policy, then the general public should have access to knowledge about the influencers in our legislative body.

Again, I am glad to have been a partner with Congressman ROUDA in this bipartisan initiative. I ask my colleagues to support our amendment to uphold transparency, accountability, and the integrity of our legislative process. And I urge all Members to vote for the amendment. It is a very commonsense amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, 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 555, line 16, insert "CABINET MEMBER," after "VICE PRESIDENT,"

Page 555, line 19, strike "the President or Vice President," and insert "the President, Vice President, or any Cabinet member".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this week, Congress has an opportunity to restore the American people's faith in our political system. H.R. 1 is a comprehensive set of democratic and anti-corruption reforms that work for the people, as opposed to those privileged enough to game the system.

My amendment is simple. It adds Cabinet members to the list of individuals who cannot benefit from an agreement with the United States government.

By ensuring the President, Vice President, and Cabinet members are not able to benefit from agreements with the government, individuals in a position to use their authority for their own personal gain will be prohibited from doing so.

The American people expect their government to act in their best interest, not in the best interest of their bank accounts.

When a department issues a ruling, the American people should not have to consider whether a Cabinet member will benefit from that action.

The President, the Vice President, and Cabinet members all have tremendous power and decisionmaking authority within our government. That power comes with great scrutiny and the need for oversight. This commonsense amendment will eliminate that confusion.

Aside from providing essential oversight for our government, H.R. 1 addresses serious issues that have plagued our country for decades. For years, Americans' access to the ballot box has been under attack, and millions of voters have been removed from voter rolls across the country.

Democrats are committed to ensuring that voting is free, fair, and easy for all citizens, and that every vote by an eligible voter is counted as cast.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, codifies that oversight, and seeks to shed a

light on any corrupt actions being taken by our elected officials and Cabinet members.

Mr. Chairman, Cabinet members should be held to the same standard as the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, and should not be able to benefit from agreements, policy, and their actions while serving the U.S. Government. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will help provide important oversight of our government.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. 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 127, insert after line 17 the following new section (and conform the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 1505. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed on recycled paper.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2021.

Page 128, line 4, strike “subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and insert “section 1505(b) of the For the People Act of 2019 and subparagraphs (B) and (C)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, the people of Orange County sent me to Congress because they were disillusioned with the nature of our politics, whether it is the toxic partnership or the vice grip of special interest money on our political system.

I offer these amendments today to improve this landmark bill by regulating political ads and restore voters' confidence in our elections.

Our government has, for too long, preferred to shield special interests instead of our constituents; and that ends by getting out of politics and passing the For the People Act.

In an age of advanced cybersecurity threats, more States are looking to one

of the oldest technologies in existence, paper. Currently, the majority of States utilize some form of paper ballot for elections, with more taking steps to adopt paper-only systems.

My amendment would require the use of recycled paper for Federal elections, a critical step to increasing the sustainability of our elections. Recycled paper production emits 40 percent fewer greenhouse gases, uses 26 percent less energy, and creates 43 percent less water waste than non-recycled paper.

The impact of requiring the use of recycled paper for ballots is significant when you consider the amount of paper used in the United States. In fact, Americans use approximately 85 million tons of paper a year, about 680 pounds per person per year.

Recycling just 1 ton of paper can save 17 trees, 7,000 gallons of water, 380 gallons of oil, 3.3 cubic yards of landfill space, and 4,000 kilowatts of energy, reducing greenhouse gases by 1 metric ton of carbon.

As security concerns continue to inspire moves to replace electronic voting methods with paper ballots, we must be mindful of the environmental impact.

□ 1915

Using recycled paper for our ballots would improve not just our right to vote, but also save the environment.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I respect the gentleman's amendment. As important as recycled paper may be, this, I believe, would present an undue burden on our States and our local officials who administer these elections.

This requirement of using recycled paper is narrowly tailored for Federal office elections, yet Federal, State, and local elections often occur at the same time. This makes it incredibly impractical and difficult for State election officials to comply with this amendment. States, theoretically, may have to have two different paper ballots: one for Federal elections and the other for State and local matters.

Also, recycled paper is less available and more expensive, giving local election officials fewer options. This requirement could have an undue burden on States as they aim to comply with this amendment, and it is impractical, as voters often vote on Federal, State, and local elections on the same ballot.

This is ultimately a federalism issue. I have a problem with the entire bill being a federalism issue. We should defer to the States and their budgets on how to best administer elections tailored to their unique considerations.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments, but with all due respect, I don't believe the facts support those statements.

It is quite clear that many States are already using recycled paper in their ballots, and recycled paper often can be cheaper than the paper chosen by certain States. This is a small request that goes a long way in supporting environmental health across our great country and continuing to fight climate change.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to show awareness and concern over climate change and our environment. Maybe this amendment is better suited for when the New Green Deal is called up on the floor for all of us to cast a vote upon, but this is an undue, unfunded mandate from the Federal Government right down to the State and local officials.

This is something that can cost local election officials even more money to run elections and then also run the risk of them not having enough money to budget to print enough ballots that will be available on election day for the increased voter turnout that we have seen over the last few election cycles. At that point in time, it becomes a very big burden on local taxpayers.

This bill is going to be a burden on local taxpayers. This bill is estimated to already cost almost \$3 billion. It creates another mandatory spending program.

I appreciate my new colleague's willingness to come here and offer amendments. I just believe that this amendment is, again, adding to the unfair, unfunded burden that H.R. 1 gives to many State and local election officials.

State and local election officials know best how to stack their ballot boxes to ensure they have enough ballots for everybody to vote, and this will now be an added cost.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, while I appreciate the comments and concerns about the potential increase in cost to local and State institutions in administering the vote, I would point out that my Republican brethren were quick to pass a tax bill that added \$2 trillion to our deficit, while simultaneously not addressing requests by local municipalities and States for additional funding to make sure that we had proper voting taking place for all voters across the U.S.

Mr. 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. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. 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 127, insert after line 17 the following (and conform the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 1505. STUDY AND REPORT ON OPTIMAL BALLOT DESIGN.

(a) STUDY.—The Election Assistance Commission shall conduct a study of the best ways to design ballots used in elections for public office, including paper ballots and electronic or digital ballots, to minimize confusion and user errors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Election Assistance Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, every election, hundreds of thousands of votes are not counted simply because of bad ballot design. These citizens fulfill their patriotic duty, but their voices are silenced by confusing voter instructions and poor ballot design. This cannot continue.

Although most Americans associate bad ballot design with the 2000 Presidential race and hanging chads, unnecessarily complex and misleading ballots still plague our elections today.

Confusing ballot design has a significant and well-documented effect on our elections, disproportionately affecting low-income and elderly voters.

You shouldn't need a magnifying glass to read a candidate's name and you shouldn't need a Ph.D. to understand voter instructions. My amendment simply directs the U.S. Election Assistance Commission to study the best ways to design both paper and digital ballots. By reviewing uncounted vote data and conducting usability tests, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission can provide States with better ballot design guidelines.

This study, which would be due in January 2020, is a commonsense way to ensure that more Americans' votes are counted next election and in every election to come.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. Chair, again, this is another added cost to the taxpayers that I believe, and my colleagues, I believe, should agree is already being taken care of. The EAC is already tasked to take on this role.

The Election Assistance Commission is an independent, bipartisan commis-

sion charged with developing guidance to meet the Help America Vote Act of 2002 requirements.

The EAC has already done extensive work on best practices for ballot design that are available to State and local officials already. In fact, the EAC published their insights on the importance of good ballot design just last month and are already in the process of updating its guidance based upon the feedback it has received. I would assume that would have been studied already.

Additionally, every 2 years following an election, the EAC sends its election administration voting survey to election officials in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and our four territories. The survey includes national-, State-, and county-level data on voter registration; uniformed and overseas voters; early, absentee, provisional voting; voting equipment usage; and poll workers, polling places, and precincts.

All that to say, again, this is a waste of taxpayer dollars to be redundant and have the EAC perform another study that is going to cost the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

It sounds like we are in agreement, because he supports studies that have made these ballots improved over time. As we just saw from the most recent election cycle, it is clear that we still have work to do. So we have agreement that we want better ballots at all locations, and I am glad Mr. DAVIS is joining me in support of that.

I also would recognize that this does not require States to follow the suggested potential improved ballot, but makes it clear that there are better ways to do it.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's intention, and I appreciate his willingness as a new Member of this institution to come down here and participate in the amendment process. We need folks who come to this institution and they want to legislate, they want to be on the floor, they want to offer amendments.

My biggest problem with this amendment is we don't know how much this study is going to cost taxpayers. These are the types of studies that I believe the information that my colleague wants to get is already going to be in place. Why do we need to spend any more tax dollars on another study that is going to provide the same answers that my colleague has already asked them to now do a new study on? The EAC is doing their job.

Now, let's get back to the overall issue of H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 was a bill introduced on January 3 with zero Republican input, zero outreach to anybody on my side of the aisle, let alone the three Republicans that we have serving on the House Ad-

ministration Committee, the only committee that marked this bill up.

At that announcement of this 571-page bill that is cosponsored by every member of the Democratic conference, it was shown that, heck, the author thanked all the outside special interest groups who helped write it.

We were given no input whatsoever on this legislation that is going to cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I am going to do everything I can to make sure we lessen the amount of undue influence and unfunded mandates coming through this amendment process, and this is my one chance to do that.

Now, I am glad that my colleague mentioned the H.R. 1 of the last Congress. I learned my lesson not to yield back, as he just did, because now I get the last word.

This is an opportunity to remind my colleague, my new colleague, that it has even been reported 80 percent of what the Congressional Budget Office estimated that our tax cut bill that put thousands of dollars in the pockets of middle-class families, it has already paid for itself by 80 percent. In less than a year, we changed this. This is why H.R. 1 of the last Congress actually helped families put more money in their pockets.

H.R. 1 this year is going to actually cost taxpayers billions and put more money in the pockets of Members of Congress' campaigns.

This is a travesty that is no comparison, and that is exactly why this bill is terrible. And no offense to my colleague; I just oppose his amendment because I think it is redundant.

Mr. 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. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, insert after line 2 the following:

SEC. 1052. USE OF POSTAL SERVICE HARD COPY CHANGE OF ADDRESS FORM TO REMIND INDIVIDUALS TO UPDATE VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Postmaster General shall modify any hard copy change of address form used by the United States Postal Service so that such form contains a reminder that any individual using such form should update the individual's voter registration as a result of any change in address.

(b) APPLICATION.—The requirement in subsection (a) shall not apply to any electronic version of a change of address form used by the United States Postal Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, each year, too many Americans lose their voter registration status when they move without updating their voter registration address.

My amendment is a commonsense measure which directs the Postmaster General to include a notice on the Postal Service's hard copy change of address form simply reminding voters to update their voter registration following a change of address.

The online change of address form on the Postal Service's website already includes a reminder to reregister with your new address. This amendment would simply ensure that voters who use the hard copy change of address form also get a reminder to update their voter registration.

No one should be denied the right to vote simply because they forgot to update their voter registration address following a move.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity.

I am not necessarily opposed to this amendment, and if the gentleman is willing, I am ready to move towards closing. I am ready to close on this debate, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, if my colleague is ready to yield back and proceed to a vote, then I am certainly willing to do so as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, 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. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for

other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMEMBERING ANTHONY RIOS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, the Dominican Republic lost one of its brightest stars this week, with the passing of singer and composer Froilan Antonio Jimenez, known in the artistic world as Anthony Rios.

Rios' ascent was rapid due to his remarkable work ethic, perseverance, and an undeniable God-given talent. Even as a child, Rios demonstrated a unique ability to intertwine music into his life.

As a young shoeshine boy in the city of Hato Mayor del Rey, Rios would serenade his customers. During Christmas season, he sang Christmas carols door to door. The world and the Dominican Republic have lost a true talent.

May he rest in peace and may God comfort his friends, family, and all those who knew and loved him dearly. He will be missed. "Rest in peace," "De descansa en paz," Anthony Rios.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, as the whip of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am pleased to lead our second monthly Special Order hour.

Last month, my colleagues and I spoke about the importance of comprehensive immigration reform. Since then, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Immigration Task Force, led by Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ of California, drafted a set of immigration principles, which our caucus has now adopted. We plan to use these as a guide as we work on developing a comprehensive immigration reform proposal. Chief among these principles is a timely path to citizenship for Dreamers and a permanent solution for those with temporary protected status and deferred and forced departure.

Democrats made an important commitment to these communities. After a failed attempt at a bipartisan solution for Dreamers and TPS recipients last year, and again a few weeks ago, we said that if we regained control of the House, we would move quickly to fix this. Democrats have spent the last few weeks working just on that.

In particular, two of our CHC colleagues, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, along with Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, have been putting together a proposal that will provide overdue needed relief. Their Dream and Promise Act, H.R. 6, will be introduced

next week. We are also grateful for the time and effort they have put into this critical legislation.

That is why we wanted to take this month's CHC's Special Order to focus on Dreamers and TPS recipients. These are unique groups within our broader immigration community and their current plight—the uncertainty of their status—is entirely the fault of President Donald Trump and actions he took against them.

For Dreamers, the American people have heard us talk about them for many years, but I think it serves reminding just who those folks are. Dreamers are mostly young adults whose parents brought them to this country when they were minors. They do not have legal immigration status in the United States. They are undocumented, just like I was once. They came here through no fault of their own. For the vast majority of them, the United States of America is the only country they have ever known. A good number of them grew up not even knowing they were in immigration limbo and at risk of being deported.

Some only found out when they applied to college. Just think about that, Madam Speaker. You are a young high school student with your whole life ahead of you. You have dreams and aspirations for future careers and you are excited to take on a new chapter of your life. Then one day you find out that you are one of those undocumented folks you have been hearing about. There is now a barrier to your ability to get a higher education, to get a good job, to establish yourself in our society.

President Obama recognized this injustice and he created a program that would give Dreamers relief from deportation, known as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. This gave them some sense of certainty, and, most importantly, it gave them the legal status they needed to pursue an education and career, to buy a home, and begin raising a family.

Nearly 800,000 individuals across the country receive DACA, and thousands more were still eligible. But President Trump abruptly chose to end the program as part of his anti-immigrant policies. Not only is this cruel and unjust, it is economic malpractice.

According to the Center for American Progress, ending DACA will cost our GDP \$460 billion. Let me say that again, Madam Speaker. Ending DACA will cost our GDP \$460 billion. That is because it will mean removing 685,000 workers out of the workforce.

If President Trump wants to promote economic growth, as he says, then why would he make such a horrible decision? I leave it up to the American people to sort out that mystery. Perhaps they can do it at the ballot box in a couple of years.

TPS recipients. Now, what is worse, Madam Speaker, is that Dreamers aren't the only group President Trump has decided to throw into legal limbo.

Over the course of his 2 years in office, the President has ended also temporary protected status. I know you know that very well, Madam Speaker, because you represent the State of Florida.

For thousands of individuals, the temporary protected status has been attempted to end. TPS is an incredibly important program. It allows individuals to stay and remain in the United States for an extended period of time if some emergency erupts in their home country that prevents them from being able to return. TPS has been using cases of severe natural disasters, as well as armed conflict.

Only a few countries have been granted TPS. The program is so important because it allows these people, who would otherwise be in limbo for an unknown amount of time, to live their lives here in the United States, giving them the ability to work and establish themselves. Some countries have been designated under TPS for many, many years and are still not safe for individuals to return back home.

That is why it has been routinely extended by Presidents of both parties. This is not a Republican or a Democratic program. Presidents of both parties have extended TPS.

TPS holders are established members of our communities. They are workers, they are homeowners, they are our neighbors and they have children and families that have built their lives here. They deserve to stay, Madam Speaker.

And the truth is our economy really needs them. More than 300,000 individuals are currently beneficiaries of TPS, but they account for more than \$10 billion in spending power in our economy according to CAP. They pay local, State, and Federal taxes. Once more, so many TPS holders are the parents or relatives of thousands of U.S. citizen children, children who deserve to have their families stay together.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, families belong together. Whether they are separated at our border, whether they came here with a young child who only recently learned he or she was undocumented, whether they cannot return to a nation that is not able to receive them, they deserve to stay together, and they deserve to remain here in the United States, the place they now call home.

During the rest of this hour, you will hear from a number of CHC colleagues from across the country about how important Dreamers and TPS recipients are to their respective districts, how these hardworking individuals are part of the very fabric of communities they represent. I look forward to hearing from them and sharing their stories with you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) whose State is home to nearly 3,000 TPS holders and more than 42,000 DACA recipients. The GDP law, if DACA were to be removed, is \$413 million, and TPS spending power in that State is \$91.7 million.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative ESPAILLAT, for organizing this important hour to share the stories of those living in fear as a result of the actions of this administration.

As a proud immigrant and representative of a Chicago district that is over one-third foreign born, I know and understand the need for a permanent solution to the status of immigrants in this country. We are long overdue for legislation that provides a path to citizenship for those with uncertain status.

Madam Speaker, there are more than 11 million individuals, including children, living in the U.S. who are currently undocumented. Of those, there are over 3.6 million Dreamers, children who entered the U.S. before their 18th birthday, and over 1.8 million children eligible for deferred action because they were brought to the U.S. before their 16th birthday.

Too many live in constant fear as a result of the cruel policies of this administration.

□ 1945

In Illinois alone, there are almost 40,000 individuals enrolled in the deferred action program, but this issue affects entire families, including those in mixed-status families.

There are about 800,000 people in Illinois alone in families with at least one undocumented family member. I want to share a story of a Dreamer, like Beatriz, who is a constituent in my district, who came to this country at the age of 6.

Like many, her parents brought her seeking refuge from hunger, poverty, and the violent drug wars ravaging Mexico and Central America. Despite the toughest odds, Beatriz graduated from the Illinois Institute of Technology with no financial aid and working a full-time job.

Dreamers like Beatriz, if given the opportunity, are incredible assets to our country, not a drain. We should welcome hardworking immigrants like Beatriz and not make it harder for them to succeed and, in turn, grow our economy and enrich the cultural riches that makes America great.

In Beatriz's own words: "While I am always in fear of deportation, I am not afraid to work or to study."

As an immigrant myself, I empathize with Beatriz and her story.

Let me be clear: Putting Dreamers and TPS beneficiaries on a pathway to citizenship is just one of the many steps that we must take to undo the damage the Trump Administration has done.

The current legal immigration system is broken, creating decades-long delays for family reunifications and exacerbating workforce gaps that harm our economy.

We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to over 11 million undocumented people in our country who live and work in fear and in the shadows.

Immigrants—many of them are undocumented—are our teachers, engineers, your law enforcement officers. We are your firefighters, your plumbers, and your doctors. In some lucky instances, we are even your Representatives in Washington.

These are people who contribute every day to our country, and it is time we act now to reasonable pathways to citizenship for these hardworking people.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding in order to share Beatriz's story.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, let me just share some numbers with you from respective States across the country.

The number of TPS holders, for example, in the State of California, over 50,000 of them; in your home State of Florida, Madam Speaker, over 44,000 of them; in Illinois, close to 3,000 of them; in Massachusetts, over 5,000 of them; in New Mexico, no data, but fewer than 1,500; in New York, over 25,000 of them; in Texas, over 46,000 of them.

And the children living with these TPS recipients are, in California, over 43,000; in Florida, again, over 37,000; in Massachusetts, over 3,000; in New York, over 23,000; and in Texas, 49,000 children are living with TPS recipients.

DACA recipients are also in large numbers. In the State of California, you have close to 223,000 DACA recipients; in Florida, close to 33,000 recipients; in Illinois, Madam Speaker, you have close to 43,000 DACA recipients; in New York, 41,000.

So these are huge numbers for people who are so important to the fabric of our country, and that is why we are here to support them, because families that stay together are stronger together. When a family is divided, our Nation is weaker; when our family is together, our Nation is stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL), whose State is the home State to 45,000 TPS recipients and nearly 33,000 DACA recipients.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, DACA recipients are our neighbors. They are entrepreneurs, college graduates, educators, and healthcare providers.

DACA recipients are helping our country lead in science, technology, and medicine. Jorge Cortes is one those DACA recipients.

Jorge came to the United States from Colombia when he was a teenager. Despite his undocumented status, Jorge worked hard. He contributed to his community and eventually graduated from Florida International University.

After graduating, he quickly established himself as an entrepreneur in Miami's technology and social innovation sector, eventually employing upwards of 15 people. For his entrepreneurship and leadership, Jorge was awarded the keys to both Miami-Dade County and the city of Miami.

A path to citizenship for DACA and TPS recipients like Jorge, would add \$1.2 billion, annually, to Florida's economy.

In our discussions about DACA, immigration reform, and the economy, it is easy to forget that DACA recipients are also people. DACA isn't just the right thing to do for our economy, it is the moral thing to do. It is time that our immigration system treats all of them as people, too.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, as has been said here tonight, bringing relief, permanent relief to DACA recipients and TPS beneficiaries must not be delayed. Comprehensive immigration reform cannot continue to be delayed.

That is why I am so happy, as I mentioned earlier, that in a week or two, H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act, which promises to bring about comprehensive immigration reform in many ways for DACA recipients and TPS recipients and other immigrants, will hit this floor.

We are hoping that all our colleagues from both sides of the aisle will recognize that this is an important effort to finally bring over 800,000 young people permanently to the United States, young people who are teachers, nurses, police officers, members of our Armed Forces. They are business owners. They purchase their own homes, in many cases. These are important members of our communities across the country, and we must allow them to stay in the United States of America.

TPS recipients, many of them cannot return back to dangerous settings in their homeland. Many of them, their countries are reeling from natural disasters. It would be a travesty if we send them back home. They must be allowed to stay here in the United States of America. This is an important moment in our time.

Families that stay together are stronger; families that are divided are weaker. Our country is made stronger when a family is together. That is why I am asking all in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle, next week, to support H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act, which will finally bring relief to many, many young people and undocumented people from this Nation, as well as TPS recipients will finally breathe some fresh air and be able to stay here in this great Nation.

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

FIVE PILLARS OF WHAT WE BELIEVE SAVES US

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, and to my friend, thank you for stalling.

What we are doing tonight—and we will try to do it somewhat efficiently

so you don't have to spend too much time in the Chair—is every week we have been taking a half an hour or so—tonight we may do something less—and sort of walking through what we believe is actually an idea that actually saves this country. And not to be too melodramatic, but let's actually walk through some of the mathematical realities.

We have 74 million baby boomers moving into retirement. The peak of the baby boom is just a couple years away from retirement. So baby boom, 74 million over an 18-year period.

If you look at Federal spending, the growth in Federal spending from 2008 to 2028 as CBO has calculated—2008 to 2028—91 percent of all the growth in Federal spending is interest, Social Security, healthcare entitlement.

I know this doesn't sort of fit the mantra that you so often hear around here from Republicans and Democrats, but it is math.

We have a demographic issue. We are getting old much faster than almost anytime—anytime, I think—in our society, and our birth rates have substantially collapsed.

So one of the things we have come to is saying: How do you maximize economic vitality in our society so we can keep our promises, those promises of earned benefits like Social Security or promises such as earned benefits of Medicare?

We believe we have five pillars, so we always start with this chart, and you can do them in any fashion you want.

Last week, we actually did 30 minutes—which I am sure was riveting for anyone who was willing to watch—on labor force participation, but it is important.

If you go back over the last couple years and look at some of the CBO reports, repeatedly there are sections in there that talk about: What is the barrier to economic expansion in our country?

They will often talk about two things: capital stock, basically, savings rates, money to be lent into the economy to multiply, to build things, to grow things; and the second thing is population, labor force availability.

Well, it turns out, since tax reform, the capital stock numbers have been much better than almost any of us had expected in the modeling. So our restraint on economic expansion turns out to be substantially labor force.

Okay. So that is what we talked about last week. How do you draw in millennial males? How do you add incentives to those who are older to stay in the labor force? So that was last week.

We have also actually talked about what we will have to do—and every week we are going to do one of these—dealing with the earned benefits. Are there things we can do in those earned benefits to add some competition for when someone is buying their medical benefits through Medicare? Can we add certain incentives?

Say I am healthy. I wish to work longer. Can we give you certain incentives to either of those programs in the Tax Code to stay in the labor force as long as you are healthy?

And we actually see other societies around the world—you know, look at Japan and others—who are actually having to work through this concept as their demographics get older. How do they actually keep as much of their population still within the labor force so the economy continues to stay stable and grow?

□ 2000

Economic growth, we are going to do a whole presentation on everything you do from designing a Tax Code that stays competitive in the world, somewhat like we did a year-plus ago, that incentivizes capital formation, incentivizes investment in plant and equipment and technology, because we had gone functionally almost two decades with very little productivity growth.

Do you want to pay Americans more? Well, what is the formula? Do we all remember our high school economics class? What are the two elements that go into typical growth in someone's salary? Well, it is inflation. If you get an inflation adjustment, you are not getting any further ahead. You are just sort of holding steady. It is productivity.

When we look at the formulas that end up organically, systematically thought through, when businesses pay their workers more, here is the inflation adjustment. By the way, we bought a new plant; we bought new equipment; we bought new technology. We are able to make this many more widgets now. Our productivity has gone up. We can pay more. That is the key reason.

We functionally have gone a couple decades with very little wage growth because we didn't have productivity growth.

As we start to talk about economic growth, it is going to be everything from designing a Tax Code that maximizes that type of growth, to trade policy that maximizes economic expansion in our country, all the way down to how you design a rational regulatory environment.

Some people like to come behind these microphones and talk about de-regulation or re-regulation. I want to make the argument that we should be, as a society, talking about smart regulation.

You have a supercomputer in your pocket or your purse, that phone you have. Why aren't we using much more technology to be the driver of our regulatory environment?

A simple example: What would happen if you could crowd source data on the environment? You could have a few thousand people. If you are in a large urban area or other areas that have a sensor on your phone that says, hey, I am going to help crowd source ozone,

or crowd source volatile organics, or whatever, our environmental regulator is no longer a file cabinet of paperwork where we put paper and document more, document more. Instead, it is almost like a quick reaction for us of: Hey, the sensors are saying there is a hotspot over here. Let's go deal with it.

I think it is time we revolutionize what we consider financial, environmental, health types of regulations, realizing we have technology today that would make us healthier, more prosperous, our financial markets much more stable, and the time between a bad act and something getting fixed could be minutes, not years.

An example is, if you had certain types of technology, a Bernie Madoff could never happen because you would instantly know his accounts don't match his bank accounts.

The other one we are going to do next week is technology disruption. What happens if you could go home and, at home, you have this thing that looks like a large kazoo? You could blow into it, and it instantly tells you if you have the flu or not and then instantly could order your antivirals. A couple hours later, those antivirals could be delivered to your home. How much healthier would you be?

We are going to bring in a whole series of healthcare technologies that is a true disruption because, remember, part of our premise is, if you look at the cost curves, so much of it is Medicare. The fact is, we do not have the resources set aside to keep our promises right now.

That technology, if we do the adoption, if we remove the barriers, could be an amazing disruption in the price of healthcare because this body—let's be brutally honest—for a decade, we have been having the wrong debate. We have the ACA over here, which, functionally, just moved around who got to pay. We had many of our Republican alternatives that we believed would add some competition and those things, but it was, substantially, who got to pay.

It is time the Republicans and Democrats got together to understand there is a technology revolution out there that could be, that can be, that will be the price disrupter on healthcare, if this body is willing to remove those barriers to that technology.

Imagine being able to have certain wearables, whether you are the type of person who walks around with a smartwatch or the type of person who has the patch that can read your blood oxygen and these types of things, or the autonomous healthcare clinics that are being experimented with in the Phoenix-Scottsdale market.

There is a revolution happening out there. We need more of it. We need to adopt it faster. We need to remove the barriers and stop having these crazy conversations of little, incremental changes. We need the disruption.

As we walk through, part of the premise is, if you look at this slide, and

I brought this slide in previous discussions, 91 percent of the spending growth between 2008 and 2028, interest, Social Security, healthcare, and functionally the healthcare entitlements.

When you look at that, you start to realize these other colors you see here are functionally the other portions of the budget. Nondefense is green. Yellow is defense. Their percentage of the growth and spending is substantially flat. A little growth here, a little growth there, but the explosion in the curve, where you see those lines going up, is interest, Social Security, and healthcare entitlements.

Why doesn't this place, why don't we as Members of Congress, have the honest conversation that, if you care about the debt, if you care about retirement security, if you care about these things, this is the honest conversation?

Take a look at this slide. Between 2018 and 2048, a 30-year period, and this slide is not adjusted for inflation, you see the little green bar on the far end? That is the rest of the Federal budget. That is the non-Social Security, non-Medicare. It is actually \$16 trillion to the positive. How do you end up with \$84 trillion in the negative over those 30 years?

It is functionally the interest and the spending on Social Security, the interest and the spending on Medicare. I believe we have a moral obligation to protect these earned entitlements. But you aren't protecting them by avoiding the subject, and that is what this place has become famous for doing.

Let's talk about this concept we refer to in our office as sort of population stability. Remember, this is just one of our five pillars. In 9 years, our society, and its driven by demographics, will have two workers for every one person in retirement. Think about that for a moment.

Programs like Social Security and Medicare, there were four or five, five-plus workers for every one in their benefits. In 9 years, we moved 2-to-1. What also happens in 9 years? It is the end of the baby-boom cycle, so the end of the spiked years.

If this slide doesn't make you go "wow, maybe we should take this seriously," because we should have taken it seriously a couple of decades ago because we knew people were going to turn 65 from the baby boom for how many years? Nine years, two workers, one person in retirement. This is absolutely critical, and this is what is coming to us.

What are the solutions on this particular pillar we call population stability? We need to be honest and work hard for policies that maximize family formation. I don't even know if I have them here—I hope I do—some of the charts that show you what is happening in the birth rates around the country.

You do understand, as a nation, we are now well below replacement rates in our population. This one I particularly like because it is from my home

State of Arizona, but the trendline is almost identical. We will go through some of that.

If I asked you right now which State had the largest fall in birth rates, how many of you would have said Arizona? It turns out Arizona had the largest fall in birth rates. It is a little complicated. You have to read through the data, but Native Americans and Hispanics, their birth rates fell substantially and are looking much more like the mean of the rest of our society.

Apparently, the demographers say, that is wonderful. What it means is, even though this place sometimes spends a lot of our politics keeping us apart, the actual demographics say, when we are all having babies like each other, it is a symbol that the melting pot is working, that we are all starting to have similar education, live in the same neighborhoods, have similar job descriptions. Now our family formations are starting to look very, very similar.

That is wonderful. The melting pot is working. But understand what that means in the future, having enough workers to participate in keeping the economy growing and stable.

These pay-as-you-go programs, which are Social Security and Medicare, have that vitality, and this is a real threat when you start to see these sorts of numbers and understand what that means.

How do you reach a level of population stability? This is a brand-new slide for us. We are going to do a little more on what is happening population-wise. Once you substantially look at, we will call it the green line, the second one down, do you see that precipitous fall?

If we are right here, that was sort of our last time of being in the positive, a bit before 2010. Since then, we have continued to fall, and fall, and fall. Now our demographers are coming back and saying, yeah, this is sort of the new normal, because it is not just the United States.

Apparently, this trend is all over the industrialized world. A lot of the great writers and thinkers on demographics are saying the next prized asset in the world isn't going to be lithium for batteries or petroleum products. It is going to be people, smart people.

You are starting to see that around the world where other countries right now are even starting to change some of their immigration rules to say, if you have talent, you are given a much faster path to enter our country. We are going to have to have that very honest conversation of a major change in our immigration system.

The last slide here, and then we are going to talk about some of the solutions in this, this is just sort of fun to understand that it is a trend. We have one or two States that are still bucking the trend of having positive population growth, and that is through birth rates. But the rest of the country is substantially collapsing.

What do you do for population stability? Okay, back to family formation. Are there things we can do that will work? We have spent about a year in our office reading literature from around the world, what they have done in Scandinavia, what they are doing right now in Hungary, what has been done in a province in Canada, trying to promote native births. Small, incremental changes—no one has found the magic formula.

Maybe we as a society have to have this discussion. What works? What can we do? Is it something you do in the Tax Code? Is it something you do in family friendly policies? What do we do to maximize family formation in our country?

Right now, when you start to look at the cost, I have only one beautiful little girl, and you realize, children are the greatest thing that ever happened to my wife and I, but it is expensive.

The second part of that population stability discussion is, if you are over here working on family formation and making sure society understands the blessing of children in our society, are there immigration policies that if you are bringing in populations into the United States that maximize the economic vitality?

□ 2015

So part of this thought experiment, based on the actual numbers in the last 10 years, the U.S. fall in birthrates functionally equals 4 million children that we expected that with the fallen birthrates will not be part of our society. You do realize that over 10 years that is functionally 4 full years of legal immigration.

So let's say we actually were effective in being serious about family formation here, and we actually started to have an honest discussion of as a society do we start to do the things such as New Zealand, Great Britain, Australia, Canada, and others are doing where substantially it is a talent-based immigration system?

Why do you want to fixate on that?

It is an immigration system that actually has the elegance of we don't care about your gender, we don't care about your religion, and we don't care about your race. But what we care about as a society is we care about the vitality, the energy, and the talent you bring to our society to maximize the economic growth so we can keep our promises, particularly on Social Security and Medicare.

Remember, demographics are really the biggest issue we as a society are facing, except it is really hard to talk about it because the math is complex.

So are we as a body willing to take on complex issues and understand you can't just do one of them?

There was a time here a decade ago or so people would come to the microphone and say: Well, if we do entitlement reform, then we get this.

We have missed that window.

Now my argument to this country, to my brothers and sisters here in Con-

gress, is we have to actually reach out to at least the five pillars we have laid out of maximizing economic growth, and that is everything from tax policy to trade policy to regulatory policy, and labor force participation.

How do you design programs, everything from Social Security Disability to TANF to food stamps to this and that, saying we want you in the labor force?

What can we do so you have your safety net, but we have got to get you into the labor force?

What do you do for population stability as we have talked about right now?

What do you do for dramatic disruptive technology adoption, particularly for healthcare, but it can also be for environment?

We are going to actually do that in the coming weeks.

Then we will have to step up and have an honest conversation of as the promised earned benefits, we call entitlements, how can we adjust and refine them so they incentivize to stay in the labor force, but they incentivize efficiencies of how healthcare is purchased?

We need to do this as an entire society. Once again, remember, in 9 years, two workers, one person in retirement, one person 65. Over the 20-year period, 2008 to 2028, 91 percent of all the growth in spending will be interest, Social Security, and healthcare entitlements. In 9 years—the CBO report that came out last month has a beautiful graph in there—in 9 years, 50 percent of all the noninterest spending coming from Washington, D.C. will be for those who are 65 and older.

So if you care about keeping our promises, if you care about this country being able to maintain its place in the world, it is math. It is demographics. There is a path for us to succeed, but it no longer works. The math no longer works by just doing one thing or these little, incremental, petty things I see happening around here on this floor where it is political power grabs instead of the things that stabilize and grow our country and protect my 3-year-old daughter and her economic future and her opportunity to actually live the American Dream.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

322. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report and certification for FY 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Ohio Permit Rules Revisions [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0121; FRL-9990-44-Region 5] received March 1, 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.

324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; NOx SIP Call and CAIR [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0631; FRL-9990-32-Region 4] received March 1, 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.

325. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1092-0028; FRL-9990-43-Region 5] received March 1, 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.

326. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units and Other Solid Waste Incineration Units Negative Declarations for Designated Facilities and Pollutants [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0588; FRL-9990-45-Region 5] received March 1, 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.

327. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of The President, transmitting an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

328. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Oil Spill Response Plans and Information Sharing for High-Hazard Flammable Trains (FAST Act) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2014-0105 (HM-251B)] (RIN: 2137-AF08) received March 1, 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.

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. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1549. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SEN-SENRENNER):

H.R. 1550. A bill to support State and tribal efforts to develop and implement management strategies to address chronic wasting disease among deer, elk, and moose populations, to support applied research regarding the causes of chronic wasting disease and

methods to control the further spread of the disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives; 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. TIPTON:

H.R. 1552. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones or markers to private cemeteries for graves of certain veterans without next of kin; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. WILD):

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Reform, 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. BABIN (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1554. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require cable operators and internet service providers who are subject to State fines to submit a report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 1556. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to prohibit the payment of bonuses to highly compensated individuals employed by the debtor and insiders of the debtor to perform services during the bankruptcy case; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HILL of California, Mr.

SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1558. A bill to delay by 5 weeks the time for individuals to file certain calendar year 2018 income tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to strengthen program integrity and enhance low-income patient benefits for safety net providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms.

DELBENE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUNTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA,

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 1560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the child tax credit fully refundable, establish an increased child tax credit for young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGGO:

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit certain acts of nepotism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1562. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain authority to the National Transportation Safety Board to investigate commercial space transportation accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1563. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain reversionary interests of the United States in and to a parcel of land located in Henderson, Tennessee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize and modernize the provision of partial hospitalization services under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1565. A bill to establish a new higher education data system to allow for more accurate, complete, and secure data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes, at all levels of postsecondary enrollment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, 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 Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to ensure online access to the registration statements filed under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1567. A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to temporarily provide water uncontaminated with perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) for agricultural purposes to areas affected by contamination from military installations, and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to acquire real property to extend the contiguous geographic footprint of any Air Force base that has shown signs of contamination from PFOA and PFOS due to activities on the base, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1568. A bill to assist in the conservation of the North Atlantic right whale by supporting and providing financial resources for North Atlantic right whale conservation programs and projects of persons with expertise required for the conservation of North Atlantic right whales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFALIZO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BABIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GHANFORTE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HOICE of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GIBBS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; 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. POCAN (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1571. A bill to establish State-Federal partnerships to provide students the opportunity to attain higher education at in-State public institutions of higher education without debt, to provide Federal Pell Grant eligibility to DREAMer students, to repeal suspension of eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965 for drug-related offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 1572. A bill to promote botanical research and botanical sciences capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. SCANLON (for herself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 1573. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote access to voter registration and voting for individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a criminal offense for individuals to engage in sexual acts while acting under color of law or with individuals

in their custody, to encourage States to adopt similar laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to lengthen the statute of limitations for enforcing robocall violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide for the participation of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands in supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the procurement practices of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MENG, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. DELGADO):

H.R. 1578. A bill to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property in Plum Island, New York, and to establish certain requirements for its final disposition including preservation of the island for conservation, education, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 180. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2019 as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 181. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 30 as "National Bartter Syndrome Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

- Article I, Section 1;
- Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;
- Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and
- Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 1554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 1555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1557.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 1558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1560.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 1561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 1562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause).

Under this clause, Congress has the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 1564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1566.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 1567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 1568.

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 Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 1573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1574.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 receipts and expenditures of all

public money shall be published from time to time.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 95: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 99: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 101: Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 114: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 141: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 194: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 208: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 220: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 285: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 295: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 299: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. BASS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLINE, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. VELA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 307: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 339: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 375: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 400: Ms. WILD and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 414: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 444: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 448: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 513: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 530: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 532: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 535: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 569: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 592: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 596: Mr. SIRES and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 613: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 615: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 618: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 649: Mr. MAST and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 650: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 652: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 663: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 693: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 724: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 727: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 732: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 739: Mr. SIRES, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 763: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 774: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 783: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 808: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 810: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SUOZZI.

- H.R. 824: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 849: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 864: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 865: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 873: Ms. NORTON and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 874: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 878: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 890: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 900: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 929: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 943: Mr. CORREA and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 949: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 959: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 960: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 962: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 973: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 997: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1002: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DELGADO, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1018: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 1043: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. KIM, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1045: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1049: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1058: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1092: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1108: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1109: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1128: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1139: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1149: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1154: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1162: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1179: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1225: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1241: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1279: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1322: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1327: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1328: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1345: Ms. SHALALA.
H.R. 1351: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1364: Mrs. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. FINKENAUER, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1371: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1372: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1399: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1407: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. COLE, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1410: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1417: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1432: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CISNEROS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1436: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1438: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1444: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1450: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1458: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1472: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1473: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1495: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1497: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 1516: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1519: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1528: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 1534: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1545: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1546: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. KIM.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. AMODEI.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 23: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BACON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mrs. AXNE.
H. Res. 34: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 54: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BACON, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 60: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 72: Mr. BARR, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. STEIL.
H. Res. 91: Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 106: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H. Res. 107: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 117: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H. Res. 119: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 124: Ms. SHALALA and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H. Res. 129: Ms. TITUS and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 136: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 149: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 152: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 153: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Res. 156: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 173: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILD.
H. Res. 174: Mr. GAETZ.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2019

No. 40

Senate

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I came to the floor to speak about the Green New Deal. I compared it to the New Deal of the 1930s.

I mentioned before that the New Deal of the 1930s is not something that we ought to be emulating.

The National Recovery Administration of the 1930s was a key feature of that New Deal. It was designed to eliminate competition, with industry, government, and labor all working together.

The National Recovery Administration turned out hundreds of codes, regulating every aspect of business. Small businesses struggled to comply, job creation stalled, and prices stayed high.

When big business and big government get together to write regulations, hard-working Americans suffer. You don't create jobs.

So I hope you will take a look at how complicated the Green New Deal is, besides costing \$93 trillion in the future.

I yield the floor.

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. 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.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate confirmed one of President Trump's well-qualified nominees to the Federal bench and advanced the nomination of another.

That is what we will do today. With Allison Rushing's nomination confirmed, we will vote later today on the nomination of Chad Readler and then turn to consideration of Eric Murphy to join him on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Murphy is a graduate of Miami University and the University of Chicago Law School and now serves as the State solicitor of Ohio. He has held two prestigious clerkships on our Federal courts, including for Justice Anthony Kennedy on the U.S. Supreme Court.

So I hope our colleagues will join me in advancing another wise choice for our Nation's judiciary.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, on another matter, in recent months our Nation has watched the Democratic Party take a sharp and abrupt left turn toward socialism.

A flawed ideology that has been rejected time and again across the world is now driving the marquee policy proposals of the new House Democratic majority, and nothing encapsulates this as clearly as the huge, self-inflicted, national wound the Democrats are agitating for called the Green New Deal.

Let's review a few of the greatest hits in this particular proposal.

Democrats have decided that every building in America needs to be either overhauled or replaced altogether. They are putting homeowners and small business owners on alert. The all-

The Senate met at 10 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.

O God our shield, the giver of victory and honor, shine on us with Your kindness that brings a rich harvest of joy.

Today, guide our lawmakers with Your spirit and lead them by the power of Your prevailing Providence. May they trust You completely and permit You to remove obstacles from the road ahead.

Lord, train them in Your school of humility so they will walk safely and never stumble. Help them to remember that all efforts to defend themselves will fail without Your grace and mercy. May they not trust in their own strength and ingenuity but instead lean on You the God of might and miracles.

We pray in Your Holy 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1671

knowing central planners here in the Nation's capital are raring to remodel the entire country.

Up next: ending all fossil fuel and nuclear energy production. Forget about coal and all of the jobs it supports in my State of Kentucky and around the country. Forget about the oil and natural gas industry and all of those jobs as well. The list goes on.

Oh, by the way, forget about nuclear, too—proving that this proposal doesn't even pretend to be a serious effort to reduce carbon emissions. It is just a statement of what sounds trendy in New York and San Francisco.

Anyone seriously concerned about carbon would know that nuclear power generates a majority of America's carbon-free electricity. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Let me say that again. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Oh, but alas, these Democrats will not let facts get in the way of what is fashionable.

Besides, why should America bother being a net exporter of energy when we could leave all of that economic potential to competitors like China?

Naturally, as background documents explained, this means eliminating all combustion engines—cars, lawn mowers, commercial airliners. Everything must go. Everything must go.

By the way, that background really helps clarify another goal behind all of this. It is providing "economic security," even those who are "unwilling to work."

All of this and more can be ours for the low, low price of a staggering expansion of centralized government and—wait for it—upward of a mere \$93 trillion. Ninety-three trillion is more than every dollar our Federal Government has spent in its entire history to date—combined. It is more than the combined annual GDP of every nation on Earth.

As our colleague Senator BLUNT and the policy committee have pointed out, this amount of money could rebuild the entire Interstate Highway System every single year—just for the heck of it—for 250 years, and you would still have a little left over—a little left over.

Or maybe Americans would rather have something nicer to drive on the roads we already have. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, I am told the government could buy every American a Ferrari. What a great idea. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, the government could buy every American a Ferrari. But, of course, everyone would have to get their driving in before Democrats ban the internal combustion engine.

To be clear, \$93 trillion is just one number and one attempt to estimate the pricetag of this fantasy novel. The proposal is so lacking in details and math that it is almost impossible for analysts to even know where to begin trying to connect it to the real world.

Let's talk about where this money would come from. That is always a question worth asking.

If we spread that \$93 trillion out over 10 years and over every American household, we get about \$65,000 per household—\$65,000 every year for every household. The median income in this country is around \$60,000. So, like any good socialist plan, I am sure we would hear a lot about soaking the rich.

We always do. We would hear that wealthy Americans could pay for this whole thing, if only they were sufficiently civic-minded, but, of course, that is not even close to accurate. A huge share of the bill would land at the feet of the American middle class. There are not enough billionaires—there are not enough billionaires to pay the trillions needed for this massive government plan.

Even if Washington decided the IRS should grab every single cent of adjusted gross income above \$1 million, all of it taken, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth—one-tenth—of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year. Take all the money away from the millionaires, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year.

In fact, in order to break even on this proposal alone, the Federal Government would have to take \$9 of every \$10 that every single American earns. The Federal Government would have to take \$9 out of \$10 of everything every American earns.

You had better believe that families' last dollar would need to go toward keeping the lights on. By one analysis, middle-class families could see their power bills jump by more than \$300 a month under the Green New Deal. That would take up the last dollar they had left.

I know Senator ERNST and several of our colleagues will be speaking at greater length on this issue later today, and I am sure each of them will point out that there certainly is one green thing about this sprawling proposal, one green thing: the huge, unprecedented pile of middle-class families' money that Democrats are itching—itching—to grab.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, on one final matter, I want to discuss something that will be happening on the floor of the House perhaps as soon as today.

Remarkably, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, Speaker PELOSI apparently feels compelled to have her Members vote on a resolution that will reportedly condemn anti-Semitism—a resolution that will purportedly condemn anti-Semitism.

Unfortunately, again, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, this

seems to be in response to the invocation of crude, hateful, and backward anti-Semitic stereotypes by one specific freshman member of the House Democratic majority.

This Democratic Congresswoman already stoked controversy in mid-February, having publicly proclaimed that Israel's supporters are only in it for the money. Apparently, she believes the only reason leaders would stand with the Jewish people and the State of Israel is Jewish money. Well, I think we have all heard that kind of talk before, and we must not tolerate it.

During my time in the Senate, I have had the honor of traveling all over America. I know I speak for colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that support for the State of Israel and the U.S.-Israel relationship is deeply felt—deeply felt—all across America. Our relationship is built on common values and democratic principles, our shared interests, close partnerships, and deep friendships. The support for Israel that you see in this Chamber is not the work of some shadow conspiracy. The Members of this body support Israel because so many Americans support Israel.

I had hoped this regrettable episode might have caused this lawmaker to be more careful with her language, but, alas, just a few weeks later, here we are again: more anti-Semitic tropes. This time, she claims that supporters of Israel actually have "an allegiance to a foreign country." That is that old, ugly, dual loyalty smear, plain as day.

We should also not overlook that in a few cases, these anti-Semitic statements have provoked offensive, anti-Muslim comments in response. That is hateful and completely inexcusable as well.

So now the House of Representatives seeks to distance itself from this Member's remarks and will apparently soon vote to condemn anti-Semitism for the second time in just a few weeks. I hope this time the message is clear.

Support for Israel isn't about the "Benjamins," it is about the hearts and minds of the American people. It is unconscionable for any Member of the U.S. Congress, even less a Member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, to repeatedly traffic in base stereotypes.

The long, bloody legacy of anti-Semitism is spread out over the pages of history, but, regrettably, this scourge is not confined to history.

Long common across the Middle East, violent, hateful acts of anti-Semitism have been increasing throughout Europe. Less than a lifetime after the Holocaust, 9 out of 10 European Jews say anti-Semitism has increased—in increased—in the past 5 years.

Eighty-eight percent of French Jews say they actively worry about targeted vandalism. That country alone saw 541 anti-Semitic incidents in 2018, a massive 74-percent increase from just the prior year.

In France, in 2006, a Jewish man was kidnapped for ransom because criminals assumed his Jewish family had to be rich. When their plan failed, they tortured and killed him. A memorial tree was planted in his honor. Earlier this month, that tree was found chopped down—anti-Semitism on top of anti-Semitism.

Trends here in America are troubling too. Every year, hundreds and hundreds of anti-Semitic incidents take place in America, everything from vandalism to harassment, to threats in schools, college campuses, and other public places, to targeting Jewish institutions.

This racial and religious hate-mongering deserves swift condemnation—swift condemnation. So I am glad the House is at least taking up this short, symbolic resolution and rejecting the anti-Semitic tropes this Democratic Congresswoman keeps peddling, but at the end of the day, it is just a symbolic resolution.

If House Democrats wanted to, they could pass real legislation to take action against anti-Semitism and shore up America's relationship with Israel. I know they could because last month the Senate did just that. We did that in the Senate last month. The House should take up and pass S. 1, the bipartisan foreign policy legislation that the Senate passed last month, 77 to 23. That legislation walks the walk. It supports Israel and gives local communities the flexibility to combat the so-called BDS movement, which is a kind of anti-Semitic economic warfare that opponents of Israel are trying to wage against the Jewish State.

The bill also attends to other critical priorities, such as renewing U.S. commitments to Jordan's security and providing for the Assad regime's butchers to be brought to justice.

S. 1 is not just about combating anti-Semitism or bolstering the U.S.-Israel relationship; it is about standing with an Arab partner like Jordan and providing justice for the Syrian people. So my point is this: Resolutions are fine, but the House could do something that mattered by taking up S. 1 that we sent them last month that deals with the BDS boycott against Israel.

Words are one thing. Meaningful action is another. House Democrats should walk the walk and pass S. 1 without any further pointless delay.

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. 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.

(The remarks of Senator SCHUMER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 97 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NOMINATION OF CHAD L. READLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on Readler, later this afternoon, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Chad Readler to the Sixth Circuit. As this Chamber by now is no doubt aware, Mr. Readler was the chief cook and bottle washer of the Trump administration's decision not to defend the healthcare law in court. In a brief submitted to the court on behalf of the Department of Justice, Mr. Readler said that protections for the 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions are unconstitutional.

I say to my Republican friends: Do you want to vote for a judge who says that protecting preexisting conditions, which affect 130 million Americans, is unconstitutional?

Well, that is what you are going to do if you vote for Readler.

Even my Republican colleague Senator ALEXANDER, who oversees the committee that created these protections, calls his arguments "as far-fetched as I have ever heard."

Can you imagine the lack of compassion it takes to argue that 130 million Americans with cancers, respiratory ailments, and all the way down to asthma don't deserve the guarantee of affordable healthcare? Can you imagine voting for a man who is so cold-hearted that he doesn't protect a mother who has a daughter or a son with cancer and the insurance company cuts them off, and they have to watch their child suffer?

Can our Republican colleagues actually vote for a nominee who feels that way not just in his words but in his action? This vote is going to be remembered for a long time—a long, long time.

Can you imagine sitting at your desk on an average workday and arguing for a policy with such catastrophic consequences for a third of our country? I, for one, cannot. That is what Readler did.

The very next day, after he wrote that brief, he was nominated for this lifetime appointment on the bench. Go figure. Only in the Trump administration could a person be rewarded for efforts to take healthcare away from average Americans. That is exactly what happened.

Yesterday, regrettably, the Senate proceeded to Readler's nomination over the objections of one of his home State Senators, Senator SHERRON BROWN. Republican leaders are so eager to confirm judges that they are willing to break the blue-slip tradition even when the nominee is the literal encapsulation of their party's most heartless policy, I might add—a policy that helped them lose the House and could help them lose future elections, if they only care about that.

Republican Senators still have a chance to reject the cynicism behind Mr. Readler's nomination. They have a chance to stand up for healthcare. I would ask my colleagues, is the confirmation of one circuit judge really

worth endorsing the position that our healthcare law should be repealed and Americans with preexisting conditions should not be protected? The answer to that question ought to be obvious.

I urge my Republican colleagues to vote no on Mr. Readler's nomination this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the more you look at the Green New Deal, the worse it looks. Last week, one think tank released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost. Here is the answer: between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years. Between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. That is an unfathomable amount of money. The 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world, for the whole planet, came to \$80.7 trillion—more than \$10 trillion less than what Democrats are proposing to spend on the Green New Deal.

Mr. President, \$93 trillion is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history. Since 1789, when the Constitution went into effect, the Federal Government has spent a total of \$83.2 trillion. That is right—it has taken us 230 years of American history to spend the amount of money the Democrats want to spend in 10 years. Look at it this way: \$93 trillion is enough money to buy more than 7,000 Ford-class aircraft carriers. To put that in perspective, guess how many aircraft carriers the Navy currently has in its entire fleet. Eleven.

It is like the Democrats are playing pretend. It is like they are on a road trip, and they are trying to pass the time, and they say, "What would you do if you won the lottery?" or "What would you do if you had all the money in the world?" It is a fun game to play for a few minutes, but this is not a game. The government doesn't have all the money in the world. That \$93 trillion is going to have to come from somewhere.

Democrats like to suggest that we can pay for it and pay for just about anything simply by taxing the wealthy, but the truth is, taxing the wealthy or even the merely well-off isn't going to pay for this proposal. Taxing all the millionaires in the United States at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years wouldn't add up anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years wouldn't get Democrats anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Let's take it a step further. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a

100-percent tax rate for 10 years would still leave Democrats far short of \$93 trillion.

The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for merely by taxing the rich. Actually implementing the Green New Deal would involve taking money not just from the well-off but from working families—and not a little bit of money either. Ninety-three trillion dollars breaks down to over \$650,000 per household over 10 years. That is more than \$65,000 per household, per year—more than the median household income in the United States. In other words, the cost per household for just 1 year of the Green New Deal is more than the yearly income of 50 percent of American households.

Let's leave aside the stratospheric cost for just a minute and talk about the other consequences of the Green New Deal.

Democrats' Green New Deal would put the government in charge of a large portion of the economy and significantly shrink Americans' freedom. Under this bill, the government will impose new and stringent regulations on your appliances, your car, your house, and your place of business. It will limit your electricity options. It will put the government in charge of your healthcare. I know that is not really energy-related, but the Green New Deal's authors went beyond energy to include a full socialist wish list.

Your options for travel may be limited. A fact sheet released—and later deleted—by one of the authors of the Green New Deal called for a plan to "build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary." Well, that might work between DC and Boston, but it is not going to work so well if you have family in Hawaii. I don't think the high-speed rail is going to reach that far. I would say that you could make the trip by passenger ship, but, of course, we don't know whether ships as we know them would exist under the Green New Deal. After all, the plan's authors want to eliminate fossil fuels, which power ships, as well as your car and your home.

Incidentally, while we are on the subject, it is worth mentioning that the Governor of California recently scaled back California's high-speed rail project. Why? Because it was costing too much money.

Under the Green New Deal, if you like your car, you probably won't be able to keep it. If you like your healthcare, you probably won't be able to keep it. If you like your house, you may not be able to keep that either. That same fact sheet from one of the Green New Deal's authors says that we need to "upgrade or replace every building in [the] U.S."

There is no question that we need to protect our environment. There is no question that we should be developing clean energy sources and building on our existing clean energy technologies.

I would tell the Chair that my home State of South Dakota is leading the way on this issue. In fact, my colleagues may be surprised to know that according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, South Dakota generates an average of two-fifths to half of its electricity from hydroelectric facilities along the Missouri River. Combined with our abundant wind generation, which provides roughly 30 percent of our electricity, South Dakota's net utility-scale energy generation is over 75 percent renewables.

I am proud of South Dakota's renewable energy achievements, and I think we should be encouraging improved domestic energy production, increasing America's renewable energy supply, and reducing consumption through improved efficiencies. What we should not be doing is adopting a wildly irresponsible, completely unworkable, and utterly unrealistic proposal that would drive taxes through the roof, reduce Americans' standard of living, and permanently damage our economy.

We are going to be voting on the Democrat's Green New Deal proposal in the coming weeks, and it will be interesting to see where all of my colleagues stand on this socialist fantasy.

You just heard the Democratic leader, the Senator from New York, say that it is a gimmick and we shouldn't be voting on this. It is the first time I think I have ever heard a leader of one of the parties here in the Senate come forward and say that we shouldn't vote on something that 11 of his Democratic colleagues have cosponsored. He doesn't want to vote on a piece of legislation that is put forward by 11 Democrats here in the Senate.

Well, I think it is important for the American people to know. I think it is important for Members of the Senate to go on record on whether they think this is a good idea or whether they think, as I think most Americans would believe, this is a crazy idea that would wreck the economy, cost Americans' jobs, and punish working families in this country with higher costs for literally everything they face in their daily lives.

For the sake of our economy and for working families, I hope that when this vote comes, at least some Democrats will slow their party's headlong rush to become the Socialist Party and not what we have historically known as the Democratic Party in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, judges are making decisions around the country right now on voting rights, on civil rights, on women's rights, on LGBTQ rights, decisions that could limit those rights not just for a year or for a decade but for a generation. They make decisions on healthcare; they make decisions on sentencing; and they make decisions on corporate power. We have seen judge after judge, especially on

the Supreme Court, put their thumbs on the scales of justice by favoring corporations over workers, by favoring Wall Street over consumers, and by favoring health insurance companies over patients. That is, fundamentally, why we in Ohio cannot afford to have Chad Readler on the bench.

Look at an op-ed he took upon himself to write as a private citizen, which reads we should allow the execution of 16-year-olds—kids, children who are 16 years old.

This is at a time when we are taking important, bipartisan steps forward on sentencing reform, and this Senate doesn't come together very often. This Senate, under Senator McCONNELL's leadership, actually came together in a bipartisan way. After all of the mostly unworkable pieces of legislation he has written that always help the rich, the President of the United States signed a bill, in this case, in which we did the right thing by taking bipartisan steps forward on sentencing reform.

How do you turn around and put someone on the bench for life who supports executing children? That is what a 16-year-old is—still a teenager, still a child under the law. Yet he thinks it is something we should do—execute children who are found guilty.

During his nomination hearing, it was pretty unbelievable that Readler stood by his op-ed and refused to disavow his support for using the death penalty on high schoolers and, possibly, on even younger children. I guess I give him credit for consistency.

His record on voting rights is equally despicable. He worked on behalf of a far-right group and argued for the elimination of Golden Week, something passed by Republicans that had been in effect for more than a decade, which means he was limiting the amount of time people can vote early, and he defended restrictive voter ID and provisional ballot laws. We know exactly whom those laws target—people of color, the elderly, young voters. They are the same people, in many cases, who face literacy tests and poll taxes. They are the people JOHN LEWIS and the foot soldiers of Selma were marching for 54 years ago tomorrow across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

It is shameful that, half a century later, we are fighting that same fight. Chad Readler again is on the wrong side. We can't afford another judge on the bench who works to undo Selma's legacy.

We can't afford another judge who has made it his mission to take away Americans' healthcare. Chad Readler's work threatens the healthcare coverage of 20 million Americans who have preexisting conditions. Last summer, Readler did what three career attorneys with the Department of Justice refused to do. He filed a brief that challenged the law that protects Americans with preexisting conditions. He filed a brief nobody else was willing to file. They all recused themselves. They all refused to do it. They thought it was

something improper and unconstitutional. One of them, I believe, resigned.

Do you know what happened then? The next day, he was nominated for this very judgeship.

So the message is loud and clear from the administration: If you go after pre-existing conditions under consumer protections, if you attack workers' rights, if you attack voters' rights within any job you hold—and there is a real incentive to do this from this administration—you may get a good, lifetime Federal judgeship. The arguments he made in his brief were unprecedented. As I said, three attorneys withdrew from the case. One resigned altogether in his objections to the Department of Justice's unprecedented actions.

One of our Republican colleagues, Senator ALEXANDER, who works with Senator MURRAY to run the HELP Committee, called Readler's argument as farfetched—Senator ALEXANDER's words, who is a conservative Republican from Tennessee—as he had ever seen. Yet, in December, a partisan Texas judge decided to go along with Readler's opinion, and he handed down the decision that undermines pre-existing condition protections for all Americans.

Right now, judges are deciding the future of Americans' healthcare every day. We can't afford to put another extremist—and he is way out of the mainstream—in my increasingly conservative, Republican State. He is way out of the mainstream among lawyers, way out of the mainstream among judges, and way out of the mainstream as a citizen. We can't afford to put another extreme judge on the court who will not defend Americans' right to healthcare.

We know there have been a number of times this body has refused to take away the consumer protections for pre-existing conditions. We remember the vote late at night when we defeated the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. We know that all kinds of Republican candidates who were victorious went on television and said they were going to defend the consumer protections for pre-existing conditions. We heard that over and over.

Why did we hear that? Even though that was not their position a few months earlier, in the cases of a lot of them, we heard it because they knew how popular it was and how much the public cared about the consumer protections for pre-existing conditions. In a moment, I am going to share some letters from Ohioans who make the point that even though, this year, Republican candidates thought it was all OK to say we are going to preserve pre-existing conditions, a vote for Judge Readler is exactly the opposite.

Don't go home and say you support consumer protections for pre-existing conditions and then vote for a judge who has a history of wanting to take that right away and who will now have a lifetime appointment and get another

chance to likely take away the protections for pre-existing conditions.

Let me share a few letters from people.

A man from Sandusky wrote to me about how the marketplaces that were created by the Affordable Care Act helped him to start his own business because he had a way to purchase insurance. He was later diagnosed with lung cancer. He wrote: "I am watching the dismantling of the only program available to me with a pre-existing condition that I can afford. I am devastated."

I don't know what Mr. Readler thinks when he reads something like that, but let me give another example.

A woman from Cleveland writes:

Protect real health care coverage for all people with pre-existing conditions. Real people's lives depend on it. My husband's life depends on it.

Chad Readler wants to be a judge. Chad Readler did the President's bidding and the insurance industry's bidding at the Department of Justice. I don't know if he knows these people exist, like the woman from Cleveland or the man from Sandusky. I hope Chad Readler would have gone out and, as President Lincoln said, gotten his public opinion badge by actually listening to how the decisions he makes affect real people.

A woman from Chagrin Falls, which is a fairly wealthy suburb of Cleveland, wrote:

I've been a cancer patient since 2011. If pre-existing conditions are no longer covered, I—along with countless others—will probably be screwed.

A mother from Waynesville, OH, wrote:

My family has lived every day worrying about the ACA being dismantled. We have a son who was born with a neurological condition before the ACA.

We lived in constant fear of medical caps and pre-existing conditions.

Just putting Chad Readler on the bench increases people's anxiety. Is Congress going to take away the Affordable Care Act? Is Congress going to wipe away those protections for pre-existing conditions? If Congress isn't, are judges going to do that? No wonder people are so anxious about that.

A woman from Fairborn writes:

I previously lost health insurance from a possible preexisting condition and now, being a 2-time cancer survivor, I'm scared of losing coverage again.

The security of having insurance since the ACA allowed me to sleep at night and focus on my health.

My editorial comment on her comments is to focus on her health, not on whether she loses her coverage.

It is unimaginable that politicians want to deny so many Americans access to health insurance and quality of life.

Senator MURRAY and I sat and watched a bunch of mostly men on the other side of the aisle cast their votes—all who had good health insurance—to take away insurance for millions of Americans and for hundreds of

thousands in my State and to take away their consumer protections for pre-existing conditions.

A mother from New Albany writes:

My daughter had two autoimmune diseases by the age of 6—SIX. That means her entire life she will be a "preexisting condition." But she isn't just a label. She is a person. Please protect my baby. She already deals with enough.

I mean, hear the passion in that letter, the strong feelings in that letter, the cries for help in that letter. Yet this body may be about to put on the Sixth Circuit, in a lifetime appointment, someone who clearly doesn't care about people like them.

Another woman from Hillsboro writes:

We are a family of pre-existing conditions and survive because we have insurance that we can afford. My husband works long, hard hours and has to work 60 hours a week for us to make it. I'm a teacher. I work about 18 out of 24 hours a day but make \$40,000 a year. We can't work any more than we already do.

Again, these are people who are working hard and who are doing everything right. They didn't ask to be sick. They didn't ask for their healthcare costs to go up. Are we going to put somebody on the court who wants to take away the consumer protections for people like this lady from Hillsboro?

These Americans work hard. They pay their premiums. Many of them deal with all that comes with caring for a child or a family member who has a chronic condition. How can Members of Congress and how can this President—all who have good insurance paid for by the taxpayers—stand by and allow activist, partisan judges to dismantle these protections that Americans rely on?

It is bad enough that so many Members of Congress want to take away these consumer protections. Now it is unelected judges the American public really doesn't know, and this body is about to put one more of them on the court, even more extreme and younger than so many other of these judges.

We can't afford another judge on the courts who will vote to take away Americans' healthcare, who will vote to take away Americans' voting rights, who will vote to take away Americans' civil rights.

I ask my colleagues to vote no on Chad Readler for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his statement and his concerns, and I am here today to join him on the floor to oppose Chad Readler's nomination to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I call on every Republican who said they were going to fight for families' healthcare coverage, protections for people with preexisting conditions, to prove they meant it by joining us.

I have heard my Republican colleagues claim time and again that they care about protections for people with preexisting conditions. I have heard

them say they want to tackle those skyrocketing healthcare costs. I have heard them say they want to help people get the care they need, but when push comes to shove, I have yet to see them join Democrats and actually vote to make that happen. In fact, they do have a long track record of working to move us in exactly the opposite direction.

People across the country have not forgotten how they had to speak up and stop Republicans from jamming through that awful TrumpCare bill, which would have spiked premiums and gutted Medicaid and put families back at the mercy of big insurance companies that could jack up prices for people with preexisting conditions.

Those people also will not forget if Republicans decide to ignore them again and rally around this judicial nominee, who wants to do the same damage.

Let's be clear. Chad Readler's nomination is the latest test of whether Republicans are serious about fighting for people's healthcare, and every Republican who supports him is failing yet again.

Make no mistake—Chad Readler has not only championed some of President Trump's most alarming steps, such as his travel ban, his family separation policy, his efforts to undermine protections for LGBTQ people and more; he has also been President Trump's right-hand man when it comes to undermining healthcare for people in this country.

When the Trump administration decided to abandon protections for people with preexisting conditions in court and throw its weight behind a lawsuit that would strike them down, Chad Readler signed on to the brief defending the decision. It is a brief that three other Justice Department officials refused to sign, and one even resigned over it. But Chad Readler led the Trump administration's legal argument for striking down protections for people with preexisting conditions, which will increase costs and throw healthcare for millions of people into utter chaos.

It was an argument one of my Republican colleagues, as you just heard, called "as far-fetched as any I've ever heard." I agree. It is farfetched, which is why it is also farfetched for any Republican who votes to confirm Readler to continue pretending they care about protections for people with preexisting conditions or helping families get affordable healthcare.

The choice, to me, is pretty simple and straightforward. You cannot be for protections for people with preexisting conditions and for making someone who wants to strike them down a circuit judge. You cannot fight for families' healthcare and vote to empower the very people who have been leading the charge to undermine it. You can't vote for Readler and stand with those families.

People across the country are watching this vote closely. They know, de-

spite Republicans' promises to fight for their healthcare, when it matters as it does here, when the care they need is truly on the line, Republicans have not come through for them.

I hope that changes today. I hope, instead of breaking their word and voting once more for President Trump's agenda of chaos and healthcare sabotage, they will live up to the promises and join us and people across the country and oppose Readler's nomination.

Before I wrap up, I want to talk about the larger issue here because Readler is not the only alarming judicial nominee from President Trump.

Just this week, in fact, Republicans jammed through Allison Rushing. She is an incredibly inexperienced circuit court nominee who has voiced some incredibly alarming ideological views, especially for women and the LGBTQ community.

Later this week we expect a vote on Eric Murphy. He is another nominee who has taken extreme positions on women's healthcare, from endorsing misinformation by signing on to briefs that cite false—false—claims about women's health to standing in support of laws that were found to unconstitutionally infringe on women's reproductive rights and against laws to increase access to contraceptive care.

People across the country have been absolutely clear that they do not want to see our courts lurch to the far right. They know this is a threat. It is a threat to women. It is a threat to our workers and our families and our environment and so much more.

So Democrats are here. We are going to keep standing up and fighting back every time President Trump and Senate Republican leaders try to move us in that direction, and I hope some Republicans will do the right thing and stand with us.

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. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today, the Senate considers the nomination of yet another unqualified, far-right nominee—Chad Readler, who is up for consideration for a seat on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Let me just say at the outset that any whiff of credibility this nominee might have had as a judicial nominee disappears the minute he puts his name on the Trump administration's absurd legal argument that protections for preexisting conditions are unconstitutional.

To get a sense of how ridiculous this argument is, you have to look at a bit of recent history.

In 2012, the Supreme Court ruled that the individual mandate was a tax, that

it was constitutional, and that the Affordable Care Act would stand. For millions of Americans, particularly the ones who wouldn't have to go to bed at night fearing that when they woke up, they could get discriminated against for a preexisting condition, just as in the old days—under the ACA, they wouldn't have to worry about that anymore—it was a joyful day when the court ruled that the Affordable Care Act would stand, but it was a tough day for the Republican strategists who had been so desperate to bring down the law at any cost.

Next, in the process of jamming the Trump tax law through Congress, in late 2017, many Republicans said: Let's bring out our old attacks on the Affordable Care Act. They passed an amendment that said there would be no penalty for those who failed to sign up for health insurance, even though everybody understands that those who have coverage often pick up the bills for those who don't.

Then, in 2018, Republican Governors and attorneys general in 20 States made what was really the silliest legal challenge to the Affordable Care Act yet, and that was in the case of Texas v. United States.

Here, they said they were going to stipulate that the Supreme Court upheld the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate only because it was a tax. Then they said: We establish that the Trump tax law dialed the penalty associated with violating the individual mandate down to zero. At least that had a kernel of accuracy.

Let me describe how they got into the backbreaking legal acrobatics next. They argued that because there is no penalty associated with violating the individual mandate, it is no longer a tax and somehow it has become unconstitutional. Finally, they argued that since the individual mandate is unconstitutional, the whole Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional and ought to be thrown out the window.

My own take is that if you were a first-year law student, you would get a failing grade for that kind of work on constitutional law, but let's stick to the history.

The Justice Department has an obligation to defend the laws of the United States. It is a quaint idea, but that is the role of the Justice Department—defending the laws of the United States in court.

The Trump administration, however, said: Who cares? It doesn't matter. And they sided with officials who shared their view.

In fact, the Trump Justice Department focused this attack specifically on the Affordable Care Act protections for preexisting conditions. It said that the mandate was inseparable from two key protections in the law, which therefore ought to be struck down: the rule that bars insurance companies from denying coverage due to preexisting conditions and the rule that bars insurance companies from jacking

up premiums based on preexisting conditions.

Here is a little bit of a recap. A group of officials on the far right, who were out of good cases to bring against the Affordable Care Act, said: Hey, let's try bringing a bad case. At the President's direction, the Trump Justice Department decided not to fight but, rather, to take part in this preposterous attack on the law of the land.

To the incredible distress of millions of Americans who walk an economic tightrope because they have a pre-existing condition, somehow the Trump people got a Texas judge to rule in their favor. Fortunately, the ACA protections remained in place while the case worked its way through the courts.

There are colleagues here in the Senate, on the other side of the aisle, who have objected to what the Justice Department did. Our friend Senator ALEXANDER, a Republican from Tennessee, who knows a little bit about healthcare, said: "The Justice Department argument in the Texas case is as far-fetched as any I've ever heard."

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER is a Republican from Tennessee, chair of a key committee, and works with us on the Finance Committee. The Justice Department's argument, according to Senator ALEXANDER, is just light years from a reasonable and rational position.

Then the Trump administration went ahead and threw out centuries of Justice Department tradition—honored by Republicans and Democrats—of defending laws as long as there is a nonfrivolous argument in their favor. They didn't decide to throw out that vital legal tradition in a case involving some obscure, out-of-date statute. In effect, they chose to debase the Justice Department and undermine the rule of law in order to attack protections for preexisting conditions.

Chad Readler is the Trump appointee who stepped up and said: Sure, you can put my name on that legal brief. So what Chad Readler was essentially saying is that it was just fine with him to go back to the days in America when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. That is really what you had if you allowed discrimination against those with preexisting conditions again. If you are healthy, there is nothing to worry about. If you are wealthy, you can write out a check and cover the payments for a preexisting condition and the health services you need.

Make no mistake about it—by putting his name on that legal brief, what Chad Readler was interested in doing was taking America back to yesteryear when the insurance companies could beat the stuffing out of somebody with a preexisting condition and find every manner of reason not to get them affordable care.

People were stuck in their jobs because of something called job lock, where they couldn't move to another company, even when they got a pro-

motion, because they wouldn't be able to get coverage. That is what Chad Readler wanted to inflict on Americans.

The case he worked on was so obviously political and meritless that three career Justice Department attorneys withdrew from it. One senior official, an individual who had been praised for 20 years of extraordinary service, actually resigned. Mr. Readler said that was OK with him too.

He said: We will take America back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. I don't really much care that senior officials—non-political officials in the Department—are leaving because this was such an extreme way to handle this case. Mr. Readler said that all of this was OK and that he would be the public face of attacking basic protections for 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

On the very same day, the President announced his nomination to sit on the powerful Sixth Circuit. That is a lifetime appointment on the Federal bench, an extraordinarily important position.

If there is somebody following the nomination at home, you just might ask yourself: Doesn't that sound look a quid pro quo?

I am the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, where we pay for much of American healthcare—Medicare, Medicaid, the children's health program, tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act, and we have the tax exclusions available to employers. On that committee, on which the Presiding Officer is a new member, you get a chance to review the credentials of lots of individuals who are involved in these decisions in which the Finance Committee is really faced with the question of how to make the best use of what is really \$2 trillion, or thereabouts, of healthcare spending, and I will tell you, in this area, it is so important to protect people with preexisting conditions.

The Trump administration just seems to have, with one nominee after another, an inexhaustible supply of far-right pretenders—persons who claim they will be for protections for preexisting conditions, only to turn around quickly and fight to take them away. So it ought to be clear that this isn't a routine nomination. Chad Readler thinks insurance companies should be able to deny care with people with preexisting conditions.

Colleagues, if you vote for Chad Readler, you are casting a vote to endorse the position of turning back the clock and rolling back time to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against those with a preexisting condition.

If Mr. Readler's history began and ended with the legal brief attacking preexisting protections, in my view, that would be disqualifying, but there is more.

He signed the Trump Justice Department legal brief green-lighting dis-

crimination against LGBTQ Americans in the Masterpiece Cakeshop case. He defended the transgender military ban. He defended the Muslim ban. He defended family separation at the border.

I am just going to close by way of saying that I think this nomination is a byproduct of what happens when the Senate abandons a long-held practice of consulting with home State Senators on nominees.

Since the early 1900s, it has been a tradition for the Judiciary Committee to seek input from Senators on judicial nominees from their home States. Lower court nominees traditionally don't move forward until those home State Senators give the green light. They do so with what are called blue slips.

In this case, the nominee is from Ohio, and the majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, is in the process of blowing up that tradition and moving this nominee over Senator BROWN's objection.

In 2009, when Republicans were in the minority, MITCH MCCONNELL and all of his colleagues fought to protect the blue-slip tradition. They wrote everybody in sight to protect it—President Obama, Senator LEAHY.

They wrote: "We hope your administration will consult with us as it considers possible nominations to the Federal courts from our states."

So they made it very clear a few years ago that they strongly supported this, but here they are blowing up a century-old tradition of bipartisanship on judicial nominees after defending it.

This issue came to a head last year, when the Senate took up the nomination of Ryan Bounds to the Ninth Circuit, despite objections from my Oregon colleague, Senator MERKLEY, and me.

We were able to block that nomination. It was the right thing to do. This was a nominee who we felt had not been straight with our judicial selection committee. As Oregon's senior Senator, I had been dealing with these nominees—Democrats and Republicans—for years, but our judicial selection commission had never felt so misled. Senator MERKLEY and I led the fight, and we were successful in defeating that nominee.

Now the White House still wants, apparently, this body to act as a rubberstamp and just approve one nominee after another without any questions.

I want my colleagues to understand that by moving this nomination forward, they are going to be responsible for creating a new reality—in effect hot-wiring the process for considering judicial nominees in a way that will take us back again to a more partisan approach.

The bipartisan blue-slip process has worked for over a century. What is going on now would end it. This is a breach of bipartisan protocol that has further driven the judiciary to a partisan extreme.

Following these actions by the Trump administration and the majority, I seriously question, if you continue this, whether the current structure of the courts is going to survive.

Colleagues, Chad Readler does not deserve a lifetime appointment to the Sixth Circuit. The moment he put his name on the Trump administration's absurd legal attack on protections for preexisting conditions, he revealed that he was going to be partisan all the way and, on top of that, that he was going to exercise poor judgment. He has been a defender of discrimination in multiple forms. He has defended the indefensible abuse of vulnerable migrant families at our border. At this point, he cannot claim to be close to the standard of impartiality and evenhandedness that a Senator ought to expect from any judicial nominee.

I intend to vote against Chad Readler. I urge my colleagues to join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I rise to oppose the nomination of Chad Readler to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I remember the 2018 campaign season, when so many Republicans suddenly became the world's most passionate defenders of patients with preexisting conditions. They told voters that never ever could they even imagine doing anything that would weaken the protections that stop health insurance companies from discriminating against people with preexisting conditions.

Whether they be breast cancer survivors or children born with birth defects or any of the tens of millions of Americans who manage chronic conditions like diabetes or depression or high blood pressure, well, Americans are about to find out whether my American colleagues meant a word of what they said on the campaign trail. Americans will soon see whether Republicans stand up for patients with preexisting conditions or vote to confirm Chad Readler to the Ohio Sixth Circuit Court.

This nominee's record of threatening patients with preexisting conditions is not up for debate. Chad Readler was the mastermind behind the Trump administration's effort to strip away the core of the Affordable Care Act—the principle that health insurance companies cannot deny coverage or kick a patient off their policy just because of their medical history.

On the campaign trail, President Trump spoke of protecting Americans with preexisting conditions, but we now know that was just another lie.

Apparently, it wasn't enough for this administration to stop defending the Affordable Care Act in court; the President sought to attack it in court. Initially, the Trump administration struggled to find someone at the De-

partment of Justice willing to take on this cause. In fact, three separate career attorneys at the Justice Department refused to argue the administration's position in court. One employee even resigned.

Chad Readler, the nominee we are voting on today, was more than happy to take on this cruel and unjust cause. He became the chief architect of the Trump administration's legal brief, challenging the very constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with preexisting conditions. In other words, Chad Readler's legal brief took the administration's effort to sabotage the Affordable Care Act to a whole new level, threatening to bring us back to a time when health insurance companies didn't have to cover cancer survivors, or individuals with substance abuse disorder, or anyone who has ever faced, ever confronted a health challenge in their life. How does President Trump reward Chad Readler for leading this assault on patients and their families? Well, the day after he filed this reckless and morally repugnant legal brief, the President nominated him to serve on the Sixth Circuit.

Now, let me tell you, I spent a lot of time crisscrossing New Jersey over the past year, and I don't think I met a single constituent who came up to me and said: Senator, what my family really needs you to do is once again let health insurance companies deny us care. On the contrary, I heard from and continue to hear from New Jerseyans who depend on these protections. They can't even believe this is still an issue.

Last summer, I spoke with a woman from Highland Park named Ann Vardeman who told me she was diagnosed with PTSD after surviving a sexual assault. Ann told me that health insurers shouldn't be able to "charge me more for something that is a horrible thing that happens to millions of people in this country through absolutely no fault of their own." Indeed, without the Affordable Care Act, there would be no Federal health protections for survivors of sexual violence like her.

Perhaps one of my constituents—Anne Zavalick of Middlesex, NJ—said it best when she wrote about her battle against bladder cancer. She wrote:

It is crucial that I continue to receive scans to make sure there is no recurrence of the cancer. . . . If I don't have coverage for preexisting conditions, I will go bankrupt. . . . Then I will probably die. So, yeah, this is kinda super important to me, personally.

It should be personal to all of us. Everyone in this body should take it personally when this administration attacks protections that 130 million Americans rely on for their health and financial security.

People remember what it was like before the Affordable Care Act, and they don't want to go backward. They remember how a woman could be denied coverage for maternity care or charged higher premiums simply for being a

woman. Today, being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition. They remember how infants born with heart deformities could hit lifetime caps within days of being born. Today, families don't have to worry about lifetime caps. They remember how cancer survivors and Americans with chronic conditions like diabetes or asthma lived in fear of being denied coverage or dropped from their policies at a moment's notice.

Today, patients are protected from discrimination, but they will not be if the courts side with Chad Readler's shameful arguments on behalf of this administration.

This issue is personal for millions of Americans across our country—from 3.8 million in New Jersey, to 4.3 million in Georgia, to 4.8 million in Ohio, Mr. Readler's home State. All told, 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions may suffer the consequences of Mr. Readler's assault on the Affordable Care Act. These Americans are not Democrats or Republicans or Independents; they are human beings with a right to access affordable, quality healthcare.

Does this Senate really want to reward someone largely responsible for endangering the coverage our constituents depend on with a lifetime appointment to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals? I sure hope not. That is not the kind of judgement we want on any court.

Last fall, we heard a lot of talk from Republicans about protecting people with preexisting conditions. We know that actions speak louder than words, and it is action that we need right now. We need every Member of this body to stand up for the right of all Americans to get quality healthcare coverage. We need every Member of this body to stand up for the proposition that Americans cannot be discriminated against in their healthcare coverage because of a preexisting condition. We need every Member of this body to vote against the nomination of Chad Readler for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I yield the floor.

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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you ask the Trump administration about their highest spending priority in terms of their budget, it is pretty clear—national defense. Over and over, the President has asked and Congress has voted for more money for America's military for operations, readiness, and investment across the board. I don't think there is any question that the votes reflect the bipartisan commitment to our military and the belief

that spending dollars today to train our men and women, to equip them properly, and to make sure they live in the best circumstances is in the best interests of America's future. We have done that year in and year out, but this year we are facing quite a challenge from the Trump administration.

This notion of building a \$5.7 billion wall is going to be paid for at the expense of the U.S. military. It is the military that will end up surrendering projects that are underway and investments in our troops that are underway so that the President can build this almighty wall of his that was supposed to be paid for by the Mexicans, right? I heard him say that—only 100 times, but I heard him say it. Now he is off of that. It will not be the Mexicans paying for the President's wall. It will be our military.

So we ought to be very honest about the vote that is coming up. President Trump has decided to declare an emergency and to say that regardless of the Constitution's giving authority to Congress to appropriate funds, he wants to take on that responsibility to decide where funds will be spent. That will be challenged in court, I am sure, as it should be. But for those Members of the Senate who in a few days will be asked to vote, I would like them to reflect on two things. Their vote supporting the President's approach is basically giving the authority of this branch of the government away to the Executive. Make no mistake, that is at the heart of it, and a number of Republican Senators—a handful—have stood up and said: We wouldn't have allowed this under a Democratic President; why would we allow it under a Republican President?

Yet others have said they are prepared to look the other way. If this President is popular back in their home States, the Constitution comes in second. I think that is a mistake.

Secondly, though, Members of the Senate, before they cast this vote giving this President the authority to take money out of our military to build this wall, ought to stop and take a look at where the money is coming from within our military.

I am in the fortunate position to be the ranking member on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is the biggest appropriations job on Capitol Hill, and I am happy to have Senator SHELBY, a Republican from Alabama, as my chairman of the subcommittee. I am the ranking Democrat on that committee. We have the biggest appropriation bill when it comes to discretionary spending—some 60 percent of the Federal discretionary budget, and we know how important it is to get it right. America never wants to come in second in a war, and we certainly never want to be in a position where we are mistreating or ignoring the needs of our men and women in uniform.

Each year we go through their requests and try to make sure the most important things are funded. The mili-

tary will tell us: There are certain things that are essential and timely, and we need you to spend money on them. And we have responded, not just in the subcommittee and in the full committee but in the Senate and in the House.

Now comes the President and says: Not so, we are going to take the money that we told you was so critically important this year and spend it on the Mexican border to extend the wall—\$5.7 billion worth of it.

As I have met with the heads of the branches of our military service, we have asked basic questions. I did that yesterday to several generals and Secretaries who came before me. I said: Has the administration sat down with you in terms of your branch of the military and told you where they are going to take the money to build the wall?

Consistently, the answer is no, they don't know. We are days or weeks away from that money being taken.

What we have done is to prepare a chart through the Military Construction Subcommittee, which is chaired by Senator BOOZMAN, the Republican from Arkansas, and Senator SCHATZ, a Democrat from Hawaii. I asked them: Where are the unobligated projects? These are projects that have been authorized but haven't been started. They may have had basic engineering and preliminary estimates done and so forth. They are ready to let a contract. The money is sitting there ready to move forward, and these are the projects that are on the target list for President Trump when it comes to cutting the military to pay for his border wall.

We have a long list here. The list includes almost every State—certainly, every State that has anything near a military facility. The State of Illinois has several key projects that we consider to be essential. There is one in Peoria, IL. It is a fire crash and rescue station that needs to be upgraded for the safety of the men and women who work there and those who use that important airport, and there are other things within our State.

As I said, hardly any State is omitted from this list. Any Senator who is voting to give this President the authority to cut military projects and to stop the spending on military projects should realize that it may come home and require an explanation.

The Presiding Officer is from the State of Oklahoma. I tell him that four of the projects are in Oklahoma that are on the target list—the hit list—for cuts if the President decides to cut those projects or Illinois projects to fund this wall.

I have two or three specific ones that I would like to highlight today because they came to my attention. I thought it would be a shame—in fact, it would be just plain wrong—for us to cut the spending on these projects. Let me tell you about one of them that struck me first.

The Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps came to see me. He is a no-nonsense man. You can understand that if you come to be a four-star general in the Marine Corps, you get down to business in a hurry. We talked about some of the damage done at the premier training facilities for the U.S. Marine Corps. Last year, Hurricane Florence tore through the State of North Carolina. The Marine Corps happened to be one of the victims of that violent storm. The hurricane damaged roughly 800 buildings on base at Camp Lejeune, New River, and Cherry Point.

Here is an overhead shot that is not as graphic because it was taken after the hurricane, but the blue coverings on the tops of these roofs are an indication of the structural damage that was done to these buildings.

As I mentioned, 800 buildings on these bases were impacted and damaged by this hurricane. This overhead shot taken last month indicates the work that needs to be done before these buildings can be successfully inhabited by the Marine Corps and their families.

I have a photo of the Camp Lejeune chapel, too. There is not much left of it. That is an indication of the damage that was done there. This is a worker walking outside of the chapel. That is what is left of the chapel. Insulation is falling from the ceiling. There is no good reason to prolong the cleanup.

The Marine Corps said they want to get down to work as quickly as possible and restore this training facility for the good of the Marine Corps and for our Nation, but this is on the hit list for the President for the wall at the border.

What else needs attention this year? The U.S. Air Force needs \$750 million to begin cleaning up Tyndall Air Force Base, which was leveled by Hurricane Michael. The Army leaders need \$1 billion for everything from more training to jump-starting new technology to keep our troops safe and effective in the battlefield. The Navy has asked for hundreds of millions of additional dollars for unexpected ship maintenance. We can't afford to shortchange the men and women in the Navy. We saw what happened not that long ago with the fatal accidents involving Navy maneuvers and exercises. We never want that to happen again.

The National Guard has 2,100 personnel on the border, but it is starting to run low in its pay account. So it was hoping some of these unobligated funds, at least a small part of them, might be used so they can continue their border mission.

Unless the Department of Defense finds \$150 to \$300 million this year, the National Guard will have to cut short its summer trainings in all 50 States.

My subcommittee has identified almost \$5 billion in military priorities that need attention today, but after President Trump takes half of that—\$2.5 billion to pay for his border wall—which priorities will get cut?

The President has also decided to cut or delay \$3.6 billion in military construction projects. The President might not think these projects are timely or important, but it was just weeks or months ago when the administration said just the opposite and asked Congress to appropriate money—examples: \$800 million for essential training facilities like the National Guard readiness centers, simulators and firing ranges in the States of Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Montana, to name a few; \$1.4 billion worth of maintenance-related projects such as aircraft hangars and vehicle maintenance shops in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma, not to mention many other States affected; \$1 billion worth of projects for medical and dental care facilities for the men and women in uniform; schools for military families, military barracks, and other essential facilities in Arizona, Missouri, Texas, and beyond.

Fort Campbell, KY, needs a new middle school for military children. The current building dates back to 1967 and is in serious disrepair. We were told that was a priority, but it could be stopped, cut, and eliminated if we are not careful to build this wall.

Also on this list is a new rifle range at Parris Island, SC, a training base for 20,000 new Marines every single year.

There is a new training center at Fort Bragg, NC, to provide top-notch training and prevent injuries among our Special Forces. They are using an old warehouse right now, and they want a modern facility. If it were your son or daughter serving our military at Fort Bragg, you would give them nothing less. The list goes on and on.

Are we really going to tell our military—the very people who are protecting and defending this Nation—that the needs they have identified and we have appropriated money for are going to be put on hold because President Trump made a campaign promise that he can't keep—that the Mexicans were going to build the wall?

Republicans and Democrats in the Senate should join the House in rejecting the President's emergency declaration. The Senate should reject any effort by the President to take money from our troops, from the military—from the Marines, from the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, the National Guard units—to build this wall. We may not agree on much, but we used to agree on fundamental things. The Department of Defense was a priority. The men and women serving there deserve not only our gratitude but the investment in their training, operations, readiness, and a way of life that shows our respect for what they are doing in service to this country. We can do nothing less.

When we face the vote—quite likely a week from today or tomorrow—on whether we agree with the House, I hope that the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, will put the national defense of our Nation first and our mili-

tary first and vote no on President Trump's effort to extend this emergency designation and to try to assume constitutional responsibilities beyond what is already written.

We are a branch of government—article I of the Constitution. Our responsibility is to appropriate funds. When we give away that responsibility, we walk away from the reason we were elected. I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will consider that as we face this historic vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Mr. Chad Readler to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court.

There are certainly many reasons to oppose Mr. Readler's nomination. His track record paints a very clear picture of what he values and what he does not. Mr. Readler fought to uphold President Trump's travel ban that targets people because of their religion. He has argued in favor of a business turning away customers simply because they are LGBT. He worked to unravel programs made during the past administration that would ensure low-income workers would actually receive their hard-earned benefits. Of the things that Mr. Readler values, protecting Americans from wrongful acts of discrimination is clearly not among them.

Yet it still remains difficult for me to understand why Mr. Readler—and any of my colleagues who choose to advance his nomination today—would support going back to an era when health insurance companies are allowed to discriminate against people with preexisting health conditions. I have heard plenty of my colleagues from across the aisle make public statements in favor of preexisting coverage protections. That is probably because they hear, like I do, from people all across my State who fear losing coverage as a result of having that pre-existing condition.

What are preexisting conditions? Well, it is things like diabetes, asthma, or even high blood pressure, and they are a reality for over 4 million Michiganders. This range of fairly common to fairly complex conditions is experienced by one in every four children, over half of the female population, and 84 percent of adults in their late fifties and in their sixties.

Today, there is a broad consensus that we need a Federal law in place that prevents insurance companies from denying coverage or jacking up prices based on someone's health status, their age, or their gender. We have a law on the books right now that protects people with preexisting conditions, but this law must be defended, not undermined.

I worked hard to pass this important coverage during my first term in the Congress, and I have fought to preserve it every day since then. Although this

fight has been successful so far, it is based on the premise that the laws passed and upheld by Congress will be defended in court. Yet the Department of Justice Civil Division, under Mr. Readler's leadership, decided not to do so. His actions fit into the story of the Trump administration's ongoing partisan efforts to sabotage our healthcare system and dismantle strategies that would lower premiums and expand quality, affordability, and coverage, generally. The President is constantly looking for ways that he can sidestep Congress and attack legislation that has brought health insurance to over 20 million Americans and cut Michigan's uninsured rate in half.

We should not be advancing a Federal court nominee whose disregard for the rule of law comes at the expense of the health and the financial stability of millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote no on Mr. Readler's nomination and his track record of promoting discrimination.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST, for organizing this opportunity for several of us in the Senate to discuss the Green New Deal and to do it this week.

To put it mildly, the Green New Deal is ambitious. To frame it more accurately, it is an unworkable, pie-in-the-sky attempt to reshape every aspect of everyday Americans' lives.

First, let me say that I am proud of my record in successfully advancing the availability and affordability of renewable energy. Many have called me the father of the Wind Energy Incentives Act. I suppose after—what?—probably 26 years, that makes me the grandfather of the Wind Energy Incentives Act. My legislation sought to give this alternative energy source the ability to compete against traditional, finite energy sources. At that time, we never knew about fracking for natural gas and for oil. We thought we were going to be completely dependent upon Saudi Arabia for our energy. Now we know that is not true, but back in 1992 and before, we did everything to think up every alternative energy we could in order to be less dependent upon the Saudis. One of those acts that I was involved in was wind energy.

The wind energy bill—now law—has been extremely successful. Iowa supplies more than 35 percent of its own electricity from wind. We were the first State in the country to generate more

than one-third of its electricity from wind. Wind energy employs approximately 7,000 Iowans, and the nearly 3,000 wind turbines in Iowa generate millions of dollars in economic activity. So I want to make it very clear that I am speaking as someone who has a very successful track record of advancing clean energy.

Think about what the Green New Deal is about. Presumably, they don't know we have been this successful because the Green New Deal, on the other hand, is nothing more than a grab bag of vague aspirations. In fact, the Green New Deal was initially introduced in the House and Senate by its authors as a nonbinding, symbolic resolution—in other words, a lot of hot air. That means that even if it were to pass as introduced, it would not become law. I am glad that Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL reintroduced the text in a format that could become law so we Senators could go on record as to whether we would want to make this the policy of the United States.

It would be one thing if the policy and goals remained on topic—namely, reducing pollution and cutting our Nation's carbon emissions. Those are worthy goals. Yet the resolution reads like a utopian manifesto that seeks to implement every liberal policy priority from the past many decades.

We have seen extreme leftwing agendas that rely on the power of the State and that usurp the role of individuals. How will those policies turn out? We have plenty examples. Look at the former Soviet Union. Look at Cuba over the last 60 years. Look at what has happened to Venezuela in the last 15 years. It has gone from the richest country in South America to a destitute country in which they die of malnutrition and people can't get medicine. In more instances than in the three I have just given you, these utopian ideas never turn out very well.

Sure, the Green New Deal includes goals that are related to energy and the environment, but for the most part, they are wholly unrealistic. For example, their calling for the upgrading of all existing buildings or, in another statement, their meeting 100 percent of the power demands of the United States through clean, renewable, zero-emission energy sources—all within the next 10 years—is simply not feasible.

Of course, no concrete proposals are put forward on how this is to be achieved. The Green New Deal just leaves us scratching our heads thinking about how all this would work.

There are a lot of questions. Would it require the government to mandate that every building owner in the United States make costly building improvements to meet national standards set here in Washington, DC?

Another question is, would every homeowner have to submit to government inspection to ensure that his or her home meets the standards dictated by the government?

Another question is, what government expenditures would have to be made, assuming all of this is even technologically possible, to go from about 17 percent of U.S. electricity generation coming from renewables today to a total 100 percent in 10 years?

The last question I will raise is, are the backers of the Green New Deal willing to support nuclear energy as a means to reach their goal? On this last point, I would conclude that a summary of the Green New Deal initially put out by the chief author in the House suggests a lack of support for nuclear energy.

As I have said before in my remarks today, I have been a leader on renewable energy production for decades, not just wind, as I have said, but geothermal, solar, biofuels, et cetera. So I am not just talking about being the author of the wind energy production tax credit.

During my leadership of the Senate Finance Committee in the 2000s, when I was chairman there, I oversaw the establishment, the enhancement, and renewal of numerous tax incentives that promote everything from wind and solar to renewable fuels like biodiesel, to energy-efficient homes, buildings, and appliances.

Unlike the unrealistic goals of the Green New Deal, these initiatives I just read are not only law, but they are real, proven, bipartisan actions that I shepherded into law to make the United States more energy independent and also, at the same time, improve our environment. Unfortunately, many of these key energy incentives I just mentioned are currently expired, and some of them have been expired for more than a year.

We had a real opportunity to extend these energy incentives as part of the appropriations deal reached earlier this month, but that was ultimately blocked by House Democrats—probably some of the same people who are promoting the Green New Deal. They seem overly focused on the lofty goals of the Green New Deal or, as Speaker PELOSI called the Green New Deal, “The green dream or whatever they call it, no one knows what it is.”

The House Democrats could not be bothered a month ago with extensions of existing and successful provisions that incentivize the type of investment they claim to have backed and not only tend to incentivize, actually have incentivized alternative energy over the last two and one-half decades—provisions that support millions of jobs for people who are actually willing to work.

Perhaps this just shows that the Green New Deal is less about tackling energy and environmental issues and more about remaking America into a dreamy new progressive paradise.

No sector of the economy is left unchecked by the Green New Deal—make no mistake about thinking otherwise. The authors of the Green New Deal are intent on reshaping every aspect of

American life through a “national, social, industrial, and economic mobilization,” and those last six words are in quotations.

Shaping American life through “national, social, industrial, and economic mobilization” that is eerily reminiscent of the 5-year plans of the former Soviet Union or of the Great Leap Forward under Chairman Mao of China.

Even the family farmer is not spared from its grand plans. The Green New Dealers want to remove what they call pollution and greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture through sustainable farming and building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food. Now, I am not against farmers taking actions to prevent soil erosion and minimizing pollution because we farmers do that already. We have been doing it for decades.

The recently passed farm bill invests more in conservation programs than any farm bill before. I trust that farmers know more and have more common sense about how to take care of their land than some bureaucrat in Washington, DC, or politicians from New York City. We all know Washington, DC, is an island surrounded by reality. So you put forth legislation like this, and it is just like 535 Members of Congress have all the knowledge in the world to tell 310 million other people what they ought to be doing.

I don't believe all those smarts rest in the Congress of the United States or even the bureaucracy of this government. Over the last several years, when it comes to farming, we have seen farmers readily adopt the use of cover crops to prevent nutrient runoff and to sequester carbon in the soil through what we call minimum or no tillage.

Today farmers may go down as the first group in history to leave the land better than they found it for future generations. Moreover, every indication is that these calls for sustainable farming and a sustainable food system go well beyond farmers being good stewards of our natural resources. It appears to be intent on changing everything from how we farm to what we farm.

A fact sheet released by the House author, shortly after introduction, made this perfectly clear. It notes a desire—now, listen to this—it notes a desire to rid the planet of methane gas-emitting cows. In case the authors are unaware, all cows and all people emit methane. It is part of the natural digestive process. The only way to stop these emissions is to ban animal agriculture. That proposal couldn't be more disconnected or out of touch with Americans.

That is what makes the taxpayers feel there is nobody in Washington, DC, who has any common sense, but don't worry. According to the authors of the Green New Deal in the House, “It is not to say you get rid of agriculture or force everybody to go vegan.” This doesn't instill much confidence in the

farmer about the real intentions behind the Green New Deal.

I am amazed by the scope of what the authors would have the government impose on the American people.

I will end by noting that I am interested in working with my colleagues on sensible policies to secure our energy independence and improve our environment, but I fear this will not be possible as long as my Democratic colleagues remain intent on handing over the country to the government to remake it in Washington, DC's, image.

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.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Chad Readler to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

This nomination, if confirmed, would be advanced without the support of one of his home State Senators, and it deliberately ignores Senate precedent that has historically respected Senators' ability to identify nominees that best fit the needs of their State.

In his current position at the Department of Justice, Chad Readler led the legal briefs for some of the Department's most extreme positions.

He defended President Trump's travel ban, led efforts to end DACA, supported the inclusion of a citizenship question on the 2020 census, suggested that the structure of the CFPB was unconstitutional, and argued that businesses should be able to refuse services to same-sex couples.

Mr. Readler also led the DOJ's legal brief for the Texas v. U.S. lawsuit, arguing against the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with preexisting conditions, even while three other career attorneys at the DOJ refused to do so.

Think about that for a second. This nominee took up his pen and drafted a legal opinion at the Department of Justice that stated it was fine for his Department not to defend the law—a law that protects millions of Americans' access to the critical healthcare they need.

If that weren't enough to shock the conscience, Mr. Readler's nomination to the Sixth Circuit judgeship was announced the same day the brief was filed.

Is that a coincidence? Maybe, but since three other career lawyers at the Department of Justice resigned rather than draft this brief and violate their duty to the law, I think it is fairly obvious.

This administration has made it crystal clear that Mr. Readler was chosen because of his willingness to dis-

mantle the ACA and completely eliminate critical protections that ensure seniors, kids, and families in Nevada and across this country are able to get health insurance, regardless of whether they have a previous medical condition. For many Americans, denying vital healthcare protections and access to care is truly a matter of life and death.

President Trump and Republican leaders have promised to sabotage our healthcare from day one, and this nomination is another example in a long line of legislation, nominations, and Executive actions aimed at ripping away healthcare coverage from hard-working families in Nevada and across the country.

The Affordable Care Act is, quite simply, the law of the land. Its patient protections have wide bipartisan support, as evidenced by Congress's inability to pass ACA repeal. Since its inception, over 400,000 Nevadans have gained healthcare coverage, including 158,000 children. Tens of million more Americans across the country have gained access to affordable health insurance, prescription drug coverage, mental health services, and preventive care.

The ACA's provisions have also guaranteed that over 1.2 million Nevadans with preexisting conditions will not be denied coverage because insurance companies deem them "too risky" to cover.

We cannot go back to the day when women, veterans, cancer survivors, and children with disabilities were charged more for healthcare or were flatout denied coverage.

Americans need us to work together to defend their access to quality and affordable healthcare, not just in Nevada but across this country. Yet Mr. Readler has shown us that he would instead take us backward, unravelling more than a decade of progress and wreaking potential havoc on our economy.

This nominee has demonstrated that he is willing to carry water for this President's political interests and not serve in the best interest of Americans.

I oppose Mr. Readler's nomination because Americans deserve a judge who respects the rule of law and interprets the law based on statute, not the political needs of this or any administration.

I oppose this nominee because Senate Republican leaders are trying to jam him through without the support of one of his home State Senators, which is a direct attack on our constitutional role as U.S. Senators to advise and consent.

I want my colleagues to know that a vote in support of his nomination is a vote in support of unleashing chaos on the American health system, eliminating preexisting condition protections, and one that would result in millions more uninsured.

Mr. Readler is a dangerous choice, who has a long track record of supporting the most extreme legal posi-

tions, which makes him unfit to sit on any court, much less one whose decisions will impact millions of Americans.

Thank you.

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.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to join over 10 colleagues to speak in opposition to the so-called Green New Deal.

Merriam-Webster defines a deal as "a bargain" or "an agreement for mutual advantage." By its name, you would think that Americans are going to derive some benefit from it, but this couldn't be further from the truth.

The truth is that this proposal is a raw deal for America, especially our rural communities.

As many of you know, every month I give out a Squeal Award, which draws attention to outrageous examples of wasteful and reckless spending of taxpayer money.

With a \$93 trillion—trillion with a "t"—pricetag, which is roughly \$10 trillion more than the entire recorded spending of the U.S. Government since 1789, this month's Squeal Award goes to the Green New Deal, which, again, I think is kind of a raw deal.

Just think about that number—\$93 trillion. To fund this radical government takeover, every American family would have to pay about \$65,000 annually. Folks, that is more than most Iowa households bring in in a year.

The ideas presented in the Green New Deal used to garner support only from the furthest fringes of the political left—the furthest fringes. Concepts like rebuilding every building in the country, outlawing fossil fuels, and guaranteed jobs would never have made their way into mainstream discourse just a few years ago. Now our Democratic colleagues are trying to make them mainstream.

In fact, 100 of the 282 Democratic Members of the House and Senate have signed on to support this plan. This is the creep of socialism into America.

If you work in a part of the energy industry that has fallen out of favor, your job has no place in the country. That is what is envisioned by the Democrats.

The Green New Deal states that one of its goals is to meet "100 percent of the power demand in the U.S. through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources."

Don't get me wrong, folks—don't get me wrong—increasing our reliance on renewables is a good goal and one that I support, but we have to be realistic about our current energy capabilities and our needs.

Private sector investment and innovation, coupled with government support and incentives, have contributed to significant advances in renewable energy.

I am proud to say that my home State of Iowa is one of the Nation's leaders in renewable energy, with wind providing nearly 40 percent of our electricity. That is more than any other State in the Nation. With more wind coming online, coal went from producing 76 percent of our electricity in 2008 to 45 percent of it in 2017.

I would note that this transition toward renewables happened largely as a result of State policies and community engagement, not heavyhanded government regulation.

Another one of the "goals" I find most interesting in this unrealistic proposal is that of providing "guaranteed jobs." What may be lost on the Democrats is that the best guaranteed jobs program is not housed in a government building; it is a strong economy like the one we are living in right now—not one bogged down by job-killing regulations and punitive tax breaks.

If you want proof of this, look no further than Iowa. Our unemployment sits at a low 2.4 percent, and we have over 63,000 job openings and about 40,000 folks looking for work. That is more job openings than there are people actually looking for jobs.

Lastly, I would point out that as a part of this proposal, our Democratic colleagues want to overhaul transportation systems in the United States. If you live in places like New York City, you can walk to a grocery store, but in rural communities like my hometown of Red Oak, IA, it can take you 30 minutes to drive to a Walmart. I am not talking about 30 minutes of driving to a Walmart in city traffic; I am talking about 30 minutes of driving, probably not meeting any cars at all on the road.

Everything from combines to tractors and to the trucks that transport our grains to market would be impacted. The Green New Deal is unrealistic and would unfairly impact rural communities across this country.

Folks, we have a clear choice. We can continue to support rural America and pro-growth economic policies that boost our economy and create jobs or we can allow socialist fantasies like the Green New Deal to creep in, take hold, bankrupt our Nation, and devastate our rural communities.

I yield the floor to my colleague Senator CORNYN.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to a question?

I am interested in whether she believes that climate change is real, caused by humans, and requires Federal action.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I will yield.

I do believe that climate change is real, and we have seen climate change for centuries, Senator SCHATZ. So, for my colleague from Hawaii, we have seen climate change; there is no doubt about that.

But what I am debating here today and what we are speaking on is right here: \$93 trillion, and we want to get rid of all fossil fuels within 10 years, folks—10 years. We can't drive a combine. We can't harvest our food. For heaven's sake, we have to be realistic.

My home State of Iowa has taken advantage of ingenuity and innovation and developed a process where wind energy contributes 40 percent of our electricity.

Now, with the new wind energy field that is being put in by MidAmerican Energy in the western part of the State, where I am from, in the next 2 to 3 years, 80 percent of our electricity will come from wind energy, and it didn't take big government or socialism to put it into place.

So thank you very much.

I yield the floor to Senator CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President.

Mr. SCHATZ. Excuse me, Mr. President. May I ask a followup question through the Chair?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has yielded the floor to Senator CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President.

Mr. SCHATZ. I just would like to get clarification. She did say climate change is real, but my question is whether—

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. SCHATZ.—manmade climate change is real, and I did not get an answer.

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order.

Mr. SCHATZ. If she's unwilling to answer that question, I understand.

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SCHATZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week, I spoke on the Senate floor about the perils of socialism. I never thought in my entire life that I would have to do something like that, but given the rise of democratic socialists, which obviously is a contradiction in terms, I think it is important to remind the American people about the failures of socialism, as well as radical policies like the ones the Democrats are trying to push off on the American people.

If you want to know what command and control economics is and what it would mean to our freedom and our liberty, all you need to do is look at the Green New Deal. This is really nothing more than an attempt to mask this power grab by the Federal Government in feel-good environmental policy by mixing ideas like Medicare for All and guaranteed jobs and unrealistic economic and environmental policies.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. With net zero emissions—

Mr. SCHUMER. Will my colleague from Texas yield for a question instead of just filibustering what he says?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CORNYN.—yield for a question after I conclude my remarks, not to be interrupted.

Mr. SCHUMER. I simply want to ask the Senator—

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SCHUMER.—if he believes climate change is real—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER.—or caused by humans.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President.

Mr. SCHUMER. We know what he is not for. What is he for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will yield. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am not for socialism. I am not for Washington, DC, thinking they know better than what my constituents know about.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield for a question and say what he is for?

Mr. CORNYN. I will not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will he yield for a question stating what he is for, not what he's against but what he is for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if the Democratic leader will just be quiet—

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORNYN. If he will be quiet for a minute, I will tell him what I am for, if he will quit interrupting.

So what this is is an attempt—is purely a power grab here in Washington masked as a feel-good environmental policy, mixing ideas like Medicare for All and guaranteed jobs with wildly unrealistic and radical environmental policies like zero net emissions transportation systems and guaranteed green housing.

Since this resolution was proposed, it has gained the ire of people on both sides of the aisle, something we don't see that often, and something that I don't know that I have ever seen. One of this bill's authors refers to the majority leader's intent to bring this resolution to the floor as sabotage.

Ordinarily, when you introduce an idea to the U.S. Congress, you are begging the majority leader to put it on the floor—the committee chairman to put it through committee so you can advance your idea. When the majority

leader said he would do that for the Green New Deal, it was called sabotage.

Since the Green New Deal was rolled out, things in Washington have gotten increasingly wacky and, believe it or not, even crazy.

We recently put a pricetag on the Green New Deal. You heard the Senator from Iowa talk about the \$93 trillion. That is so much money that I doubt most of us can wrap our brains around it. It is kind of like when somebody tells you the Earth is 140 million miles from Mars. How do you conceptualize that? You have no point of reference to understand just how far that really is.

Let me put it this way: If you combine the gross domestic product of every single country in 2017—every single country on the planet in 2017—the price of the Green New Deal would be higher than that.

If you total up how much the United States has spent—the U.S. Government, since the Constitution went into effect in 1789, the price of the Green New Deal would still be higher.

If you total the value of 1 year's worth of oil and gas production in Texas, it would take almost seven centuries of production to pay for the Green New Deal.

Margaret Thatcher, who had a gift for words, said: "The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money." Well, in this case, you don't even have the money to begin with, but that is what this is really about.

This is the antithesis of what our Founders believed in when they founded the United States of America. They believed that checks and balances and separated powers were protections of our individual liberty and our right to make decisions for ourselves and our families.

They viewed the concentration of power that would be necessary to do something like the Green New Deal as the opposite—antagonistic to individual liberty.

Mr. President, things like eradicating air travel clearly aren't the answer, and the Senator from Hawaii would say that wouldn't work very well if you tried to get to Hawaii from Washington, DC.

No matter what your perspectives on energy are or the environment, I think every one of us can single out something we can agree on; that is, smarter policies that will not bankrupt our country.

The solution is not the Green New Deal or another government power grab. It is all about innovation—

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President.

Mr. CORNYN.—the creativity of Americans—

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President.

Mr. CORNYN.—doing research and science to come up with—

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President.

Mr. CORNYN.—innovations.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the Senator yield for a second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. He has declined to yield.

Mr. MARKEY. I would just seek to be recognized and just ask the Senator if the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not yielded.

Mr. MARKEY.—\$93 trillion number comes from a Koch brothers-funded organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend.

The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I notice one thing: When people around here—colleagues across the aisle—don't like what they are hearing, they try to suppress or drown out dissenting voices.

I think the American people need to hear this debate because our ability to innovate is critical to the success of our economy and our competitiveness in the global economy.

Investing in science and technology and increasing our ability to innovate is an important part of keeping our economy strong. Rather than the government's seizing control of nearly every industry, overregulating their activities as you would under the Green New Deal, we should harness the power of the private sector to drive real, affordable solutions, and that is how we find cutting-edge solutions to our biggest challenges.

A lot of folks try to paint with broad strokes about energy. You are either on the side of innovation and new technologies or you are in favor of traditional oil and gas development.

Well, I am proud to come from a State that believes truly in an "all of the above" approach. We generate more electricity from wind than any other State in the country, and we believe in all of the above. You don't have to pick one or the other.

Not only do we lead the Nation in oil and gas production, we also lead, as I said, in wind energy production too. We are proof that you can implement policies that get government out of the way and leave industry experts to do their jobs. You can be pro-energy, pro-innovation, and pro-growth.

The Green New Deal is not the answer to our problems. It is a solution in search of a problem, and it is a naked power grab by Washington, DC, seeking to impose on each and every American how we should run our lives.

It is the opposite of the individual liberties and freedoms that our Founders believed our country would be based on. I hope in the coming months we will take steps to promote freedom and not more government control and ideas that lead to innovation, not socialist policies.

With that, I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my colleague said he would yield to a question after he finished debating. I would like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleague a question. I appreciate that.

Just three: No. 1, does he believe that climate change is real? Does he believe it is caused by humans? And does he believe this body ought to do something about it?

I would appreciate an answer.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will say to my friend from New York that I know what their talking points are now, but I don't believe what we ought to do about the environment is impose a travesty like the Green New Deal.

This is a government power grab. It is unaffordable. It is unrealistic. And, really, this reflects the most radical ideology and fringe of the Democratic Party today.

I think we should not have a socialist power grab of our entire economy.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator—Mr. President, will he yield? He didn't really answer my question.

What will he do about climate change? I ask my colleague to please answer not what he is against but what he is for. We have not heard from the other side of the aisle anything they are for about climate change or whether they believe it is real and caused by humans.

I would ask my colleague, once again, not what he is against. We know what he is against. What is he for?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there is a great book called "SuperFreakonomics" written by some Chicago economists who talk about the threat to the environment of horse manure back when we had horse-drawn buggies in our cities because the internal combustion engine had not been created. They point out that that environmental hazard went away almost overnight because the internal combustion engine was created.

Likewise, when I was growing up, a scientist named Paul Ehrlich from Stanford wrote a book called "The Population Bomb." He said that millions of people would starve across our country and across the world unless we basically quit having children. What he miscalculated is the impact of a gentleman by the name of Norman Borlaug and the Green Revolution that he began due to research and development of an innovative plant gene research.

So we were able to basically defeat the population bomb, and we were able to deal with the environmental hazard of horse manure by innovation. That is what I am for, that is what I said, and that is what I would say again to my friend from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the so-called Green New Deal. This unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic proposal is bad for all Americans, but it is especially bad for the people who live in my home State of Indiana.

Indiana is the most manufacturing-intensive State in the country, and my Hoosiers are rightfully proud of that distinction. We make America's planes, our trucks, our recreational vehicles, our boats, and our pipelines. We produce the aluminum and steel that go into those products. We mine the coal that makes it affordable to power all of those factories.

Indiana is home to those respectable, high-paying jobs because of the highly skilled Hoosier workforce, our world-class infrastructure network, and, yes, our low energy costs. But the Green New Deal would crush Indiana's affordable energy prices, forcing the cost of doing business to skyrocket for Hoosier manufacturers and farmers alike and eliminating jobs in the process.

What would this Green New Deal mean for American families?

Over the next decade, the so-called deal would cost up to \$65,000 per American household per year. That is roughly the 50 percent—47 percent more than the median Hoosier household income.

Yes, America must continue to support an "all of the above" energy strategy, and I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to get that done. We must continue to develop renewable energy sources like wind and solar, but we must also continue to utilize our important baseload energy sources—that is your coal, your natural gas, your nuclear power. We simply cannot afford to eliminate these critical sources from our Nation's energy mix, and that is what the Green New Deal would call for.

In Indiana, approximately 92 percent of our electricity is generated by coal and natural gas—92 percent. Wind and solar account for just 6 percent of Indiana's electricity, and they cannot reliably and affordably produce the electricity Indiana needs.

So instead of turning a blind eye to coal and natural gas—energy sources that power America—let's continue to incentivize research and development. Instead of promoting job-killing legislation like the Green New Deal, we should be promoting proposals like the USE IT Act. This is bipartisan legislation put forward by my colleague from Wyoming that would promote carbon capture research and development.

We agree on the need to incentivize market-based carbon capture systems.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, would the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I would like to continue until I complete my remarks. I thank my colleague.

We really need to incentivize market-based carbon capture systems and ensure America can continue to cleanly and affordably produce baseload energy. By my reckoning, this is just one of many areas in which Republicans and Democrats can find common ground and work together to protect God's green Earth.

Indiana is an environmentally conscientious State. We continue to ex-

pand solar and wind production each year. We love to protect our important natural resources, such as the Indiana Dunes and Hoosier National Forest, but we cannot support a proposal like the Green New Deal that would endanger tens of thousands of Hoosier jobs. The Green New Deal is widely out of touch with Indiana's priorities. Hoosiers know a bad deal when they see one. This is a bad deal.

My fellow Hoosiers are greatly concerned that this radical proposal will cause utility bills to skyrocket and force Indiana factories to shutter. For these reasons, I am a resounding no on the Green New Deal. I stand with Hoosier farmers, I stand with Hoosier manufacturers, and I stand with Hoosier families in opposing this \$93 trillion deal.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I will.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, does the Senator believe climate change is real, and will he stand with the scientific community, which believes unanimously or almost completely that climate change is real and that human activity caused it?

Mr. YOUNG. Well, that is an easy one. I thank my good colleague. I have publicly said for a long period of time—and you can check my record—that I believe the climate is changing. I believe that all flora, fauna, and human beings have some impact on that. I also fervently believe that we can protect our environment without wrecking our economy. We can do that through energy efficiency initiatives, investment in energy R&D, carbon capture and sequestration, and adoption of free market principles.

I read a very impactful book, in response to my good colleague, early on in my adulthood, and I recommend it to him. It is titled "Ecocide in the USSR," and it explains how centrally planned economies and fatal, conceit-like efforts to engineer a better environment centrally, to plan an economy centrally, end up decimating our natural environment. That continues to have an impact on how I look at these issues. Perhaps we will find an opportunity to work together, though, and find some common ground. It won't be on the Green New Deal.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to join my colleagues in expressing concern over the maybe well-intended but poorly constructed policy in the Green New Deal.

First, I want to start by saying I have no intention of yielding until the end of my remarks, but the one question I would have for people across the aisle is, Do you actually support the Green New Deal? Do you support it in the form it has been proposed? I can't

imagine that you do because you understand the math, you understand the challenges, and you understand the reality that \$65,000 a year is the median household income in North Carolina.

So what we are talking about—the cost of the bill over 10 years is roughly what the average North Carolinian family makes. We know that is not sustainable. We know it is not sustainable to have our electric bills increase by \$3,800 a year. We know it is not sustainable to go beyond just the energy components of the Green New Deal to other aspects of the Green New Deal that just don't make sense.

So \$93 trillion is not something I can get my head wrapped around. I know that is the number we are talking about. But I think we can get to the household impact and recognize that it is not sustainable, right? So why are we having this discussion?

Mr. MARKEY. Would the Senator yield and tell us—

Mr. TILLIS. I do not yield.

Mr. BARRASSO. Regular order.

Mr. MARKEY—where he got that bogus number of \$93 trillion? That is a completely made-up number by the Koch brothers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend. The Senate is out of order.

The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has made it very clear that he will not yield until he is finished.

Mr. TILLIS. I will state for any other Members who come in that I have no intention of yielding. And in my time, in the 4 years I have been here, it has never occurred to me to interrupt in the way that we have been interrupted here, but maybe that actually gets to the point. This bill, as proposed, doesn't work.

I want to go back and tell you, as a Member of the North Carolina House, when I was in the minority as a Republican, I supported the renewable portfolio standard. I went to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and said: What you are proposing is not sustainable. Let's work together and do something different. And we did. That gave rise to almost 13 percent of all the energy generated in North Carolina today being generated from renewable sources. It gave rise to a sustainable electric bill that is one of the most competitive in the country.

What has happened with the Green New Deal is that the people at the extreme are preventing those of us who actually want to make progress from having a reasonable discussion instead of shouting over each other.

I don't care if it is \$93 trillion, \$43 trillion, or \$10 trillion—it is unsustainable. We can sit here and question the sources, but at the end of the day, we all know that this was theater. This was something that people

wanted to pitch. They wanted to win an election. But it was a dishonest promise that could never be fulfilled.

If you take a look at the other provisions of this bill—guaranteed jobs. I mean, it is reading like some sort of a socialist manifesto. As somebody who grew up in a trailer park and who didn't get a degree until I was 36 years old, I want an America that gives me an opportunity, not an America that tells me what my job is and how much money I am going to make.

So we have to have a realistic discussion about the Green New Deal. We are pushing people into corners and not having a good discussion about things we should be making progress on.

By the way, just out of levity, we even had some people go so far as to say that maybe we should reduce the number of cows we have on the planet because they create methane gas. I will not get into the gross reasons as to why. So maybe the chicken caucus is in favor of getting rid of cows or eating more cows.

Why don't we lower the temperature, recognize we have a proposal that doesn't work, and recognize it was generally motivated by politics. And when you take such an extreme stand, you should expect the other side to come to the floor, just as we are doing today, and make it real.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, we had a lot of discussion about the energy parts of the Green New Deal, but it goes into lots of other areas. There are many frequently asked questions.

I would say on the energy costs—and President Obama's energy adviser says you couldn't reach the goal—one thing we need to remember on the energy costs is that families pay those utility bills.

We just avoided a clean power regulation that in my State would have doubled the utility bill in 10 or 12 years. During the 3 years or so we were debating that because the court cases kept saying there really is no authority to do this, I kept reminding the people I work for, the next time you write your utility bill, just write out your check one more time, because if this goes into effect, within a decade, that is what you will be doing. See what happens when you pay that bill by writing your check one more time.

Some of the questions on this have been about other things as well. The fact that we love a challenge—this Green New Deal creates that. It talks about Medicare for all. At least in the talking points, it talks about job guarantees for all, a vacation in every job guaranteed by the government, and I think maybe even a vacation in the government program if you choose not to work.

There are lots of things here for people to be concerned about. There are estimates of cost, but even if they were three times the cost, it would be pretty extraordinary. In fact, \$36 trillion

would rebuild the entire Interstate Highway System every year for 100 years. When you are talking about \$93 trillion, \$80 trillion is the entire gross domestic product of the world. These are big numbers. It is a big bill.

Surprisingly, a dozen Senators are supporting this bill. They have cosponsored the bill. Whether it is the guaranteed jobs number or the universal healthcare number or the all-renewable electric grid system number or the guaranteed green housing number that individuals would have to comply with, this is an amazing step in a different direction. It is one that the country clearly will not take. It is one that I believe even the sponsors have some concerns about.

We will have a chance to vote on it here in the next few days or weeks, and we will see what the American people have to say about it.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand that the majority has the floor, and so I will be very brief. I have enormous regard for Senator BLUNT and for those who have spoken already. I just want to say that, for the people who say we want to have a discussion about this issue, we are so eager to have a discussion about this issue. I come here every week hoping to have a discussion about this issue, and I would love to have a discussion about this issue. I would love to have hearings in the Environment and Public Works Committee about a climate bill.

I would love to have people working together to solve this problem. I will say that Senator SCHATZ and I have a piece of climate legislation that is not this one, but it does have the support of seven Republican former chairs of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, six current and former Republican Congressmen, four former Republican EPA Administrators and Secretaries of Treasury and State, two former Republican chairs of the Federal Reserve, and one former Republican CBO Director. A Republican congressman referred to that bill as not just an olive branch reaching out to Republicans but an olive limb reaching out to Republicans.

I hope we can emerge from this with a real conversation about real bills, and in the context of that, we will be very interested to know what the Republican proposal is to deal with climate change.

I yield the floor.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I appreciate the courtesy of my distinguished colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from Iowa for organizing this discussion on the Green New Deal resolution.

The public doesn't usually pay a whole lot of attention to nonbinding resolutions here in the Congress, but

that is not the case with this one. The sponsors of the Green New Deal in the House and the Senate certainly deserve recognition for the profile they managed to create so quickly. Of course, that is a double-edged sword because now people are beginning to pay attention to what is actually in the Green New Deal.

Leader MCCONNELL has proposed bringing the resolution to the floor, which has created, in my view, sort of a baffling response. The planned sponsors are claiming that a vote is "cynical" and meant to "disrupt" their "movement." You and I both know that every Member of this body would clamor to have their bills brought up for floor consideration. Most of us here live in the land of realistic and practical solutions.

The Green New Deal is very vague, but it does include enough detail to know that it proposes radical solutions that, in my view, are neither practical nor realistic. It is a wish list dressed up as environmental policy.

We knew it was going to be expensive. We knew the goal was to eliminate coal and gas industries, along with a lot of other good-paying jobs that they support in energy States like mine. This isn't the first salvo in the war on coal, for sure. We knew all the economic harm they would be proposing, but this is a massive shift to the left that goes far beyond anything the Democrats have proposed before. This plan doesn't stop at eliminating the use of coal and natural gas for electricity. The plan also ends nuclear electricity and severely curtails the commercial air industry.

The environmental and energy components of this proposal are estimated to cost \$8.3 to \$12.3 trillion over the next decade, which averages out to about \$52,000 to \$71,000 for every American household.

We will be left with possibly an energy grid that lacks affordability and reliability to make the American manufacturers competitive around the globe and meet the basic needs of our families. Right now, coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy account for 83 percent of all the electricity produced in the United States. It is neither practical nor realistic to believe that we could phase all of that capacity out without some catastrophic consequences.

Unbelievably, this is just one piece of the Green New Deal. The sticker shock continues with tens of trillions of dollars to fund guaranteed jobs for people unwilling to work, eliminate private healthcare for 170 Americans in favor of a government-run system, replace or retrofit all housing stock for environmental compliance, and guaranteeing it to every American and putting food on everyone's table. Altogether, it could cost possibly \$93 trillion over a 10-year period of time. We could liquidate all the wealth in the entire country and maybe just cover that tab, but we wouldn't have anything left.

The Green New Deal sponsors claim the government will be making investments. They claim that the returns will pay for everything and make a profit for the people. Is this realistic or practical?

I think not. And if it fails, then what do we do?

Some say the Green New Deal, even if it is a disaster of a policy that would destroy our economy, at least has Congress finally talking about climate change. This is what we heard from my colleague. We serve on the EPW Committee together. It is a huge disservice, I think, to us. We have been working in a bipartisan fashion to deliver real solutions since before anyone had ever heard of the Green New Deal.

In the EPW Committee, Senators from coal States, such as Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming, who is here, and Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island, and Senator CARPER, and myself have been working for market-driven solutions to the challenge of atmospheric CO₂.

Members of both parties have worked and will continue to work on these important policies to meaningfully address carbon challenges while also protecting and creating jobs. We do not need a \$93 trillion turn that fundamentally alters the foundations of this country. We are capable of making investments in technology and infrastructure to address our Nation's challenges in a commonsense and bipartisan way.

The Green New Deal is not practical. It is not realistic, and it is a bit scary that so many Democrats are embracing it. The American people deserve to know where each of us stands on this policy. That is why we are going to have a vote. I am glad that we will have the opportunity to take a vote on this resolution in the coming months, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in opposing this utterly unfathomable and unworkable resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, although I had prepared my remarks to address what many of my colleagues have just covered—and that would be the preposterous proposal of the Green New Deal—I want to take a little different angle.

I think there is a point where so often those of us on the conservative side of the ledger, I think, get overwhelmed by the conversation being dominated by the other side. It is a fertile ground to want to try to use a better environment to parlay that incremental way into more government.

I think what we have here is just like addressing healthcare costs. We had ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—which turned out to be the “Uncomfortable Care Act,” but there were issues that were valid. In my own company years ago, I was worried about it. I drafted a plan that was proactive, ad-

dressed high healthcare costs, and made the pledge that you should never go broke because you get sick or have a bad accident. I crafted a plan through the real world that cut costs, and my employees have not paid a premium increase in 9 years.

I want to talk about the Green New Deal. I am a conservationist, and I am a member of the Nature Conservancy, as a business and an individual. We cannot let the other side co-opt the issue and preempt it because they think the argument is on their side. I am not going to belabor the point that I think it is preposterous. I want to make the point that if you think any of that can be done—whether it is \$50 trillion or \$93 trillion—keep in mind that we are running nearly trillion-dollar deficits. We are \$22 trillion in debt. Does that sound like anything that the Federal Government could actually solve in a sustainable way when we are in a pickle like we are currently in?

Until we change the dynamic here and get individuals who know how to do things where it works, in States like Indiana and in many States, and maybe let States have a bigger hand in the equation, where their budgets are balanced, where they have cash balances, and where it is not a false hope.

Let's look at the particulars of what the Green New Deal is supposed to do in addition to cleaning up our environment, which we have made great strides with. It is being spun as an economic argument. It is the exact opposite of that. I want to challenge folks on our side of the ledger, from the practical side, to where we generally lose out on the general argument, and, incrementally, things change against us over time.

We just had legislation pass in 2017. I want to tell this little story of what we did in our own special way. I am going to challenge enterprisers and I am going to challenge businesses across the country to think about this as a way to avoid that.

In 2017 we had, in my opinion—for enterprisers, small businesses, and farmers; and I have been involved in both—the biggest opportunity that has come along in years. We are keeping more of our own resources and not sending it here to a broken institution that has given us all of these deficits and debt, but we have to do something with it.

Back in January of 2018, my son, who is one of my three kids now in my business, said: Dad, let's take tax reform and share the benefits with employees.

That is a great idea. I didn't think it would have a bigger political meaning until he said: Hey, let's put it in the company memo that it is due to tax reform. We have taken, in my mind, the biggest thing we could do—whether you want to return the dividends into the environment, into higher wages, or into whatever you want to do—and we have had less than a year to run with it. All I know is that like many companies in Indiana, we lowered healthcare costs and flattened them for 9 years.

We raised 401(k) benefits. We started quarterly bonuses instead of just annual ones.

We are doing what I think this country needs to do—quit looking to the Federal Government to solve all of our problems, even when they have an argument like that we need to further improve our environment, that we need to avoid what could possibly be a catastrophe down the road, where we do stick our head in the sand.

Don't look to this institution to do it because I don't think you can credibly say that you can do anything in the context of the product that has been delivered over the last decade or two. States, individuals, businesses, organizations—but especially businesses, because we have reaped the benefits, in my opinion, of the biggest legislation that has occurred in decades—must put our money where our mouth is, where my company's is. Invest in your employees and change the system from the bottom up, not from the top down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank my colleagues for coming down here and having this important discussion. I want to thank my Democratic colleagues, for whom I have a lot of respect, for being here and having this debate. I am sure it is not going to be the first time that we are going to be doing this on the Green New Deal or other elements of proposals coming from the House or the Senate. This is a big issue happening in the House and what is going to happen over here with some of our colleagues.

I think, in many ways, it is an issue that focuses on the future and where the country is going. As the majority leader recently said in an interview, “I can pretty safely say this is the first time in my political career that the essence of America is being debated . . . of socialism and democratic capitalism.”

OK. Let's have that debate. We are having that debate. What is the essence of America? I believe it is freedom and liberty. That is what we are founded on, and that is what I think proposals like the Green New Deal would undermine. To be clear, some people are joking about it—like banning hamburgers or airplanes or returning to the horse and buggy, but I actually think there are many people who are looking at this very seriously, and so we should.

Some of these kinds of ideas can be funny until they are not funny. What we are trying to do here is to talk about this proposal in a serious manner. In my State, the great State of Alaska, this is a deadly serious matter. There is so much that is in this idea, the Green New Deal—government takeover, healthcare, free housing, and free food, and the list goes on and on. The costs, as have been pointed out, are very high.

Today what I want to do is to talk about one aspect that would be particularly detrimental to my State and

to many other States—my colleagues from West Virginia and North Dakota are here on the floor—and that is this proposal to ban hydrocarbons produced in America within a decade. This is not a joke.

There are many Members in this body—some are on the floor right now, and some are in the House—who think this is a serious proposal and would like to do it. I want to talk about that. I want to stipulate that I am certainly somebody who is in favor of “all of the above” energy. The fact that America is now producing more oil, more gas, and more renewables than any other country in the world is good for all of us, Democrats and Republicans.

My colleague from Rhode Island is here. He and I have worked on a whole host of issues together involving oceans. I think the technological advances with regard to hundreds of years of supplies of natural gas with technology and with renewables provide huge opportunities for Democrats and Republicans to work together to bring down greenhouse gas emissions. This is enormous. We are just scratching the surface.

I look forward to working with him and the Senator from Massachusetts on these kinds of ideas because I think they are exciting, and I think, when you are burning natural gas at very high temperatures, you almost have very little greenhouse gas emissions. Combine that with technology and renewables. We have hundreds of years of these supplies. It is a great opportunity, and it is exciting. I want to work with them.

Let me get back to the proposal on the Green New Deal on natural resources.

In my opinion, we do not spend enough time on this floor talking about the positive societal benefits of natural resource development in America—oil, gas, renewables, fisheries. These industries don't just fuel our power generation and transportation and electricity for our homes; these industries literally lift people out of poverty. They lengthen life expectancy. They literally save lives. There is a strong correlation between poverty, the lack of economic opportunity, and the health of our citizens.

I am going to show a few charts here. This correlation is strong in my State, particularly with our Alaska Native population. In 1954, the Interior Department, with the help of the University of Pittsburgh, conducted a study of the health of Alaska Natives.

Here is a quote from 1954: “The indigent people of Native Alaska are the victims of sickness, crippling conditions and premature death to a degree exceeded in very few parts of the world.”

Some of the poorest people on the planet were my constituents in Alaska—in America—in 1954. More than 10 years later, in 1969—just 50 years ago—the situation was still dire.

Here is what Emil Notti, the president of the Alaska Federation of Na-

tives, told Congress 50 years ago, in 1969:

The native people in rural Alaska live in the most miserable homes in the United States. The life expectancy of the average Native Alaskan is 34 years old compared to 69 years old for the rest of the country.

So what happened after that?

We had a big change. We are not there yet, but we had a big change, and I want to explain. This was a chart that was studied just last year in the *Journal of Internal Medicine*. It is a study that was published in 2018 about the life expectancies of Americans.

Where you see blue and purple is where Americans' life expectancy increased the most. The State with the greatest change in the entire country was in my State. By the way, that is a pretty important statistic—life expectancy. It doesn't get more important than that. Are you living longer? Look what happened in Alaska. The North Slope of Alaska, the Aleutian Islands chain, and the southeast all experienced huge increases in life expectancy from these very low levels, some of the lowest in the world.

Why did that happen?

On the North Slope of Alaska, this Congress passed the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act to develop Prudhoe Bay, to develop oil and gas—some of the biggest fields in the world. At the same time, we also had a very large zinc mine that came into production. Because of this body's Magnuson-Stevens Act, we also had a huge increase in our fisheries.

The bottom line is that natural resource development happened in Alaska, in America, and people's lives increased. That is a remarkable thing, and we don't talk about it enough. The average life expectancy increase in Alaska was almost between 8 and 13 years. That is a measure of success because we were developing our resources of oil and gas. That is why I am taking this Green New Deal literally deadly seriously because what we have done in our State and in our country by producing resources is we have created the ability for people to actually live longer, and I challenge my colleagues to come up with a better statistic and a more important statistic than that.

I am going to end with a quote from a gentleman who came down here and testified in front of the Senate, Matthew Rexford—a proud Alaska Native leader from Kaktovik, AK, which is in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. He testified that Congress should give his small community the opportunity to develop the resources near his village. We did that in 2017 after a 40-year debate.

He spoke firsthand about his knowledge as to what resource development did for America, for Alaska, and for his community:

The oil and gas industry supports our communities by providing jobs, business opportunities, infrastructure investment. It has built our schools, hospitals. It has moved our people from Third World living conditions to

what we expect in America. We refuse to go backward in time.

That is what he said. I believe the Green New Deal—certainly, its ban on hydrocarbon production—would take us back in time. For the sake of Matthew and all of these Alaskans who have done so well by responsibly developing our resources, we are not going to allow that to happen.

I yield the floor to my colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Does the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield my time to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not possible.

Mr. MARKEY. Would the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Alaska yielded the floor.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I would pose a question to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts cannot pose a question. He has the floor.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, through the Presiding Officer, I pose a question to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska does not have the floor. Therefore, he cannot respond.

The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I will just make this point through the Presiding Officer, which is that the words “fossil fuels” are not in the resolution. No. 2, airplanes are not banned in the resolution. No. 3, there is no guarantee for healthcare for everyone in America in the resolution. No. 4, there is nothing that provides for those who are unwilling to work in the resolution. None of this is true.

We know the Koch brothers paid for this \$93 trillion study, and all we are hearing from the Republican side is of a Koch brothers-produced document that is absolutely inaccurate. There is no banning of airplanes. There is no guarantee of Medicare for all. Neither of those is in the resolution. This entire discussion is based upon a completely fraudulent, bogus report that the Koch brothers produced.

What we are trying to say to the other side is we should have a debate about the science, that we should have a debate about the human activity, that we should have a debate about what the solutions are, and that we should bring it out here as a great deliberative body.

Right now, we are debating the Green New Deal, but the Republicans haven't given us any hearings. They have given us no scientists, no witnesses, and no debate. They are just doing this because the Koch brothers have produced a report at a cost of \$93 trillion that is completely and totally inaccurate. In fact, with regard to the accusation of the banning of airplanes, PolitiFact has looked at it, examined it, and said it is completely and totally inaccurate.

I think it is difficult to have a debate when the facts here are those which we cannot submit to committees, witnesses, debates. Instead, all we are subjected to is a representation of the Green New Deal that is completely inaccurate. For that matter, the words "fossil fuels" don't even appear in the Green New Deal.

This is not right. If the Republicans want to, they should set up a debate. Then we could have it out here on whether the planet is dangerously warming, whether human activity is principally responsible, whether this body should take action in order to deal with that problem, and whether, economically, we can unleash a technological revolution to solve the problem.

That is what we should be debating out here this afternoon, not a whole group of bogus facts that have been produced by the Koch brothers, have been paid for by the Koch brothers, and that are being repeated over and over again on the other side without any Republican saying he actually believes the planet is dangerously warming, that he actually agrees with the U.N.'s scientists who say it is an existential threat to us, that he actually agrees it is largely caused by human activity, and that we, the greatest deliberative body in the world, should have a robust debate. If the Republicans believe it is serious, they should present their own plan for debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we thank our friends on the other side of the aisle for helping to make our case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes, I am asking a question.

If the Senator from Massachusetts has the floor, I ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the leader for a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have been making the case for the last several weeks that our Republican colleagues love to get up and rant about what they are against even though they exaggerate and tell mistruths about the bill Senator MARKEY has sponsored. Yet we have been asking repeatedly, haven't we, three questions: Do you believe climate change is real? Do you believe it is caused by human

activity? Most importantly, what would you do about it?

Here we have had an hour of debate, haven't we, with our Republican colleagues, and there have been a lot of mistruths and a lot of "here is what we are against" but not one single thing they are for.

So isn't it true, my friend from Massachusetts, that they have helped to make our case? We are glad they are finally talking about climate change, but we have to do something about it. Isn't it true we haven't heard a single positive response about what they would do?

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the leader has put his finger right on it.

We want a debate. We want to see their plan. We want to know if they agree with the science of the entire United Nations and 13 of our own Federal Agencies that produced an identical report at the end of 2018—that being, it is dangerous and a great threat to our country, and we have to do something about it.

So where is the Republicans' plan? What is their answer? Of course, they don't have one. They want to bring out the Green New Deal with no hearings, no witnesses, and no science when they should be bringing out their own plan.

The leader is right. It is just, basically, a condition they have, and the number they are using—the \$93 trillion in terms of the cost of the Green New Deal—is a Koch brothers-produced number. It is their group that put it together. So how could we possibly be having a serious debate about something the Koch brothers have produced, in terms of dealing with global warming, since they are central players in this dangerous warming of our planet?

I yield to the leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I pose a second question.

Isn't it true that our Republican colleagues have been in the majority for 5 years and that during that time, more and more Americans believe global warming is a serious problem? I think it is above two-thirds. It is at 70 percent. It is a significant percentage of Republicans and a majority of Democrats and Independents. Isn't it true that in those 5 years, the Republican leader, our friend, hasn't brought a single piece of legislation to the floor that would deal with climate change in any way? Is that correct?

Mr. MARKEY. The leader is correct. No solutions, 5 years, and it is more dangerously warm on the planet. Four hundred billion dollars' worth of damage was done to our country in the last 2 years. We had fires out in the West, flooding, \$400 billion worth of damage—and the consensus among scientists is that it is only going to grow worse as each year goes by—and still no answers. Nothing on the floor from the Republicans, nothing that would deal with the problem, and no admission that it is caused by human beings and that we can do something about it.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, we have not heard a single answer from any of the

Senators on the floor or any who spoke about what their plan is.

So I would ask you to repeat and ask them three questions that they still haven't answered—simple questions with no predisposed answers.

A, do any of our Republican colleagues—this is a question—believe climate change is real?

Mr. MARKEY. We don't know the answer.

Mr. SCHUMER. Second, do any of our Republican colleagues over there believe it is caused by human activity?

Mr. MARKEY. We don't know the answer.

Mr. SCHUMER. And C, do they have any plan, proposal, suggestion as to how we deal with the issue?

Mr. MARKEY. We don't know the answer.

Mr. SCHUMER. And I would ask my colleague to ask our Republican friends—if they have an answer to any of those questions, to yield the floor to them.

Mr. MARKEY. And I would be glad to yield the floor to any of them who would be willing to be recognized, but, through the leader, the problem is that they keep talking about a \$93 trillion cost, which is a report from the American Action Forum, a partisan, right-wing group funded by the Koch Brothers and Karl Rove as a sister group to his Crossroads USA 501(c)(3). That is what we are now debating out here on the floor, and not the science.

Mr. SCHUMER. Can you ask them to not repeat the same talking points about what they are against and finally say something about what they are for?

Mr. MARKEY. I would yield to any of my friends on the other side of the aisle who have concrete, positive proposals for dealing with the crisis of climate change in our country and on the planet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor to answer those specific questions, and I would point to an op-ed that I wrote for the New York Times last year. Perhaps the Senator from New York doesn't read his hometown newspaper, but there is an editorial in the New York Times of December 18: "Cut Carbon Through Innovation, Not Regulation." It is a plan. Cut carbon through innovation, not regulation.

The question is, Do we believe the climate is changing? Do humans have an impact? The answer is yes to both. As a matter of fact, I wrote:

[The] climate is changing, and we, collectively, have a responsibility to do something about it.

It is right here in the New York Times from December 18.

Second, the United States and the world will continue to rely on affordable and abundant fossil fuels, including coal, to power our economies for decades to come.

We need to also rely on innovation, not new taxes, not punishing global

agreements. That is the ultimate solution.

I will point out that this is something that I had written and submitted and published long before the so-called Green New Deal was ever introduced into Congress either in the House or in the Senate.

I go on to say:

People across the world are rejecting the idea that carbon taxes and raising the cost of energy is the answer to lowering emissions.

Because we know, as I go on:

In France, the government just suspended a planned fuel tax increase after some of its citizens took to the streets in protest.

It was every story on the news.

And in the United States, the results of [the] November elections showed that these plans and other government interventions are just as unpopular.

Voters in Washington State rejected the creation of an expensive tax on carbon emissions. In Colorado, a ballot measure to severely restrict drilling was defeated. And in Arizona, voters rejected a mandate to make the state's utilities much more dependent on renewable energy by 2030—regardless of the cost to consumers.

I would point out that all three of those States elected liberal Democrats to Congress on election night.

In further answer to that question, I would point to USA TODAY, March 4, 2019. Today is the 6th, so we are talking Monday. Today is Wednesday. This is this week's paper, front page:

To a warming planet's rescue: Carbon Capture.

To the rescue of a warming planet.

In the race against climate change, scientists are looking for ways to pull CO₂ out of the Earth's atmosphere and store it away.

And what they point to is bipartisan legislation passed by this body, passed by the House, and signed into law by President Trump focusing on carbon capture and sequestration. It talks about a program called 45Q. That is the FUTURE Act. One of the cosponsors from the other side of the aisle is on the floor right now. His name is mentioned, my name is mentioned in finding the solution.

There are Republican solutions and ideas that are focused on innovation, not regulation, not taxation, focused on freedom and the innovation that we have had.

So I just come to tell you, Mr. President, that there are solutions, and the Republicans will continue to offer them. We had a hearing most recently just last week on something called the USE IT Act—again, to capture carbon and to sequester it. We have been working on new-age nuclear power, working with leaders around the world. We passed that, and it was signed into law—an innovation bill for nuclear power, new-age nuclear power that will be in small reactors, safer reactors, cheaper to use, no carbon whatsoever.

So there are absolute solutions, and Republicans are going to continue to come to the floor, but we are not going to support something that would bankrupt the country, something that

would raise the cost of energy for families, something that would drive people to the point of having to spend money they don't have, having our country borrow money we don't have, all at a time when you say, what is the cause? There are suggestions and numbers that have been raised. I haven't heard any numbers from the other side of the aisle.

So I come to the floor to tell you that Republicans have continued to offer solutions, and I have been offering some of these solutions for 10 years. It took us a while to get these into law, but they are working. They are working and have been identified as working. Even President Obama's former Secretary of Energy, Ernie Moniz, who came and testified to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, said there are two things that would make a big difference. One is the new-age nuclear work that we are doing, and the other is carbon capture and sequestration. Those are large-scale products that work.

I see other colleagues on the floor. Do I have the floor right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, as long as I continue to have the floor, I would like to point out that we have a booming economy in this country. In just over a year, tax relief has helped create 3 million new jobs. Manufacturing jobs have increased for 10 straight months. There is the fact that we have more jobs available than there are people looking for jobs. We have a booming economy. I want to do nothing that is going to harm these people all across the country who are working to have an opportunity in such a strong, healthy, growing economy.

This Green New Deal—this Big Government takeover of the economy—it is masked as an environmental proposal. To me, it is radical. The president of the Laborers' International Union of North America calls it a "bad deal."

Take a look at America. We are leading the world in reducing carbon dioxide because of the technological and innovative techniques we have had. We know from what we hear about the Green New Deal that it is prohibitively expensive, with predictions of up to \$93 trillion. The entire net worth of the United States—of all the homes and all the families and everything—is only \$112 trillion, and this alone would cost \$93 trillion. You can go by how much it is going to cost each individual family. It is completely unaffordable. It is not something that is workable. But it is so far outside the America mainstream even if it were affordable.

So what we have seen here is the Democrats take another hard left turn. Under this Green New Deal, in just 10 years, the Nation's energy system would undergo a Washington makeover. The Green New Deal would end the use of energy resources that currently provide power for three out

of five homes and businesses in the United States. Think about the harm that would cause the economy. This Green New Deal mandates the use of expensive power sources that can't keep the lights on. Wind and solar are important. We need more renewable energy in this country. But right now, wind and solar provide less than 8 percent of our electricity.

Should we increase the use of renewables? Absolutely. But eliminating affordable coal and natural gas would be a costly mistake—and not only that, it is impossible to do. The electric grid can't handle it.

Last month, there was an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal titled "The Green New Deal's Impossible Electric Grid," written by Robert Blohm of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation. He writes that if the electric grid relies solely on renewable energy sources, "the grid itself may collapse."

That is not all we lose if the grid collapses. Our transportation system is in the crosshairs. The Green New Deal seeks to transform how Americans travel. It calls for an extensive and expensive national, high-speed rail system to replace air travel.

The State of California attempted to build a high-speed rail line between Los Angeles and San Francisco. It turns out the price was too high even for California. The Governor, Gavin Newsom, just recently canceled the line between San Francisco and Los Angeles. Why? He said because of the massive cost. But it is all part of the Green New Deal. The question is, if California can't afford to build high-speed rail between two major cities, how can we afford to build a system that crisscrosses the country? We can't.

The Green New Deal doesn't stop at energy and travel; it extends to every building in the country. Homeowners are going to be forced to retrofit their houses, and businesses would have to do the same.

This is what massive government overreach looks like.

The rest of the world is going to continue to pollute even if the country were to adopt something as extreme as the Green New Deal. It would cancel all of the gains we have made in the United States by the fact that our emissions continue to go down. In 2017, we produced just 13 percent of global emissions here in the United States—just 13 percent. China and India together—33 percent. And they are rising over there. Without dramatic changes from India and China, global emissions are going to continue to climb. So even if all the Green New Deal's costly mandates went into effect, with the punishment to our country and our economy, there would still be no real effect on the Earth's temperature.

So, look, it is no surprise that the Democrats are trying to duck this big green bomb. Senate Democrats may even decide to vote present to avoid

voting for their own extreme proposal that a dozen of them have either signed on to or cosponsored, including just about every Democratic Senator who is running for President. They have all signed on. They are all cosponsoring it.

This green dream is unreachable, but there is a proven way to reduce our emissions, which is why I talk about what we are wanting to do in a positive way with nuclear energy, with carbon capture, things that have gathered the attention of the New York Times and were on the front page of USA TODAY on Monday.

So we are going to continue to work with the FUTURE Act and with the USE IT Act. The committee is going to continue to work in a bipartisan way because Republicans are committed to finding solutions through innovation, not taxation, not regulation—solutions that do not hurt our strong and healthy, growing economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues, first of all, in, yes, opposing this Green New Deal, this joint resolution, that is full of so many dangerous policies and positions. But before I get into my reasons for that, let me also join my colleague from Wyoming in saying I am for the things he is for and even more—carbon capture, utilization, and storage, refined coal, all kinds of ways that we can accomplish the same goals together, with realistic proposals, not fantasies.

Let me also say something that should warm the heart of our colleague from Massachusetts. The Koch brothers strongly opposed my candidacy and my election to the U.S. Senate. I owe them nothing, and I am grateful.

You know, I wasn't always this pessimistic about the possibilities in this Chamber. I believe, in fact, that divided government presents an opportunity for the parties to come together to find common ground and to have legislative victories based on shared goals and shared values. I hope we can get back to that.

I had hoped for it even on controversial issues, like immigration and healthcare, and I certainly hoped for it on energy policy, but when I heard that the Democrats were proposing this Green New Deal, I didn't view it as an opportunity for political gamesmanship. I viewed it as an opportunity to find common ground, to compromise, to find balance, and to negotiate the way that I believe our founders intended it.

I don't think killing innovators with something like a Green New Deal is how we accomplish the goals they say they are for in their Green New Deal.

You can imagine my disappointment when I read the contents of this joint resolution. The Green New Deal is not serious policy. It is a fantasy. I am personally disappointed to see so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle cosponsor this—especially those

who are seeking higher office—and ignore the realities.

Someone earlier mentioned that the Green New Deal never talks about airplanes. No, but it does say that we want to transition to 100-percent renewable energy by 2030. Well, I don't know how you fly airplanes without having fossil fuels.

As the Presiding Officer may have seen, in my State of North Dakota, we are having a really, really cold winter. In fact, most of the Upper Midwest is. The National Weather Service referred to a stretch of this really cold weather earlier this winter as a polar vortex. We call it winter.

Polar vortex or whatever you want to call it, it has been a rough winter. Rough winters aren't rare or new to us, but this one has been particularly cold. We were well below zero several days in a row. In fact, during the polar vortex, one day the wind chill was well below 50 degrees below. By the way, for those of you from the South, 50 below is below zero—zero. It is a really low number.

But I believe there are some facts that have been left out related to how this will affect human health.

On January 1, in Hettinger, ND, it reached 42 degrees below zero without wind chill. That is real temperature. Again, that has happened in many communities throughout the State.

During these low temperatures, guess what doesn't happen. The wind doesn't blow, and when the wind doesn't blow, windmills stop providing energy, and they actually start consuming it. When I was a regulator, I cited a couple thousand megawatts of wind turbines in North Dakota.

When the energy can't be produced by wind turbines, it turns to gas, and, then, guess what happens. Natural gas providers have to ask their customers to curtail their gas consumption because they need the gas for a more firm supply of electricity that backs up the wind turbines.

Again, I was a utility regulator. I saw this happen a lot, and it happened just a couple of weeks ago in the Midwest.

Can you imagine that when temperatures drop below minus 22 degrees and wind turbines stop working? That means that many North Dakotans, like my mom and my grandchildren, have to rely on intermittent electricity to fill the gap caused by the cutbacks in gas. Do you see the cycle of this? It is a circle. One bad thing leads to another bad thing.

In this situation, it is when—not if—an electric outage occurs during a polar vortex, it would be disastrous for the people of my State and many others. This is a serious health risk, and I do not want my friends and family to ever wonder if they will be able to warm their homes when they need it the most.

Even if the Green New Deal were to pass, we could never afford it. You have heard a lot of statements today from Members about the expected cost of up

to \$93 trillion. You can argue that it is not \$93 trillion—that it is only \$90 trillion, it is only \$80 trillion, or it is only \$50 trillion. It is too much. It is unaffordable. And \$93 trillion is more than 90 percent of the combined wealth of all—I said “all”—American households in this country. It would cost every American family as much as \$65,000 per year, which, as you know, is more than the average yearly household income.

A tax-and-spend agenda to pay for an energy plan that wouldn't even work flies in the face of one of our Nation's greatest success stories—our domestic energy production.

To a large degree, the U.S. rocket ship economy is being driven by the energy renaissance happening all across our country, like in my State of North Dakota. Our strategy of energy dominance encompasses an “all of the above” approach—harnessing wind, oil, natural gas, solar, nuclear, and, yes, coal potential.

Millions of Americans are employed by energy development, and that number is only expected to grow.

In fact, in 2020 the United States will become a net energy exporter for the first time. At the same time, emissions have steadily decreased over the years, and it serves as a very important national security hedge. Why would we halt this positive momentum and stymie promising solutions?

The key to a better energy future is not taxation regulation but innovation and empowerment, as so beautifully articulated by my friend from Wyoming.

Ms. STABENOW. Would my friend from North Dakota pause for a question?

Mr. CRAMER. If these recent polar vortexes and cold winters taught us anything, it is that we have a well-rounded energy policy that encourages the best ideas. We need to be pragmatic and collaborative to find solutions. That is not what defines this Green New Deal. It is unrealistic, unworkable, and unaffordable.

I hope we never become so lopsided that my friends, neighbors, and family back home are unable to turn the heat on when they need it the most.

I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Will my friend from North Dakota be willing to yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to echo my colleagues' concerns about the Green New Deal.

We are here because the majority leader has indicated that the Senate will be considering this misguided proposal in the coming weeks.

You would think our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be ecstatic about the idea of a Senate vote on a resolution that essentially compasses their party's entire platform. Instead, the minority leader is scrambling to conceive ideas that will give

his caucus members cover instead of embracing a plan. I can see why.

The Green New Deal didn't quite receive the celebration Democrats were expecting when it was announced. Its release was greeted with a combination of bewilderment, amusement, and confusion, which gave way to anger and disbelief the more Americans learned about it.

This is understandable. People don't tend to react positively when you threaten to upheave their lives by eliminating their jobs, outlawing their vehicles, and demanding they essentially build their homes to whatever standards Democrats in Washington decide.

If you ask most Americans if government control over almost every aspect of their lives is the direction they want to see the Nation take, the answer is an overwhelming no. Yet that is exactly what the Green New Deal seeks to do under the pretense of ending climate change.

The authors of the Green New Deal and its accompanying memo suggest their plan is the cure for all of society's ills. They cast themselves as saviors who will end global warming, income equality, and depression in one fell swoop. The Green New Deal will guarantee every American free healthcare, college tuition, and a job with a "family-sustaining" wage.

That last part isn't even required to receive the benefits promised by the Green New Deal. If an able-bodied person is unwilling to look for work, the government would provide "economic security" under the plan.

What supporters can't say is how they will implement this, what impact it will have on the average American, and where the trillions of dollars it will cost will come from. These details are important when you are asking for support of a plan that is estimated to cost up to \$93 trillion and dramatically expands the Federal Government's reach into the daily lives of every American.

Single moms, seniors, and those living on fixed incomes—the very people whom the Green New Deal supporters purport to help—will be the most negatively impacted by this proposal.

Getting the majority of our Nation's energy from renewable sources is certainly a worthy goal. However, you cannot brand a \$93 trillion, all-encompassing liberal wish list as an energy plan and expect it to be embraced with no questions asked.

Only a fraction of this plan deals with climate change, but its energy mandates are entirely unworkable. The Green New Deal dictates that the Nation will rely 100 percent on renewable power within a decade. Experts say it is impossible to accomplish this by 2050, much less within a constricted 10-year timeline.

The way forward to solve our environmental challenges should be driven by positive incentives, research, and development, not heavyhanded regulation.

The uncomfortable truth for the Green New Deal proponents is that the United States is already leading the charge on reducing carbon emissions. We can continue to build on that progress and encourage change within the international community without mandating a government takeover of nearly every sector of our economy.

As a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have long advocated for an "all of the above" approach to energy security. This strategy includes wind, renewable biomass, hydroelectric and solar power, and it absolutely needs to include the expansion of nuclear power, which the Green New Deal mysteriously leaves out.

These are the right ways to responsibly address our energy needs. The Green New Deal—which makes undeliverable promises, proposes to dramatically drive up costs for every American, and eliminates thousands of jobs in the energy sector—is not the way to go. The Green New Deal will result in a staggering loss of jobs. It redistributes wealth on a scale our Nation has never seen before. It calls for a massive government takeover of our Nation's economy and culture. Worst of all, it hides all of this in a fanciful energy modernization scheme that can't be achieved in the manner it is written.

The Green New Deal is not a serious plan. The Senate should wholeheartedly reject it when it comes before us.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I am here on the floor to ultimately speak regarding Mr. Reader's nomination, but I do want to respond to my colleagues. It is hard to know where we begin because so much is said that doesn't make any sense. It is made up. It is ridiculous.

What I wanted to address as my colleague was speaking was where it said in the Green New Deal that we couldn't have ice cream. I have looked everywhere. I like ice cream, and I was shocked that we weren't going to have ice cream. Sure enough, there is nowhere where it says that they are outlawing ice cream.

For people who like cheeseburgers and milkshakes, I don't see anything in there about that either.

As the lead Democrat in the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, who works with farmers every single day and appreciates the great work they are doing to stop carbon pollution, I would just have to say that it is pretty silly, if it weren't so serious, how the Republican majority and the Republican leader are mocking what is probably the most serious issue of our time.

There are many things that I care about and the people in Michigan care about, but if we don't get a handle on what is happening on this erratic and dangerous weather, it is going to affect

every part of our economy and every part of our way of life.

So if the majority leader or others want to say that we are declaring a war to outlaw air travel or the military or ice cream, that is absurd and would be funny if the whole subject weren't so serious.

By the way, in addition to that, the Republican majority leader said that we want to end air travel and cow farts. By the way, just for the record, cows don't fart; they belch.

The fact is that this mocking the serious, serious issue of our time, where we can't get the majority to join us on a simple resolution to say that climate change is real, that it is man-made, and that we need to act and that we have a responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to act. Let's start there.

I don't want to hear that somehow the world is coming to an end if there is a proposal that passes and not have something in its place that addresses what is actually happening in terms of the threats to all of us, our families, our States, and our economy.

This is real. This subject is real. It needs a real discussion. We can have differences. We will have differences on how to address it, and that is fine—but to mock the whole subject of what is happening right before our eyes. We have to make up new names now for weather events in Michigan. Not only do we have polar vortexes where the cold is rolling down because of the warming in the Arctic, but we have cyclone bombs or bomb cyclones—I am not sure which it is—but it is weather, wind events, that come at 60, 80 miles an hour into a community like a cyclone bomb. We are having to make up new terms for what is happening right in front of us.

So I would hope that when it comes to this discussion on what happens with the weather and climate change, that we would put aside the games, stop making stuff up, and have a serious discussion about how we can come together, create new jobs, move the economy, stop carbon pollution, and make sure our kids and grandkids actually have something to be proud of.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. President, I now want to speak about the Readler nomination. I have often said that healthcare isn't political; it is personal. Being able to take your child to the doctor when they get sick is not political; it is personal. Being able to manage chronic conditions such as diabetes, heart disease, and high blood pressure with quality medical care and prescription medicine is not political; it is personal. Being able to count on your medical insurance to cover you if you get sick is not political; that is personal.

That is why, when the Trump administration nominates people for powerful positions who waged war on healthcare—you want to talk about somebody going to war. We have someone who waged war on healthcare who

we are about to vote on, on the Senate floor. I take that very personally, and the people of Michigan take it personally too.

I will be voting no on Chad Readler, President Trump's nominee for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. I want to take a moment to explain why.

The Sixth Circuit covers Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and my own State of Michigan. In this unending parade of terrible judicial nominees, Mr. Readler stands out. It is not just that he defended restrictive voting laws in Ohio or that he voiced support for giving minors the death penalty—young people the death penalty—or that he argued that State and local governments shouldn't be allowed to pass laws to protect our LGBTQ friends and neighbors from discrimination, no, Mr. Readler's appalling views, if implemented, would touch every single family in Michigan.

At the Department of Justice, Mr. Readler has led efforts to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, including protections for people with preexisting conditions. In fact, he is the architect of the argument in *Texas v. United States*; that if the requirement that people have health insurance is found unconstitutional, then protecting people with preexisting conditions is also unconstitutional. Perhaps "architect" is the wrong word, given that architects build things, and Mr. Readler is solely devoted to tearing them down.

His argument is, of course, nonsense. It is also terrifying for Michigan families. Just imagine what Mr. Readler's goal could mean for the family of a child with diabetes, asthma, or cancer. Parents could find themselves with no insurance coverage for a child who needs chemotherapy to survive. Families could once again run up against lifetime limits that mean a child with complex medical issues could reach her lifetime limit by age 2 or 3. Parents could spend a lifetime worrying about a child who would never be able to qualify for health insurance as an adult.

Of course, moms and their daughters would be charged more if being a woman was once again treated as a pre-existing condition. All of these things routinely happened to Michigan families during the bad old days when insurance companies were in charge of our healthcare prior to the Affordable Care Act. Now Mr. Readler wants to bring those bad old days back.

However, that is not the end of Mr. Readler's noxious views. He is just as toxic when it comes to education.

In my State, Education Secretary Betsy DeVos made a name for herself undermining our public education system. Well, you can call Chad Readler the Betsy DeVos of Ohio. Mr. Readler, as chair of the Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools, pushed school privatization and fought oversight over Ohio's troubled charter schools. He fought oversight of the troubled charter schools.

He fought to eliminate the part of Ohio's Constitution that guarantees Ohio students will receive "a thorough and efficient" education. In short, he would eliminate the right to public education in Ohio.

He proposed language that would exclude LGBTQ students from discrimination protections in Ohio schools, and while at the Department of Justice, he defended Betsy DeVos when she delayed implementation of rules aimed at helping students who are victims of illegal or deceptive tactics by colleges. They were victims of illegal or deceptive practices by colleges, and he supported stopping that relief.

Michigan families who have children with preexisting conditions deserve better than Chad Readler. Michigan students who have been targeted by unscrupulous colleges deserve better than Chad Readler. Michigan folks who have business before the U.S. court of appeals certainly deserve better than Chad Readler.

In my judgment, he has no business being a judge with a lifetime appointment, and I know a whole lot of Michigan families who agree. I am voting no, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as the longest serving Member of the Senate and also the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I feel compelled—and I normally don't come down and speak about these things—but I want to warn about the destruction of long-held norms and traditions that have protected the Senate's unique constitutional role with respect to lifetime judicial appointments.

This is an extraordinary responsibility on the part of the U.S. Senate. The Constitution quite properly allows any President to nominate whomever they want for a lifetime position on our Federal courts, but as our Founders said, the Senate has to give advice and consent because of the effect of this person's lifetime position. They go way beyond the term of the Senators who vote for them and the term of the President who nominates the person.

In fact, until recently, and certainly during the years I have served here, Members of this body knew well they had a say when it came to who serves in the Federal courts in their States. It didn't matter whether you had a Republican or Democratic President or a Republican or Democratic majority in the Senate; blue slips protected the prerogative of home State Senators and gave meaning to the constitutional requirement of advice and consent. It ensures fairness but, more importantly, I think it also ensured comity in the Senate. That now is fast becoming history, and I fear it is going to do lasting damage to the Senate.

What is happening is a disingenuous double standard. When I was chairman

of the Judiciary Committee at the beginning of the Obama administration, every single Senate Republican, including many serving today, signed a letter. They made the case for the importance of the blue-slip tradition. They said it was absolutely imperative that it be respected during the new administration, the Obama administration. The Republicans said: We must do this. Well, I didn't need any reminder because under my chairmanship during both the Bush Republican administration and the Obama Democratic administration, I respected the blue-slip tradition without exception, even when it was not politically expedient to do so. I respected Republicans and Democrats alike. Regardless of who was in the Oval Office, under my chairmanship, not a single judicial nominee received a hearing without first receiving both home State Senators' positive blue slips.

I defended the blue slips, and that was unpopular in my own party on occasion, but I believed in both their constitutional and institutional importance. I also believed in the prerogatives of home State Senators and the need to ensure that the White House works in good faith with those Senators. I believed then, and I still believe now, that certain principles matter more than party. Something that, unfortunately, some, probably because they are new here, don't understand.

All of us, whether Democratic or Republican, should care about good-faith consultation when it comes to nominees from our home States. The reasons are principled and pragmatic. We know our State better than anybody else. We know who is qualified to fill lifetime judicial seats. They are going to have a tremendous impact on our communities. We know the men and women who are qualified. Without blue slips, nothing prevents our State selection committees from being completely ignored by the White House. Nothing would even prevent a New York or California lawyer from being nominated to a Texas court or vice versa.

Yet the Senate is abandoning this protection. Senators of the Republican Party who promised they would uphold it, gave their word they would uphold it, asked me to uphold it, have suddenly broken their word. That bothers me.

Last week, for example, for the first time in the history of this body, a nominee was confirmed to a seat on the circuit court over the objections of both home State Senators. That is the first time in our history that has happened. That meant my friends on the other side of the aisle had to break their word from what they agreed to before.

This week, we are voting on two additional nominees, Chad Readler and Eric Murphy, who are opposed by another home State Senator, Mr. BROWN. Senator BROWN made extensive efforts to reach a compromise with the White

House on these two Sixth Circuit vacancies, but the White House was not interested.

The White House knew the Republicans would not keep to the position they expected Democrats to keep when we were in the majority, and because they knew they could rely on Members of their own party not to follow tradition for the first time, they didn't even try. The White House didn't even try to consult. Even superficial consultation is an afterthought.

Senator BROWN then attended the confirmation hearings. He spoke against these nominations. He cited, among other things, Mr. Readler's unprecedented actions attacking healthcare protections while serving in the Trump Justice Department.

Mr. Readler was willing to reverse Justice Department policy and sign a brief undermining protections for pre-existing conditions when career Justice Department officials—career officials who have been there in both Republican and Democratic administrations—refused. They refused to reverse their well-established Justice Department policy. He, however, was perfectly willing to throw it away in court. Is this somebody we expect to be fair on the court?

Senator BROWN cited Mr. Murphy's longstanding support and advocacy for restrictive voting laws in Ohio. He knows that his constituents will have to live with the ramifications if these nominees are confirmed. It will directly affect the State. He expressed his concerns about their records, and his voice, in this process as a U.S. Senator, was ignored.

These votes come on the heels of the Senate's confirming a 37-year-old nominee for the Fourth Circuit who has practiced law for less than 10 years—a grand total of 9 years. She now holds a lifetime judgeship on an appellate court, just one step below the Supreme Court. Her confirmation hearing made a mockery of the Senate's duty of advice and consent.

It marked the first time in the Judiciary Committee's history—the first time ever that a nomination hearing was held during the October recess over the objections of the other party. We found out why.

Only two Republican Senators attended the hearing, and the questioning lasted only 20 minutes for someone who demonstrated no abilities to serve on the Fourth Circuit. They knew it didn't make any difference whether she had the abilities or knew what she was doing. All they knew is that this White House had nominated her, so let's rubberstamp this.

Frankly, the Senate should never function as a mere rubberstamp for nominees seeking lifetime appointments to our Federal judiciary. We shouldn't do it whether there is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House. That is exactly what we are doing with a Republican President and a Republican majority. No matter

whether the person is qualified, if the name comes up, rubberstamp it.

When I chaired the Judiciary Committee, many Senators—Republican Senators—expressed both publicly and privately their appreciation for the fact that my respect for blue slips protected their rights and gave meaning to advice and consent. Many told me this is the way it must always be, whether Republicans or Democrats are in the majority.

Well, their about-face, now that they control the Senate, is unbecoming, and it basically says that the Senate will just bow down to the executive branch. We will give up our responsibility, we will give up our authority, and we will just be rubberstamps. We might as well not even bother to show up; just do whatever we are told. It is deeply disappointing.

I know the pressure because many of my Republican friends have told me to rubberstamp President Trump's nominees. I know my warnings will fall on many deaf ears, even for those who promised me they would not do this.

I have served in the Senate long enough to know that political winds tend to change direction. Inevitably, the majority becomes the minority, and the White House changes hands. I suspect that many of my Republican colleagues who care about this institution, as do I—and there are many—are going to live to regret many of these actions.

The further down this path the Senate goes, the harder it is going to be to unring this bell. A vote for Mr. Readler or Mr. Murphy is a vote to say that we abandon our abilities as home State Senators to serve as a check not just on this President but any future President, Republican or Democrat. Basically, we are saying that we don't believe in advice and consent. Basically, we are saying that we don't believe in the Senate being the conscience of the Nation. Basically, we are saying that we don't believe the Founders of this country knew what they were doing when they said the U.S. Senate—this body of 100 people—has to represent 325 million Americans and that we don't believe they should have any responsibility, have any say in lifetime appointments.

If we abandon longstanding traditions and chase partisan expediency, I remind everybody that provides only fleeting advantage. It inflicts lasting harm on this body. It is within our power to stop it right here and right now.

I urge all Senators to ensure that home State Senators are provided the same courtesies during the Trump administration that they received from both Republican and Democratic judiciary chairmen during the Obama administration. I believe we can do that. I ask my fellow Senators to oppose Mr. Readler's and Mr. Murphy's nominations because they were done so out of the way that they should be done. Let the U.S. Senate, all of us, Republicans

and Democrats, say that we are not a rubberstamp to any President. We don't take our orders from any President. We don't bow and scrape for any President. Let's act like Senators, not like a rubberstamp.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FRANZ WUERFMANNSDOBLER

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to recognize a true public servant, an individual who has been by my side since my first year as a Senator, someone who will be dearly missed, not only in my office but by this institution as a whole as he moves on to his next chapter this week: my deputy chief of staff and senior policy advisor, Franz Wuerfmannsdobler.

Franz has had a great impact on this institution, on the staff members who served here over the last two decades, and on me. His sage advice, his patience, his incredibly calm demeanor, his willingness to mentor and guide others, his respect for this institution, and his knowledge borne out of 20 years of experience in the Senate have contributed in countless ways to the meaningful work we have been able to do here for the people of Delaware and our country.

Today, I want to recognize and thank Franz for his remarkable and his selfless career. I want to thank him for what he has done for me, for my office, for the people of Delaware, and pay tribute to the legacy he leaves.

It is a remarkable legacy. He has been on the frontlines of events and policy battles that have quite literally shaped the history of our country over the last two decades—from 9/11 to the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, from energy and appropriations efforts to sustained concerns and engagement around bipartisanship.

Franz's career in the Senate began in 1998 when he served as a legislative assistant for the late, great Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia, who was himself a giant of this body. For 8 years, Franz handled issues from energy to environment, to climate change and natural resources. It was also in Senator Byrd's office that Franz cut his teeth on the complex appropriations process, learning from the master appropriator himself.

Franz's career then took him to the office of former Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota, where he was a trusted senior energy policy advisor, and then on the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee before finally joining my own office in March of 2011.

Franz's list of legislative accomplishments is long and impressive and reflects his deep grasp of policy and the mechanics of politics. He helped to shape elements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. He was central to establishing reformed fuel economy standards for our Nation's automobiles and played a key role in the Recovery Act, a massive effort that helped pull our Nation out of the depths of a recession.

Franz is a person of ideas and vision. His vision for our country has led to policies that have made our Nation cleaner, more innovative, and more secure. Likewise, his vision in my Senate office has made our team more efficient, more effective, and more successful. Franz has played a key role in shaping my office early on, helping to create a team-based structure and the positive culture of our legislative staff.

He also introduced me to the valuable concept of having an office built around and relying on expert legislative fellows, including, in particular, fellows from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, whose incredible expertise and deep knowledge in scientific matters has been invaluable in advancing technology and science policy in my last 8 years. In total, Franz has mentored more than 15 fellows during his time in the Senate—13 of them are AAAS fellows in my own office, and they have attested individually and collectively to the reach, scope, and power of his guidance and mentorship to them.

Franz is also a master of appropriations—an arcane process that even the most seasoned legislative veterans should admit that they don't completely understand. He brought his wealth of experience to our team, taking the reins of the Federal budget and appropriations process and building from the ground up the complex and detailed appropriations system that we use to this day. There is no question that Franz's expertise and the time he dedicated to building this meticulous system has made me a more effective member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and led to countless wins for the State of Delaware—from funding for critical transportation improvements and investments in our first responders to support that has helped to establish and enhance the NIIMBL manufacturing institute of the University of Delaware and to fully fund science and R&D projects around the country and in my home State.

Beyond Franz's technical expertise, nothing better exemplifies his character than the patience and dedication with which he has taught others about the appropriations process. Each year, Franz hosts "Appropriations Bootcamp 101" to teach new staff members the ins and outs of this riveting and complex process. He takes the time to explain it, to get into the weeds, and to answer question after question. Franz has also taken his show on the road in

my home State of Delaware, meeting with State, local government, and community stakeholders to explain the appropriations process and help to secure more funding for our State. He has even developed a legendary method for teaching staff about appropriations by using bags of marbles to explain funding allocations for each Appropriations subcommittee. For the record, the legislative branch gets just one marble.

Franz's patience extends far beyond the annual appropriations process. He always maintains his cool and has a striking and calming presence, even in the most trying of circumstances. One of those more trying circumstances occurred at a staff outing just a few years ago. Franz had driven a couple of other members of our team, and on their way home, his car broke down. The group decided to push start the car, going down a hill to get momentum, while a junior staffer manned the wheel. Unfortunately, the lack of power steering made it impossible to turn the wheel. After a good strong push, the car rolled right down the hill and into a tree. Franz very calmly said: Don't worry about it. It is not a problem; it is all going to be fine—even when the front end of his car was unrecognizable. Franz's response to that situation, his cool and calm demeanor, is characteristic of the grace he has imparted on all of us, even in some of the most tumultuous times here in the Senate.

One of the unique things about Franz is that whenever you meet somebody who knows him or has worked with him, they talk about the ways in which he has gone out of his own way to help them and mentor them over the years. So many people in the Senate view Franz not just as a friend or colleague but as someone who they know has helped them in their careers and someone who has shown them the ropes and invested time in supporting them and helping them succeed. One member of my team described it this way:

Franz has an uncanny ability to take the time necessary to help. He enables us to do our jobs and do them well. We get meaningful things done, and that's because of the wisdom Franz has imparted."

In an environment here in the Senate that is at times fast paced, Franz takes the time to invest in younger people. He sees potential in staff and imparts knowledge and experience, even when there is more than enough to keep him busy just meeting his own commitments. For example, Franz took it upon himself to create a manual for the new fellows who work in my office every year. The manual, which should be required reading for every new Senate staffer, describes how to write a bill and important things about the process of working in the Senate.

He also maintains the Capitol Hill Urban Dictionary, which he shares with new staff and interns to help them decode internal Senate jargon, including oft-used, but rarely explained phrases like "en bloc" or "move the needle." It explains, for example, what

to do when asked: Do you have language on that.

Franz embraces the importance of teaching the next generation of Capitol Hill staff how to do their job well. I think that is truly his greatest legacy—the remarkable diaspora of younger staff members he has believed in, invested in, and helped to train who are now working everywhere from the Senate to the House, to the Department of Defense, to running a non-profit in Kenya.

Each year, Franz and his wonderful wife Lisa host an annual gathering at their home for a growing community of current and former fellows and, literally, dozens of colleagues—folks who have shared experiences, who care about policy, who like a good geeky joke, and who enjoy helping each other and developing and sustaining each other's careers.

That is just the kind of person Franz is. He has impacted so many people—something that was never more evident than at his wedding to Lisa a few years ago, which I was deeply honored to have the chance to officiate. In addition to their friends and family, guests that day included former Senator Dorgan, folks who had mentored Franz early in his career, dozens of individuals he mentored himself, and people from all walks of life who support Franz and Lisa and care about them. It was a testament to the community they have created, both inside and outside the Senate.

Franz cares deeply about this institution. He cares about policies, and he cares about people. He is always looking for ways to bridge the partisan divide and make this broken place work better. It hasn't always been easy. Like many of us, Franz has struggled with the slowing pace of legislative progress in the Senate in recent years and its increasingly divisive nature. It says so much about him and about his faith in us and in this institution that he is leaving his Senate career to go work on these very issues, helping to lead the Bipartisan Policy Center in advancing bipartisan policy solutions to address the challenges facing our Nation and the institution of the Senate.

He has made such a mark that he is known throughout this institution by a single name. Few people are known by just one name—Bono, Noah, Cher, Franz. With Franz's leaving the Senate, I promise to continue to do my part here to bridge what divides us where we can and to do the important work required of us. That includes passage of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act, important bipartisan legislation that will level the tax playing field for clean energy, which Franz has worked on for Congress after Congress as long as I have been here—work that I intend to finish.

While I am sad today to see Franz leave my office in the Senate, he will be deeply missed by everyone on my staff and everyone who has benefited from his wisdom, but I am also excited

to see the inspiring things he will accomplish in his next chapter.

I want to thank Franz for his dedication, his leadership, and his expertise. I want to thank his family for sharing him with us these past 8 years in my office and these 2 decades here in the Senate. He inspires me every day to be a better and more thoughtful, more careful, and more caring legislator. He leaves a deep and positive impact on all of us that we will not soon forget. Thank you, Franz. You will be deeply missed.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to three circuit court nominees who will receive votes on the floor this week: Allison Jones Rushing, nominated to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals; Chad Readler, nominated to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals; and Eric Murphy, also nominated to the Sixth Circuit.

I want to begin by addressing how these nominations were handled and the ongoing disregard for Senate norms and traditions by Republican leadership. Most notable is the change in how blue slips are treated. Blue slips work. The blue slip ensures that the interests of home State Senators are respected when it comes to judicial nominees from their States.

Honoring blue slips helps guarantee that the White House nominates well-qualified, mainstream individuals to key seats on the circuit and district courts, and it prevents the selection of nominees who do not reside in the circuit in which they are slated to serve.

In the past century, before President Trump took office, only five judges had ever been confirmed with only one blue slip; two were by a Democratic chair over the objection of a Democratic Senator, not over the objection of a Republican, then in the minority. The other three instances occurred when a Republican chairman overruled a Democratic Senator.

In fact, Democratic chairs have never moved a judicial nominee to confirmation over the objection of a Republican Senator. Let me say that again: Democratic chairs have never confirmed a judicial nominee without a blue slip from a Republican Senator.

However, since President Trump took office, 10 circuit court nominees have received hearings, and four have been confirmed over the objection of Democratic home State Senators. In just over 2 years, Republicans are on their way to doubling the number of judges confirmed over the objection of home State Senators than have been confirmed in the last 100 years.

This week we are considering both Mr. Readler and Mr. Murphy who lack blue slips from Ohio's Senior Senator, my friend and colleague Senator BROWN.

Senator BROWN's opposition was not unreasonable; in fact, Senator BROWN

worked with the White House for weeks in an effort to find consensus picks for the Sixth Circuit.

But the White House refused to cooperate, and he was left with no choice but to withhold his blue slip. In doing so, Senator BROWN said: "I cannot support nominees who have actively worked to strip Ohioans of their rights. Special interests already have armies of lobbyists and lawyers on their side, they don't need judges in their pockets."

Further, when the majority did move forward on the nominations of Mr. Readler and Mr. Murphy, the two appeared on the same panel at the same hearing. With 5-minute rounds of questioning, these stacked circuit court hearings make it all but impossible for Senators on the committee to thoroughly vet judicial nominees, and that, in turn, makes it impossible for this body to fulfill its obligation of providing advice and consent.

Ms. Rushing's nomination is also the product of a departure from Senate norms. Then-Chairman GRASSLEY held Ms. Rushing's hearing on October 17, 2018, during an extended Senate recess. Only two Senators questioned Ms. Rushing, and no Democrats were present to question the nominee.

These process violations matter. They matter because they impact the quality of the nominees we are considering and the ability of the nominee to reflect the State and community to which they are being nominated.

We have already seen several nominees who have had no judicial experience, and others with no trial experience whatsoever. We have seen nominees who have been rated unqualified for lack of experience and also for lack of judgement, ethical problems, and issues with impartiality and temperament.

This isn't a partisan issue. This is an issue that should concern Senators from both sides of the aisle. At a time when Americans increasingly distrust the institutions of our government, we should not be degrading the Federal judiciary with unqualified and ideological nominees.

Turning to the nominees themselves, I first want to discuss Allison Rushing. Ms. Rushing is only 36 years old. In fact, she has practiced law for only 9 years. She has never tried a case in the Fourth Circuit, the court to which she has been nominated, and she was not even admitted to practice in the Fourth Circuit until 2017; yet she is being nominated to serve on a Federal circuit court.

Even in her limited experience, Ms. Rushing has demonstrated strong ideological views. For instance, in 2013, Ms. Rushing spoke about the Supreme Court's decision to strike down a key provision of the Defense of Marriage Act. She claimed that Justice Kennedy had written "the opinion in a unique way that calls it bigotry to believe that homosexuality does not comport with Judeo-Christian morality."

Ms. Rushing also demonstrated her hostility to the rights of employees in a brief she submitted in a 2018 Supreme Court case. Ms. Rushing argued that employment agreements requiring employees to waive their rights to go to court as a condition of employment should be allowed, even though most people don't have a choice to turn down a job.

Ms. Rushing's view prevents employees who have entered arbitration agreements from bringing lawsuits against their employers, even if the employers have violated their rights or fired them against the law.

As the dissent pointed out, Ms. Rushing's position risked leading to "the under-enforcement of federal and state statutes designed to advance the well-being of vulnerable workers."

I next would like to address the nomination of Chad Readler. Mr. Readler previously headed the Justice Department's Civil Division. In that position, he defended some of the most troubling policies this administration has implemented. He defended the President's decision to end the DACA program, the policy to separate immigrant children from their parents, and the President's Muslim travel ban.

Most concerning, however, is that Mr. Readler led the administration's efforts to overturn the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Readler argued that the healthcare law's protections for pre-existing conditions should be struck down. Even Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER called the arguments made in Mr. Readler's brief "as far-fetched as any I've ever heard."

Finally, the Senate is voting on Eric Murphy to the Sixth Circuit. As the chief appellate lawyer for the State of Ohio, Mr. Murphy led the State's defense of its law banning same-sex marriage, which was struck down by the Supreme Court in *Obergefell v. Hodges*. Jim Obergefell wrote an op-ed recently saying: "Barely four years ago, Mr. Murphy made a forceful argument that my marriage was unconstitutional. As the attorney tasked with defending Ohio's discriminatory ban on same-sex marriage, he used dog-whistles . . . [I]f Murphy had been successful, [my husband] and I, and tens of thousands of couples like us, would have been denied the right to marry and forced to live as second-class citizens."

Mr. Murphy also led Ohio's defense of restrictive voting laws, including the Ohio law allowing the State to purge eligible voters if they missed voting in just one Federal election, and he has amassed a troubling record on women's reproductive rights, arguing for instance in support of a 20-week abortion ban, which he claimed would create "at most, an incidental burden" on a woman's right to make her own reproductive health care decisions.

The three nominees before the Senate exemplify the Trump administration's efforts to stack our courts with nominees who are far outside the judicial mainstream. I believe they will

not protect the rights of all Americans and should not be confirmed. I will vote no on each of these nominees, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the judicial nomination coming up and the cloture vote on the other nominee.

With both nominees, I offered the White House cooperation to choose two more moderate nominees for Ohio, both of whom had been vetted by a bipartisan commission Senator PORTMAN and I had, and the White House said they would rather pick these two extremist judges—these two young, far-right judges who have attacked America’s healthcare and have attacked the consumer protection on preexisting condition.

Judges are making decisions right now—in this body, fortunately, as Members of the Senate, we all have good coverage and health insurance—that try to take insurance away from millions of Americans and several thousands in my State, even as they have tried to eliminate the consumer protections for those people who have preexisting conditions. There are millions of Americans who are anxious about holding onto their insurance because they get sick a lot and it is expensive to take care of them. They are afraid of having their insurance canceled, and they can’t get insurance because of a preexisting condition, and this Congress tried to repeal that law and it failed.

Now, Senator MCCONNELL has turned to the Federal Judiciary, and the President of the United States seems to think the only way to eliminate the consumer protection for those with preexisting conditions is through the Judiciary. Judges are making decisions right now on voting rights, on civil rights, on women’s rights, LGBT rights, on healthcare, on sentencing, and on corporate power—decisions that could limit those rights for a generation.

We know that the Federal Judiciary already puts its thumb on the scales of justice to support corporations over workers, to support Wall Street over consumers, and to support insurance companies over patients. We know that the Federal Judiciary and the Supreme Court have done that dozens of times. We know that the Federal Judiciary, increasingly, is looking like a group of far-right, young, detached people who never go out and get their public opinion pass, as Lincoln said. They never consider what the public wants in this country.

Chad Readler, the nominee whom we will vote on in a moment, took it upon himself as a Jones Day lawyer—one of the greatest law firms in the country, headquartered in Cleveland—to write an op-ed as a private citizen saying we should allow the execution of 16-year-olds. He actually wasn’t that specific.

He implied it could be even younger than that. He said we would allow the execution of teenagers. At a time when this body—something we should be proud of—took important bipartisan steps forward on sentencing reform that was supported by the White House, supported by a lot of Republicans, and supported by virtually all Democrats, how do we turn around and put someone on the bench for life who supports executing children? How does that compute? How we can do that?

He argued on behalf of the far-right think tank for the elimination of “Golden Week” in Ohio, a period where people can vote early. They can register and vote early. It was passed by a Republican legislature. It has bipartisan support, but not by this right-wing nominee who thinks it is OK to eliminate people’s right to vote and restrict it. He defended restrictive voter ID. He defended the squeezing of provisional ballot laws.

On the eve of the 54th anniversary tomorrow of Bloody Sunday in Selma, AL, it is shameful to put on the bench another judge who will rubberstamp modern-day literacy tests and poll taxes. Fundamentally, it is the same purpose. You find ways to suppress the vote. You find ways to take people’s voting rights away. You find ways to disqualify people who want to vote.

Chad Readler’s record on healthcare is clear. He has been a ringleader in the Republican effort to take away the protections on preexisting conditions for all Americans. He wrote the White House’s brief. We all know that now. He wrote a brief that nobody else above him at the Justice Department was willing to do. Three people refused to write it. One actually resigned. The next day, he was rewarded by this lifetime appointment as a Sixth Circuit Federal judge. Remember that. The White House rewarded him after suggesting that we block the consumer protections for preexisting conditions for millions of Americans and for hundreds of thousands in Virginia, Arkansas, and in Ohio. Millions of Americans would lose their consumer protections under his views, and the next day the White House decided to reward him with a judgeship.

As I said, three career attorneys withdrew from the case. One resigned altogether in objection to doing this. Senator ALEXANDER, our friend from Tennessee, who sits near where Senator KAINE is sitting, said this was just amazingly awful language that Chad Readler had suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, judges are deciding the future of America’s healthcare right now, the right to vote right now, civil rights right now,

LGBTQ rights right now, women’s rights right now. Judges around the country are deciding that. We can’t afford to put another out-of-the-mainstream judge on the court—and he is clearly out of the mainstream among Ohio lawyers, among Ohio judges, among Ohio citizens—who will not defend America’s right to healthcare.

I ask my colleagues to think about the families you promised to vote for. If any of you in your campaigns, if any of you in discussions you have had with your constituents, if any of you in your public statements, and if any of you running for office committed that you would support consumer protections for preexisting conditions, the only way you can prove you actually believe that is by voting no on Chad Readler in about 1 minute from now. If you really believe in preserving preexisting condition consumer protections so you don’t see in your State—in Tennessee, Virginia, Arkansas, and Ohio—millions of Americans lose their insurance, then your only way to support what you promise is to vote no on Chad Readler.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Readler nomination?

Mr. KAINE. Madam 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Coons	Jones
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Blumenthal	Duckworth	King
Booker	Durbin	Klobuchar
Brown	Feinstein	Leahy
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markey
Cardin	Harris	Menendez
Carper	Hassan	Merkley
Casey	Heinrich	Murphy
Collins	Hirono	Murray

Peters	Shaheen	Van Hollen
Reed	Sinema	Warner
Rosen	Smith	Warren
Sanders	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Schatz	Tester	Wyden
Schumer	Udall	

NOT VOTING—1

Manchin

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Eric F. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Brown	Kaine	Sinema
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Manchin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO DON YOUNG

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Alaskan of the Week time on the Senate floor, my favorite time of the week to talk about someone who has made a difference in my State. As you know, and as all the pages know, I try to come down to the floor every week to talk about someone who is in Alaska doing a great job for America, for their community, for the State, and what I believe is the best State in the country. I know we can all debate that.

Some of you might take issue a little bit with the characterization of the best State, but we certainly have some bragging rights on some elements that make us the most unique State in America. For example, right now, the Iditarod, the Last Great Race, is underway, with 52 mushers and their dog teams—up to 14 dogs—barreling for well over 900 miles across the State of Alaska toward Nome in some of the most harsh, difficult, and rugged terrain in the world. That is just one of the many things that makes us unique. We have the Iditarod, the Northern Lights that dance in the sky, communities that still hunt whales to feed their villages, which they have been doing for centuries. We have the most fish and the longest coastline. As a matter of fact, our coastline is longer than the rest of the lower 48's coastline combined. We have the tallest mountain in the world, and we have a mountain of a Congressman named DON YOUNG.

Usually, Alaskans of the Week are reserved for people who aren't so visible, who aren't legends, who maybe are doing something in their community that not a lot of people are noticing. Today, March 6, 2019, I couldn't resist because DON YOUNG, the Dean of the House, has officially become the long-

est continuously serving Republican in the Congress in U.S. history. Let me repeat that. Today, DON YOUNG has become the longest, continually serving Republican in the Congress—Senate or House—in the history of the United States of America. He was already here when every single Member of Congress was sworn in. Think about that. For every Member who has been sworn in, in the Senate or in the House, DON YOUNG was here. In fact, according to Roll Call, there are at least 75 Members of the House who were not even born when DON YOUNG came to Washington. That is an amazing achievement.

He has served Alaska and our country so well for 46 years that it was only right to feature him as the Alaskan of the Week and to make a special Alaskan of the Week poster with the young DON YOUNG and President Ford and many others and Don in uniform. We just love DON YOUNG in Alaska. Congrats to DON.

Where do we begin to talk about Congressman YOUNG and the enormous impact he has had on Alaska and America? Let me start in Central California, where he was raised on a small ranch. He began the hard work of ranching young. "My dad was a good man," Don said, "but he believed that when you turned 7, you became a hired man." So he worked sunup to sundown. It was hot, riddled with snakes, and poison ivy. When he was still young, his dad read him the book "The Call of the Wild" by Jack London. Alaska sounded really good to DON YOUNG. It was cold, not hot, and there were lots of dogs. He loved dogs. There were no snakes and no poison ivy.

After he got out of the Army in 1959, the year Alaska became a State, he heeded the call of the wild and headed up the Alcan—much of it was still unpaved—in a brandnew Plymouth Fury. Alaska would never be the same.

He fought forest fires. He owned a skating rink for a short time, but the BIA school needed a teacher in Fort Yukon, way up in the Interior on the Yukon River—a place he still, to this day, calls home and has a home there. In fact, he jokes that he is the only Congressman who uses an outhouse when he goes home. Anyway, he went to coach and teach fifth grade. He became a trapper, a gold miner, and a tugboat captain. Eventually, he met Lou, his wife, who stayed by his side for 46 years until she passed in 2009. Now he has found another partner in Ann. Thank you, Ann, for continuing to share him with all of us.

DON, with Lou's prompting, caught the political bug. He served in the State House in Alaska. He served in the State Senate in Alaska. He learned some good lessons there; namely, that his time in the State Senate taught him that he was more of a House guy, where bills move fast, where elections are right around the corner no matter what, and where the action is.

Along the way, they had two wonderful daughters, which to DON are still

the most important things in his life. Then Lou talked him into running for Congress, and with the help of people like my wife's grandmother who was an avid Don Young supporter, he began to introduce himself to a wider audience.

Due to a tragic airplane accident that took the life of then-Congressman Nick Begich, DON YOUNG was appointed to his seat in 1973. He won the next special election, and because he has been so effective for our State—he passed more than 90 bills, mostly to help Alaska—and because he knows so many of our fellow Alaskans by name because he is fiercely loyal, and because he has helped hundreds of his fellow Alaskans since 1973, he has been reelected every year since. I can't count how many elections that is, but it is a lot.

He is consistently ranked among the Congress's most effective legislators. He was just recently ranked the most effective legislator, No. 1 in the House, by the nonpartisan group the Center for Effective Lawmaking. Heck, even in his freshman year, Ralph Nader said he was the most powerful Congressman in the Congress. I imagine that he came to that conclusion with some trepidation.

You will not hear DON YOUNG talk about these things because he doesn't like to brag. He is a humble man, so let me do a little bragging on his behalf. Nearly everything, and I mean everything, that has advanced Alaska legislatively has DON YOUNG's fingerprints on them, from the Trans-Alaska Pipeline to the Ketchikan Shipyard, to the many land exchanges—kind of like what we just did recently on the Senate floor under Senator MURKOWSKI's leadership—to the health clinics dotting our State, to the state-of-the-art Alaska Native Medical Center in Anchorage, DON YOUNG has played a critical part in all of this.

He is tenacious. Just last Congress, DON YOUNG in the House, and Senator MURKOWSKI and I in the Senate, finally, after 40 years, got ANWR opened in terms of the ability for responsible resource development in the 1002 area of our State.

One of his biggest victories was the role he played in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which transformed the American fishing industry. Among other things, the act created a 200-mile limit to keep foreign fishermen from plundering our fish and to sustain our fisheries. It wasn't easy to get that bill passed through Congress. Congressman YOUNG worked it on the House side, and Ted Stevens, of course, worked it in the Senate.

After it passed the Congress, he still wasn't finished. President Ford was considering vetoing this legislation. His Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, thought it would raise tensions with key allies, especially Japan and Korea because they fished 3 miles right off the shores of Alaska, and we pushed them out to 200 miles with this legislation.

So on Air Force One in 1974, I believe, with a stopover at Alaska, DON YOUNG,

the new Congressman, debated one of the smartest guys in Washington, Henry Kissinger, in front of President Ford on whether the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which would transform our fisheries, should be vetoed. Kissinger argued it should; DON YOUNG argued it should not. Well, guess who won that debate on Air Force One. Legend has it that at the end, Henry Kissinger and DON YOUNG met for a martini after the debate DON YOUNG won. They are still good friends today. That is just another example.

DON YOUNG has been good friends with Presidents and has discussed the issues of the day with some of the most important people in the world, but through it all, he has never lost his fundamental goodness, sense of fair play, honor, and his willingness to reach across the aisle to help another Member.

He has never forgotten who he works for. He works for the people of Alaska, and he has remained a man of the people since he was elected. He has never, not for a second, lost his love for our great State. He could have done anything, and he chose to stay, year after year, decade after decade, to serve the people of our State and the people of America. He recently said:

Every day I try to do something for somebody in some group. And every day I try to learn something new. We all go into the ground the same way. The only thing we can leave behind [here on this Earth] are our accomplishments.

Well, he has notched numerous accomplishments, and he is far from finished. If I had my guess, I would also say he is far from finished with some of his famous theatrics too: brandishing walrus parts and steel traps on the floor of the House, maybe an altercation or two with colleagues that may or may not involve a sharp weapon, and campaign commercials that border on the humorous. DON YOUNG is not finished speaking his mind and giving us Alaskans his heart.

It has been an honor to serve our great State next to this historic figure. So Congressman YOUNG, for your service, for your mentorship, and friendship with me, thank you for all you have done for all of us in Alaska and in America.

Congratulations on being the longest serving Republican in the Congress in U.S. history today, and even more important, thank you and congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before I was elected Governor of Delaware in 1992, I served in the House of Representatives for five terms. We have one congressional seat. Alaska is one of those States, as the Senator from Alaska knows, that also has one congressional seat.

I got to the House on January 3, 1983, and one of the first people I met there

was DON YOUNG. We ended up on the same committee together, not the Environment and Public Works we serve on today but the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has a lot of the same jurisdiction as the Environment and Public Works Committee.

So I remember going to Alaska with him and a bunch of our colleagues and just going through Prudhoe and just seeing all kinds of places around the Senator's beautiful State and going back with my family years later.

My colleague is also a colonel in the Marines. I call him "colonel." He knows that JOHN BARRASSO and I like music and that every now and then, we will find some way to work some music lyrics into what we have to say. In listening to the Senator talk about DON YOUNG, it reminds me of a great song by Bob Dylan, called "Forever Young," which is a classic song. You can find anything on the internet these days, and someone was nice enough to pull up the first verse of the lyrics of "Forever Young" by Bob Dylan.

It goes something like this:

May God bless and keep you always
May your wishes all come true
May you always do for others
And let others do for you
May you build a ladder to the stars
And climb on every rung
May you stay forever young
Forever young, forever young
May you stay forever young

DON YOUNG, congratulations from your Delaware buddy and former colleague. Thank you.

What I really think we need to do is to join hands here in the Senate and sing "Kumbaya" and get our act together now that things have calmed down a little bit from earlier today.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I rise to speak this afternoon on the need for Congress to take some bold action in addressing climate change.

Earlier today, a number of our Republican friends were here on the Senate floor to chastise the Green New Deal, which is a resolution that was introduced by my good friend, the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I came down and listened for a bit. For a moment there, the conversation got a little bit heated, as our Presiding Officer may recall and, I am certain, as our staff recalls. I listened as several of our Republican friends denounced the resolution and claimed it would bankrupt the country and, in almost the same breath, claimed that they supported climate action without having provided a whole lot of tangible details about what actions they do support.

On several occasions, I have heard our friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that the Green New Deal is somehow preventing the Senate from doing work to produce results on climate action. If you had watched my Democratic colleagues and me during that debate, you would have noticed a little bit of frustration because we have long been eager to work with our

Republican colleagues on climate solutions, and we would gladly welcome the reality of how we could work in a bipartisan way on meaningful climate actions.

As the adage goes, actions speak louder than words, and for more than two decades, the Democrats have tried to put forth different climate solutions. Some of them have employed market forces, which is usually my favorite approach. Some have employed investing in technology. I like that one a lot too. Some have also set more strict standards, and sometimes that is part of the solution. Yet, when it comes to generating support for these policies, we don't seem to get much support from our friends on the other side of the aisle. At least we didn't today. I know this because I have sponsored quite a bit of legislation. I have sponsored pieces of legislation that have enacted many of these policies that I am talking about.

Despite these repeated setbacks, I remain ready; I remain willing; and I remain eager to work with our Republican colleagues to find approaches that work for them and that work for our planet. I am going to keep trying. I am one of those people who doesn't give up, and I am not going to give up in this instance either.

To say that a nonbinding resolution of bold ideas and ambitious goals is somehow keeping Congress from taking real action on climate change, with all due respect, is just not true. What is true is that my Democratic colleagues and I and, quite frankly, I think, the American people just don't see the urgency and the passion from our Republican friends to act on climate change. What is also true is that our country can no longer afford political leaders to give lip service to the growing climate crisis. We need real action, and we need it now.

I have a poster here that talks about extreme weather. I live in a little State, and we have seen wildfires not in my State but on the other side of our country, where one of our sons lives. We have seen wildfires in California, Oregon, Washington, and Montana that have been as big as Delaware—maybe that have been bigger than Delaware—just in the last year. We are told that the path that we are on with respect to global warming and climate change could, by 2050, give us a wildfire season that would burn up six times more forest area each year in parts of the United States—six times more—if we stay on the path that we are on today.

I have another chart here on sea level rise. Since 1993, sea levels have risen by 3 inches, which doesn't sound like much. By 2100, if we do nothing, we could see the sea level rise by 6 feet or more. If I had the time, I would explain the science behind that large, enormous increase. This will cause economic devastation along our coasts if we don't act. An estimated \$3.6 trillion in cumulative damage to U.S. coastal

properties and infrastructure could result from rising seas and extreme weather. I live in a State that is the lowest lying State in America. The State is sinking while the seas around us are rising, and that isn't a good combination. For us, this is up close and personal.

We also raise a lot of corn and soybeans, I am told, in Sussex County, DE, in southern Delaware. We may raise more soybeans than just about any county this side of the Mississippi River. According to the "National Climate Assessment," with more frequent and intense rains that are combined with rising temperatures, farmers will be likely to experience a reduction in corn and soybean yields by up to 25 percent.

I mention this because I talk to a lot of farmers in our State during the course of a week or a month, and I can't tell you how many times I have heard this year about the farmers who planted their crops last spring, a year ago, and it rained. Then they had to replant. It rained some more, and they tried to replant again, but it rained some more, and they were done. From that point on, they had no crops or they had greatly diminished crops. They used crop insurance, which, fortunately, was available. I think that these facts make clear that every sector in our economy is or will be disrupted by climate change if we don't act now.

We have had a GDP loss. This is the loss in the GDP from the great recession of about a decade ago, and this is the forecast for the GDP loss by 2100 if we stay on the course that we are on. Basically, it will be twice as big a hit to the GDP because of climate change than what we suffered in the great recession.

Earlier today, there was a common news release that we put out, and I am going to quote it. It reads: "Neither global efforts to mitigate the causes of climate change nor regional efforts to adapt to the impacts currently approach the scales needed to avoid substantial damages to the U.S. economy, environment, and human health and well-being over the coming decades."

Think about that. I am going to read that again: "Neither global efforts to mitigate the causes of climate change nor regional efforts to adapt to the impacts currently approach the scales needed to avoid substantial damages to the U.S. economy, environment, and human health and well-being over the coming decades."

That is not some statement from Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, or any number of environmental organizations. That is not the statement of any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the House or in the Senate. That is right out of the Government Accountability Office's high-risk list that was released earlier today. The GAO released its high-risk ways of losing money and raising money in our country. Again, one of the high-risk

areas the GAO identified in this year's report was our Federal Government's fiscal exposure to climate change risks. So there you have it from the non-partisan GAO, which is probably going to be a surprise to a lot of people.

We have two options here. We can either confront this challenge head-on and reduce carbon emissions, enhance resiliency, and support clean energy jobs or we can pretend the science is not real and do nothing, which will threaten the future of our children and our grandchildren. Sadly, with our current President in the White House, despite what you may have heard today again and again, our Republican friends—not all of them but too many of them—have taken the latter option. They have decided repeatedly to retreat from this threat and ignore the clear signs of climate change.

Instead of pursuing ideas to address climate change and protect Americans from its effects, we have seen the current administration promote policies that undermine the climate science and increase our dependency on dirty energy. These actions threaten U.S. competitiveness in the global clean energy economy, and they threaten the health of every single American. Unfortunately, most of our Republican friends have been applauding this President with every one of these actions.

The Democrats know that we cannot shrink away from this problem. We want to build on the work we started with President Obama and Vice President Biden when their administration was leading our country and when we set actions in motion to put our country on a path of net zero emissions for carbon.

During the Obama administration, starting with the Recovery Act right at the end of the great recession, the Federal Government provided economic incentives and smart regulations to support market investments in clean energy. Thanks to this work, consumers are paying less for energy, and more than 3 million people went to work today in the clean energy sector of our country. One of them, until a couple of years ago, was our older son, Christopher, who worked for a big company called Honeywell. The job for him and the folks with whom he worked was to work on large building energy conservation projects all over the Northeast. He did that for a number of years.

There are millions of jobs that are provided in that sector—millions of good-paying jobs. As folks are displaced, whether they happen to be coal miners or other folks who are displaced because of a loss of employment opportunities in that industry, we have a moral obligation to make sure that those men and women are retrained and retooled so they can do some of these jobs in which there happen to be technicians who work in the solar panel industry—in the solar energy industry—or in offshore wind or in energy conservation buildings. There is a

huge amount of waste in buildings, and a lot of tradesmen and -women can be employed in that sector.

Just today, though, I met with a number of folks in the wind industry, and they talked about the exciting growth in that industry, including in offshore wind. I learned that today the wind and solar industries are, respectively, the first and second fastest growing sectors in this country. I will say that again. I learned that today the wind and solar industry are, respectively, the first and second fastest growing sectors in this country. I was surprised to hear that.

Here is another fact. At the end of 2008, before President Obama took office, wind and other renewables, other than hydropower, made up about 3 percent of our Nation's electric-generating capacity. Think about that. At the end of 2008, Barack Obama was about to become President. At that time, wind and other renewables, other than hydro, made up about 3 percent of our Nation's electric-generating capacity. Wind power alone was at 1 percent. When President Obama and Joe Biden left office, renewables other than hydropower were hitting 10-percent capacity, with wind power making up about 7 percent. I learned today that wind power is expected to make up almost 10 percent of our Nation's electricity in 2 years, not in two decades but in 2 years. We have come a long way in a hurry, and I think that is only going to accelerate.

These substantial increases in clean energy economic opportunities aren't the result of markets just being markets; they were because we put smart policy in place and because we in this body invested in smart policy. We had leadership that believed that climate change was a threat, and we had an opportunity to do something good for our planet and, at the same time, create opportunity—job opportunities, employment opportunities—across the country, which is what happened.

These advances in clean energy are great, but much more must be done to address the growing climate crisis that we face. That is why the Democrats continue to support policies that will reduce our Nation's carbon footprint, will help to create a fair economy, and will support those who are the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

My hope is that our Republican friends will translate their words into actions by joining us in working on real climate solutions. Once again, I invite all of our Republican colleagues to join our resolution, which simply states that climate change is real, that we as humans have a fair amount to do with it, and that Congress needs to act. There are three things—that climate change is real; that we as humans have quite a bit to do with that; and that Congress needs to do something to respond to this threat. From there, let's have a meaningful, fact-based debate as to what actions we must take.

I have a piece of paper that reads for me to end with this, but I am not going to end with this. I am going to say this now and lead into something else. Calls to take climate action should not divide us. This is an issue that should unite us—not just our body, the Senate, not just the Congress, not just the Federal Government, but our country and our world.

In Isaiah, in the Old Testament, it says: "Come now and let us reason together." I used to think that was LBJ, and I found out it was Isaiah, and LBJ was quoting Isaiah. "Come now and let us reason together."

We have a robust and an innovative economy. That is a blessing. We should meet the climate challenges head-on. We should work together to make sure that policies we put in place harness the talents of the American people, provide good jobs and wages, and create economic opportunities, especially in communities that need them. It is not a time for political theater. Let's come together and debate solutions. Our children and their children are depending on us to chart a responsible path.

I want to say something to our Presiding Officer.

When I was new here, I remember sitting up there and watching a couple of guys who had been here for a while: a guy named Ted Kennedy—I think his chair and his desk were right back there—a very liberal Democrat, maybe the most liberal Democrat we had in the Senate at the time—and a fellow on the Republican side in like the second row, about halfway over, MIKE ENZI. They would come to the floor sometimes when I was presiding as a new Senator, and I couldn't believe that day after day, week after week, month after month, they would come to the floor and get all kinds of stuff done. You had Ted Kennedy, who was maybe the most liberal Democrat, and you had MIKE ENZI, who was arguably one of the most conservative Republicans we had, and as the leaders of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, they got a ton of stuff done.

I once asked MIKE ENZI—one day, I was presiding while he was speaking, and he talked about the 80/20 rule. When he talked about the 80/20 rule, I didn't know what he was talking about. After he finished talking, I asked him to come up to where you are sitting, Mr. President.

I was presiding, and I said: MIKE ENZI, what is the 80/20 rule?

He said: That is the secret. That is why Ted Kennedy and I get so much done.

I said: What is it?

He said: Ted and I agree on 80 percent of this stuff, and we disagree on 20 percent of this stuff. We focus on the 80 percent where we agree and set aside the other 20 percent to come back to at a later date.

I said: Ah, the 80/20 rule.

I will close with this. I remember that when I was new here, like the Pre-

siding Officer, some of the people in the Senate were people whom I had served with in the House. I knew them. I had served with some of the people when I was Governor, and I knew them. But there were a bunch of people here whom I didn't know. So I got here, I was new, and I would just ask the people I didn't know if I could maybe come to their office and have a cup of coffee with them and just talk for a while. People were very nice to do that.

One of the people I did this with was Ted Kennedy. I just really didn't know him. I remember meeting with him and asking him if maybe I could come by his office and have a cup of coffee sometime.

He said: Fine. We will do better than that. Come to my hideaway. We will have lunch together.

I was blown away. Here is this guy who is a legend, and he is willing to invite me to his hideaway to have lunch. I went, and I will never forget it. His hideaway was about three times the size of mine, and it was like a Kennedy museum. It was just incredible.

I said: Why is it that so many Republicans want you, Ted Kennedy, a very liberal Democrat, to be their cosponsor and to be their dance partner on legislation that needs a Democrat? Why do so many people want to work with you? I will never forget what he said. He said: I think this is the reason, TOM. I am always willing to compromise on policy; never willing to compromise on principle.

That is what he said.

I would say the lesson for us today is this: We have a problem on this planet. I think most of us realize this is a real problem. Our planet is getting hotter, warmer. We are seeing vestiges of that every day with this crazy weather we live with.

DAN SULLIVAN was just on the floor talking about the Iditarod. It was only about 2 years ago that they had to truck snow in to be able to actually have the Iditarod dog race in Alaska.

There is crazy stuff going on with our weather. I think some of the policy and the principle here is that—our planet is getting warmer, we have something to do with that as human beings, and I think we have an obligation here in the Senate to do something positive about it. The great news is that we could actually create a lot of jobs by doing that, by responding to this challenge.

My hope is that here in the tumult of today's debate and maybe the debate going forward, that we will all keep in mind MIKE ENZI's words on the 80/20 rule and that we will keep in mind the words of Ted Kennedy: always willing to compromise on policy; never willing to compromise on principle. Maybe, guided by their wisdom, we can find a middle ground and do something good for not just this body, not just the Congress, not just our country, but good for our planet and our kids.

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. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Murphy nomination expire at 12:30 p.m., Thursday, March 7; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that following disposition of the Murphy nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Fleming nomination, the cloture motion on the nomination be withdrawn, the time until 1:45 be equally divided in the usual form, and the Senate vote on the nomination at 1:45; finally, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, on March 4 and 5, 2019, I was unavoidably absent due to illness during rollcall votes Nos. 34 and 35. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SAM MAMET

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to honor the career of Sam Mamet, who recently announced his retirement as the executive director of the Colorado Municipal League. Sam spent the better half of his adult life working to empower communities and local governments across Colorado. It is not an understatement to say that every corner of the State is incredibly grateful for his work.

Sam joined the Colorado Municipal League in 1979, when he spearheaded the organization's advocacy in the State capitol. After 26 years in that po-

sition, Sam would go on to spend the rest of his time in the organization as its executive director. There, he worked tirelessly to foster partnerships across the State and the country that have benefited Colorado's 270 towns and cities. He also spent time as an adjunct professor of political science at CU Denver.

Throughout my time in public service, I have always appreciated Sam's thoughtful approach to policymaking, his collaborative spirit, and his unwavering advocacy for our local communities. When I worked in local government, I always knew I could count on Sam to ensure that our perspective would be heard at the State and Federal level. After joining the Senate, I have had the benefit of his advice across issues, ranging from infrastructure to tax policy.

Going forward, I will miss Sam's wit, humility, and sense of humor—attributes in short supply in our politics today.

Although Sam is retiring from the Municipal League, I suspect he will continue to serve the State of Colorado with the same passion that has characterized his career. We wish Sam well in retirement and extend our deepest thanks for his lifetime of public service. ●

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON PARISH

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge the 200th anniversary of the founding of Washington Parish in my home State of Louisiana. It is a parish filled with determined and patriotic citizens who work day in and day out to better our State and our Nation.

Washington Parish, named in honor of our first President, is located in the section of Louisiana known as the Florida Parishes. The parish government was founded on March 6, 1819, and a few years later, the town of Franklinton would become the permanent parish seat. The parish covers 676 square miles with the Mississippi State line serving as the eastern and northern borders.

The area is rich with American history. In 1814, Andrew Jackson marched with his soldiers across the Pearl River and recruited many of the local citizens to join them in the Battle of New Orleans. The "Military Road" constructed by General Andrew Jackson crossed the Pearl River into present-day Bogalusa. Records from the War Department show the future President and his troops made camp in the area on November 28, 1814.

As one of the most rural parts of the State, the parish is known for its pine forests, rolling hills, and many farms. The people who call Washington Parish home are incredibly proud of their local heritage, good food, and for hosting the Washington Parish Free Fair, the Nation's largest free fair.

I would like to wish the citizens of Washington Parish a very happy bicen-

ennial and thank them for their many contributions over the last 200 years to our beautiful State and to our Nation. ●

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL COLLEEN MCGUIRE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I have the honor of recognizing BG Colleen McGuire, Retired, of Missoula, MT, for being inducted into the U.S. Army Women's Foundation Hall of Fame on March 7, 2019.

Colleen has stayed true to her Montana roots, spending her childhood and collegiate years in Missoula. As a student at the University of Montana, she excelled in the Reserve Officer Training Corps, ROTC and began her distinguished career with the 279th Engineer Company at Fort Missoula. Upon graduation, she continued to serve her great country as she earned a commission in U.S. Army while serving with the Military Police Corps. Her academic achievements continued as she earned a master's of arts and science from the Command and Staff College and a master's of strategic studies from the Army War College.

Colleen's highly accomplished journey through the U.S. Army consists of a multitude of leadership roles as exemplified by her command of troops. Early in her career, her inspirational leadership skills were evident as she led a platoon in Germany and later taking command of the Bravo Company within the Law Enforcement Command of Fort Lewis, WA. Success in these roles propelled her career, and in 1998 she was hand-selected to command the 705th Military Police Battalion, Fort Leavenworth, KS.

One notable chapter in Colleen's career came in the fall of 1993, when she was assigned as the public affairs officer for Joint Task Force-Somalia. In early October, two U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopters were shot down during a covert operation, which launched a 2-day battle that later became known as the Battle of Mogadishu. In the months that followed, Colleen played a pivotal role in telling the United States' story that would later inspire several books and the movie "Black Hawk Down."

Perhaps Colleen's most notable achievements came as she shattered glass ceilings across the Army. Epitomizing the Montana pioneer spirit, she was the first female to assume command of the U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command, CID, serve as the provost marshal General of the Army, and take command of the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks in Fort Leavenworth KS. Not only did she command with distinction, but she opened the door for aspiring women to follow in her footsteps. It is fitting that Colleen should be inducted into the U.S. Army Women's Foundation Hall of Fame, and I am pleased that her accomplishments will be memorialized as an example for generations to come.

During her military service, she earned numerous awards. Colleen's

awards include the following: Legion of Merit with two oak-leaf clusters, the Bronze Star Medal, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with four oak-leaf clusters, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal with three oak-leaf clusters, the Army Achievement Medal with three oak-leaf clusters, the Iraqi Campaign Medal, the Senior Parachutist's Badge, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.

After 32 years of dedicated service, Colleen now resides in Kalispell, MT. She continues to serve as an inspirational leader in the community. On behalf of our grateful Nation, I thank her for her courage and selfless dedication to others as a hallmark for generation to come.●

RECOGNIZING JOPLIN HIGH SCHOOL ROTC

● Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Joplin High School Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, one of the oldest such programs in the United States.

At a time when our Nation faces extraordinary challenges at home and abroad, preparing the next generation is paramount. The future lays in the hands of our youth. Since 1919, Joplin High School JROTC has been developing outstanding citizens for Missouri through leadership development, discipline, and service.

Today, less than 1 percent of Americans serve in the military; yet, Joplin High School JROTC has 120 cadets who are part of the program's historic legacy under the leadership of Lt. Col. (Ret.) Joshua Reitz and 1SG (Ret.) Richard Banks. Some of these cadets will go on to put the lessons and leadership training they received into practice through service in the U.S. Armed Forces. Military service is not only a career, but a lifestyle full of continuous reward and knowledge. For those that choose the path of Military Service, we should thank.

To the members of Eagle Battalion, I urge you to uphold your school's core values of truth, honor, and loyalty. These values may be no guarantee of popularity, comfort, or success, at least not as the world defines success; yet, a life of integrity characterized by these virtues is a life of which you can be proud.

The path of leadership is a difficult one and often lonely. America needs strong servant-leaders in the next generation willing to confront the challenges we face with courage, rooted in the principles that make our Nation great.

As your Senator, I have been given the solemn responsibility to nominate young women and men for placements at our Nation's service academies. It is a duty I do not take lightly, knowing that these future leaders will be on the frontlines of securing American freedom. I encourage those of you who

have been a part of Joplin High School JROTC to seriously consider applying for one of these highly selective spots. The program's legacy of excellence demands that I give your candidacy the consideration it deserves.

I want to thank Joplin High School ROTC for their dedication to their school, to Joplin, to Missouri, and to our country. Congratulations on the first 100 years of service, and here is to the next century of service.●

REMEMBERING KATHLEEN "MIKE" DALTON

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, she was a mentor, communicator, historian, volunteer, role model, and a friend with an incredible memory of Alaska history, a journalist, public servant, a Republican, a woman who had strong opinions and was not afraid to express them, a pillar of the community, a legend.

This weekend, the Pioneers of Alaska Fairbanks Igloo will remember Kathleen "Mike" Dalton who passed in January at the age of 93. I rise today to speak in memory of my friend, this woman named Mike, an oracle of Alaska history and at the same time a fixture of Alaska's political history.

So how does a girl get the name Mike? Mike was born to an Irish father who anticipated that he would have two children. One named Patricia, the other named Mike. Problem is that Mike's father had little control of the gender of his children. Mike's sister, the first of the children, was named Patricia. The second, who turned out to be a girl as well, was named Kathleen, but that stubborn Irish father would have nothing of it. Kathleen was "Mike" from the very beginning.

Mike grew up in Arizona. Her father worked on the Navajo Reservation as a carpenter and construction worker. She moved to Tucson to attend Catholic school at age 10 and graduated with a degree in English from Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff. She followed a friend and schoolmate to Alaska, and as they say, the rest is history.

Mike acclimated well to the north and was quickly introduced to the sport of dog mushing. She met Jim Dalton, the son of a pioneer and Klondike gold rush legend and married him in 1950. Jim was an engineer who played a major role in development of the naval petroleum reserve on Alaska's North Slope. Jim and Mike lived in Barrow, now the community known as Utqiagvik, and had two children. They bought 30 acres in Fairbanks and built a loghouse. Jim continued to work on the North Slope. Mike stayed in Fairbanks to raise the children, but ever ingenious, she found ways to hitch a ride to see Jim. She made 12 trips above the Arctic Circle during the winter of 1968-1969.

Mike chose to live a full life in Fairbanks. She was a reporter for the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, writing the first draft of Alaska's post-Statehood

history. She covered all of the big events: the 1964 earthquake, the 1967 Fairbanks flood, the discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay, and the construction of a 500-mile haul road that made oil production possible. That road is today known as the Dalton Highway, in acknowledgment of Jim Dalton's pioneering work on the North Slope. Jim died in 1977.

While Mike's writing endeared her to Alaskans, her greater contribution may be her decision to rescue all of the News-Miner's World War II era photo archives from a dumpster, after an editor new to Alaska, determined that they lacked historic value. Waiting until dark, she dove in, dusted the photos off, and preserved them.

She was recruited to stuff envelopes and lick stamps for Republican candidates, the stepping stone to a half century's leadership in the Fairbanks Republican Women's Club. Her email list was envied by all.

In 1964, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, a regional government for interior Alaska, was formed. Mike ran for a seat on the borough assembly, which is the borough's legislative body. She was the top vote getter. Turning to a career in government, Mike managed Senator Ted Stevens' interior Alaska field office from 1971-1978. She worked for another legend, who recently passed, Alaska State Senator Jack Coghill, and during the administration of Governor Jay Hammond, she relocated to Washington, DC, to manage Alaska's Washington office.

Returning to Alaska, she devoted her life to community service. In 1991, she worked for the city of Unalaska and helped organize the 50th commemoration of the Japanese occupation of the Aleutians. She helped organize the first American delegation visit to the Russian Far East and the Kamchatka Peninsula, hoping to improve ties between Russia and Alaska as the USSR came apart. Active in the Pioneers of Alaska, Mike recorded oral histories of Alaska's pioneers for the University of Alaska archives. She repatriated 24 paintings by Alaska's most famous artist, Sydney Laurence, back to Alaska. She was active in the campaign to settle Alaska Native land claims and was one of the first non-Natives to be honored by the Fairbanks Native Association.

Mike was about service to others, not glory to herself. She would drive 50 miles out of town to give a ride to a sourdough who needed it, deliver her prized oatmeal cookies to the seniors, chase after a dog gone astray. She went out to fix the culverts that collapsed under the weight of Alaska winter to prevent spring floods, and she raised money for the hospital. She was generous to newcomers who experienced difficulties in acclimating and a mentor to young women.

Upon Mike's induction to the Alaska Women's Hall of Fame in 2016, it was

remembered that Mike refused to attend an event honoring her 90th birthday because she was so adamantly opposed to self-aggrandizement.

The Alaska Women's Hall of Fame recognized Mike as a "seemingly tireless activist whose efforts have made waves since her arrival in Alaska from Arizona in 1949 . . . As for Fairbanks, her home base for more than half a century Mike played a major part in shaping its social, political and economic future, as well as the state, while preserving a valuable part of our history."

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to share a brief glimpse into the extraordinary life of Mike Dalton in the U.S. Senate today. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 47. An act to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 483. An act to enact into law a bill by reference.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 11:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 49. An act to designate the outstation of the Department of Veterans Affairs in North Ogden, Utah, as the Major Brent Taylor Vet Center Outstation.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 347. An act to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado.

H.R. 762. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1271. An act to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for pre-med students preparing to attend medical school.

H.R. 1381. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with a registered individual's cause of death, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 347. An act to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 762. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1138. An act to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 1271. An act to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for pre-med students preparing to attend medical school.

H.R. 1381. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with a registered individual's cause of death, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 6, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 47. An act to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 483. An act to enact into law a bill by reference.

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-521. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs) transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report relative to the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget meeting the nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-522. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Productivity Enhancing Capital Investment (PECI)" (RIN0790-AK46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-523. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Rates of Subsistence Allowance and Commutation Instead of Uniforms for Members of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps" (RIN0790-AK32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-524. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Timing Requirements for Filing Reports on Form N-Port" (RIN3235-AL42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-525. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of his intent to terminate the designation of India as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-526. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of his intent to terminate the designation of Turkey as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-527. 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; Ohio River; Louisville, KY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0168)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-528. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Oil Spill Response Plans and Information Sharing for High-Hazard Flammable Trains (FAST Act)" (RIN2137-AF08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 1, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-11. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Tompkins County, New York urging the United States Congress to pass the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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 Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 668. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 669. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 670. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 671. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 672. A bill to establish State-Federal partnerships to provide students the opportunity to attain higher education at in-State public institutions of higher education without debt, to provide Federal Pell Grant eligibility to DREAMer students, to repeal suspension of eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965 for drug-related offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 673. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 674. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a grant program for the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure along the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 675. A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to temporarily provide water uncontaminated with perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) for agricultural purposes to areas affected by contamination from military installations, and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to acquire real property to ex-

tend the contiguous geographic footprint of any Air Force base that has shown signs of contamination from PFOA and PFOS due to activities on the base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain post graduation scholarship grants from gross income in the same manner as qualified scholarships to promote economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 677. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide for the participation of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 678. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 679. A bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 681. A bill to establish a new higher education data system to allow for more accurate, complete, and secure data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes, at all levels of postsecondary enrollment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms.

ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 682. A bill to restore the Federal Communications Commission's Open Internet Order and its net neutrality protections; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 683. A bill to establish a voluntary program in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to encourage consumers to purchase or lease new automobiles made in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. PETERS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 685. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 686. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater access to higher education for America's students, to eliminate educational barriers for participation in a public service career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 687. A bill to provide for a temporary safe harbor for certain failures by individuals to pay estimated income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 688. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 689. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to support State and Tribal efforts to develop and implement management strategies to address chronic wasting disease among deer, elk, and moose populations, to support research regarding the causes of chronic wasting disease and methods to control the further spread of the disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN,

Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 690. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the child tax credit fully refundable, establish an increased child tax credit for young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 96. A resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People's Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 97. A resolution establishing the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. Res. 98. A resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 25

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 25, a bill to reserve any amounts forfeited to the United States Government as a result of the criminal prosecution of Joaquin Archivaldo Guzman Loera (commonly known as "El Chapo"), or of other felony convictions involving the transportation of controlled substances into the United States, for security measures along the Southern border, including the completion of a border wall.

S. 61

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 61, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their

dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 179

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 179, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a clinical trial of the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of adults with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 186

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 186, a bill to ensure timely completion of the concurrent resolution on the budget and regular appropriations bills, and for other purposes.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 237, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes.

S. 279

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

S. 287

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 287, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes.

S. 336

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 336, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the response of law enforcement agencies to reports of missing or murdered Indians.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 454

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish the Office of Rural Broadband, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal

the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to assist States in improving guardianship oversight and data collection.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 94

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 94, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Justice should protect individuals with pre-existing medical conditions by defending the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), in which the plaintiffs seek to invalidate protections for individuals with pre-existing medical conditions.

S. RES. 95

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 95, a resolution recognizing the 198th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 674. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a grant program for the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure along the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, Today I am introducing the "Clean Corridors Act of 2019." This legislation authorizes \$3 billion in grant funding to public entities for installing electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure along designated corridors.

Earlier this week, Chairman BARRASSO and I sent a letter to the full Senate requesting Senators' priorities for a surface transportation bill reauthorization this Congress. The surface transportation bill is the primary authorizing legislation for the programs of the Federal Highway Administration at the U.S. Department of Transportation, among other programs related to surface transportation.

As the Ranking Member on the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, this legislation is a reauthorization priority of my own.

Nearly two years ago, the Rocky Mountain Institute published a report that said re-installing electric vehicle charging infrastructure should be, quote, an "urgent priority in all states

and major municipalities. Getting it right will require unprecedented cooperation by many stakeholder groups. The time to act is now."

I agree. This legislation would provide grants for the installment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure along the National Highway System. This bill is the product of remarkable collaboration between stakeholders, and it will take us one step forward in reducing emissions, improving air quality, and enhancing energy security and fuel choice. This legislation is endorsed by stakeholders from across the electric vehicle supply chain, including the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, Electric Drive Transportation Association, Edison Electric Institute, Auto Alliance, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, and the American Highway Users Alliance.

As I have stated before, the threat of climate change is greater than any one state, or region or country—we all have to do our part, and the federal government has a leadership role to play. By deploying necessary electric and fuel cell vehicle charging infrastructure, and supporting growth of these needed technologies, doing so will help us lower the rate of emissions of carbon into our atmosphere.

Even better yet, this legislation will help us in our efforts to put the United States back in the driver's seat of the world's clean energy economy, while creating green manufacturing jobs here at home. This legislation is a true win-win for our environment and our economy, and it is my hope that the Senate will support this legislation and that it will be enacted this Congress.

S. 674

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 "Clean Corridors Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. GRANTS FOR CHARGING AND FUELING INFRASTRUCTURE TO MODERNIZE AND RECONNECT AMERICA FOR THE 21ST CENTURY.

(a) PURPOSE; FINDINGS.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish a grant program to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure along designated alternative fuel corridors that will be accessible to all drivers of zero emission vehicles.

(2) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) greater adoption of zero emission vehicles will help—

(i) reduce emissions and improve air quality;

(ii) enhance the energy security of the United States by expanding the use of zero emission fuels;

(iii) enhance fuel choice and utilization of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure in order to benefit consumers;

(iv) ensure that the transportation infrastructure of the United States is equipped to manage the demands and anticipated future needs of the economy; and

(v) develop a new economic sector in the United States that will create middle class jobs;

(B) consumer and business adoption of zero emission vehicles depends in part on the availability of reliable and convenient fueling and charging infrastructure;

(C) electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure must be strategically deployed to ensure the deployment and adoption of zero emission fuels; and

(D) infrastructure owners and operators should prepare to meet the charging and fueling needs of electric vehicles and hydrogen vehicles.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 151 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the FAST Act, the Secretary shall” and inserting “The Secretary shall periodically”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “previously designated by the Federal Highway Administration or” before “designated by”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “5 years after the date of establishment of the corridors under subsection (a), and every 5 years thereafter,” and inserting “180 days after the date of enactment of the Clean Corridors Act of 2019,”; and

(B) by inserting “establish a recurring process to regularly” before “update”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “establishes an aspirational goal of achieving” and inserting “describes efforts, including through funds awarded through the grant program under subsection (f), that will aid efforts to achieve”; and

(ii) by striking “by the end of fiscal year 2020,” and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) summarizes best practices and provides guidance, developed through consultation with the Secretary of Energy, for project development of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure at the State, Tribal, and local level to allow for the predictable deployment of that infrastructure.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Clean Corridors Act of 2019, the Secretary shall establish a grant program to award grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (5).

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity eligible to receive a grant under this subsection is—

“(A) a State or political subdivision of a State;

“(B) a metropolitan planning organization;

“(C) a unit of local government;

“(D) a special purpose district or public authority with a transportation function, including a port authority;

“(E) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304));

“(F) an authority, agency, or instrumentality of, or an entity owned by, 1 or more entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (E); or

“(G) a group of entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (F).

“(3) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall require, including a description of how the eligible entity has considered—

“(A) public accessibility of charging or fueling infrastructure proposed to be funded with a grant under this subsection, includ-

“(i) charging or fueling connector types and publicly available information on real-time availability; and

“(ii) payment methods to ensure secure, convenient, fair, and equal access;

“(B) collaborative engagement with stakeholders (including automobile manufacturers, utilities, infrastructure providers, technology providers, zero emission fuel providers, metropolitan planning organizations, States, Indian tribes, and units of local governments, fleet owners, fleet managers, fuel station owners and operators, labor organizations, infrastructure construction and component parts suppliers, and multi-State and regional entities)—

“(i) to foster enhanced, coordinated, public-private or private investment in electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure;

“(ii) to expand deployment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure;

“(iii) to protect personal privacy and ensure cybersecurity; and

“(iv) to ensure that a properly trained workforce is available to construct and install electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure;

“(C) the location of the station or fueling site, such as consideration of—

“(i) the availability of onsite amenities for vehicle operators, such as restrooms or food facilities;

“(ii) access in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); and

“(iii) height and fueling capacity requirements for facilities that charge or refuel large vehicles, such as semi-trailer trucks;

“(D) infrastructure installation that can be responsive to technology advancements, such as accommodating autonomous vehicles and future charging methods; and

“(E) the long-term operation and maintenance of the electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure, to avoid stranded assets and protect the investment of public funds in that infrastructure.

“(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting eligible entities to receive a grant under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the application of the eligible entity would—

“(A) improve alternative fueling corridor networks by—

“(i) converting corridor-pending corridors to corridor-ready corridors; or

“(ii) in the case of corridor-ready corridors, providing redundancy—

“(I) to meet excess demand for charging and fueling infrastructure; or

“(II) to reduce congestion at existing charging and fueling infrastructure in high-traffic locations;

“(B) meet current or anticipated market demands for charging or fueling infrastructure;

“(C) enable or accelerate the construction of charging or fueling infrastructure that would be unlikely to be completed without Federal assistance; and

“(D) support a long-term competitive market for electric vehicle charging and hydrogen fueling infrastructure.

“(5) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subsection shall only use the funds to contract with a private entity for acquisition and installation of publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure that is directly related to the charging or fueling of a vehicle in accordance with this paragraph.

“(B) LOCATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE.—Any electric vehicle charging infrastructure or

hydrogen fueling infrastructure acquired and installed with a grant under this subsection shall be located along an alternative fuel corridor designated—

“(i) under this section, on the condition that any affected Indian tribes are consulted before the designation; or

“(ii) by a State or group of States, such as the Regional Electric Vehicle West Plan of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, on the condition that any affected Indian tribes are consulted before the designation.

“(C) OPERATING ASSISTANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), an eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use a portion of the funds to provide to a private entity operating assistance for the first 5 years of operations after the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure while the facility transitions to independent system operations.

“(ii) INCLUSIONS.—Operating assistance under this subparagraph shall be limited to costs allocable to operating and maintaining the electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure and service, including costs associated with labor, marketing, and administrative costs.

“(iii) LIMITATION.—Operating assistance under this subparagraph may not exceed the amount of a contract under subparagraph (A) to acquire and install publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure.

“(D) SIGNS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to this paragraph and paragraph (6)(B), an eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use a portion of the funds to acquire and install—

“(I) traffic control devices located in the right-of-way to provide directional information to electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure acquired, installed, or operated with the grant; and

“(II) on-premises signs to provide information about electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure acquired, installed, or operated with a grant under this subsection.

“(ii) APPLICABILITY.—Clause (i) shall apply only to an eligible entity that—

“(I) receives a grant under this subsection; and

“(II) is using that grant for the acquisition and installation of publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure and hydrogen fueling infrastructure.

“(iii) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT.—The amount of funds used to acquire and install traffic control devices and on-premises signs under clause (i) may not exceed the amount of a contract under subparagraph (A) to acquire and install publicly accessible charging or fueling infrastructure.

“(iv) NO NEW AUTHORITY CREATED.—Nothing in this subparagraph authorizes an eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection to acquire and install traffic control devices or on-premises signs if the entity is not otherwise authorized to do so.

“(6) PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any project funded by a grant under this subsection shall be treated as a project on a Federal-aid highway under this chapter.

“(B) SIGNS.—Any traffic control device or on-premises sign acquired, installed, or operated with a grant under this subsection shall comply with—

“(i) the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, if located in the right-of-way; and

“(ii) other provisions of Federal, State, and local law, as applicable.

“(7) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out with a grant under this subsection shall not exceed 80 percent of the total project cost.

“(8) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2028.”.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 686. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater access to higher education for America’s students, to eliminate educational barriers for participation in a public service career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Strengthening American Communities (SAC) Act of 2019. My bill seeks to expand access to debt-free public service career pathways for Americans who want to serve their communities, States, or our Nation. No one should be denied the opportunity to serve their community as a law enforcement officer, public health practitioner, social worker, or educator based on his or her ability to afford the rising cost of an undergraduate education. As Congress moves towards reauthorizing the Higher Education Act this year, I intend for my bill to be a first step towards correcting public sector workforce disparities by enabling people to serve their communities without being hobbled by massive student loan debt, and by providing current public servants with the financial freedom to continue to heed their calling to service.

Every city, town, and rural community in the United States relies on individuals who choose to utilize their talents for the betterment of others while accepting the lower pay of public service careers. The very foundation of our civil society is based on these public servants making such sacrifices. Far too many individuals who feel drawn to public service do not pursue such careers—or they are forced to abandon such careers prematurely—due to the high cost of obtaining their college educations. When I had the opportunity to hear directly from a student at an Historically Black College and University (HBCU) in my home State of Maryland, I was saddened to hear from an academically successful sophomore who was planning to drop out of school because she feared further indebting herself and her family. She said that while she appreciated the financial assistance she did receive, it simply wasn’t sufficient to cover her cost of attendance. While this student had aspirations to serve in her own community, she could not bear to burden her family with the cost of her education. As a result, my home City of Baltimore missed out on the talents of an engaged and aspiring public servant.

Our current system of indebting individuals at the onset of their careers has led to minority underrepresenta-

tion in the public sector workforce. First generation college students and students from low-income families cannot afford to take on student loan debt and enter into lower-paying public service careers. As a result, our Nation is deprived of the talents and perspectives of individuals who want to serve their communities but simply cannot afford to do so. As a result, our workforce is less representative of the people it serves. We must find new ways for people to earn the degrees they need to meet our community needs. I believe that students who make a commitment to public service should be afforded a debt-free pathway to the baccalaureate degree they need to start their public service career just as those individuals who have already made the decision to choose service over salary should not have to wait for ten years in a lower-paying public service career before seeing any reward in the form of federal student loan forgiveness.

The Strengthening American Communities Act I am introducing today offers a new path for future public servants to earn their baccalaureate degree. Through a new partnership between the Federal Government, States, and public and private, non-profit institutions of higher education, students will have the ability to receive the first two years of their education at a community college, Minority Serving Institution, or Historically Black College or University tuition- and fee-free. Colleges would be required to commit to ensuring student success, and students would have to meet certain academic standards and complete their education within two years. Once students start their junior or senior years or transfer into a four-year institution, those who commit themselves to at least three years of public service and meet certain academic standards will receive a National Public Service Education Grant to pay a significant portion of their college’s tuition, fees, and room and board costs. Universities must provide students with opportunities to engage in public service commitments, academic counseling and student support services, and the opportunity to earn to finish their degree in fewer than two years. Depending on a student’s financial need, under the Strengthening American Communities Act, they may be able to graduate with a baccalaureate degree debt-free before embarking on their chosen path to become a public servant.

For those individuals who have already answered their calling to public service, my legislation would assist more public servants continue serving their communities by accelerating the existing Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. Under current law, these dedicated workers must work for 10 years in a public service career and make 120 monthly payments on their federal student loans before they see a dime of federal student loan forgiveness. Economic, family, and other reasons can cause individuals to leave the

public sector workforce and despite their years of service, the service these workers provided are not taken into consideration. I propose to accelerate the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program to provide more immediate student loan relief. For every two years of employment and corresponding monthly Federal student loan payments, hard-working public sector employees will receive a percentage of their federal student loans forgiven, with 100 percent of the federal student loan balance being forgiven at the end of 10 years of service. With 99 percent of the initial round of PSLF applicants being rejected last year for loan forgiveness due to administrative barriers and misunderstanding of the rules of the program, Congress should work to accelerating Public Service Loan Forgiveness, therefore encouraging additional individuals to stay in the public sector workforce despite the lower-paying salaries, reduce their cost of borrowing for home and auto loans, and set aside additional money for their own retirement.

As Congress moves forward with an overdue reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to help individuals who are wholly committed to public service by supporting the Strengthening American Communities Act. No individual willing to serve his or her community in a public service career should be held back from that calling due to the high cost of obtaining a college education. No individual willing to serve his or her community should be forced to leave public service because of financial hardship.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce in the Senate, with my colleague Senator YOUNG, a bipartisan resolution to repeal the 1991 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMF) against Iraq. This legislation will formally end the authorizations for the Gulf and Iraq wars—28 and 17 years, respectively, after these AUMFs were first passed, reasserting Congress’ vital role in not only declaring wars, but in ending them. The repeal of these authorizations also recognizes the strong partnership the United States now has with a sovereign, democratic Iraq.

The United States is no longer at war with Iraq and our legal frameworks should reflect this reality as much as our policy frameworks, to include the Strategic Framework Agreement that Iraq and the United States signed in November 2008, which affirms the establishment of a long-term relationship of cooperation and friendship, based on the principle of equality in

sovereignty and the rights and principles that are enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Since 2014, U.S. troops have been in Iraq, alongside Iraqi forces, at the Government of Iraq's request for assistance in combating the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Current Administration officials, including Secretary Pompeo, Acting Secretary Shanahan and Commander of the United States Central Command, General Votel, have routinely emphasized that United States military forces remain in Iraq at the invitation of the Government of Iraq and in respect to its sovereignty. Recent presidential administrations have maintained that the 2002 AUMF only serves to "reinforce" any legal authority to combat ISIS provided by the 2001 AUMF and is not independently required to authorize any such activities. As such, repealing the 1991 AUMF and the 2002 AUMF would not affect ongoing United States military operations. It would however, prevent the future misuse of the Gulf and Iraq War authorizations and strengthen Congressional oversight over war powers.

It is past time to repeal both AUMFs and formally mark the end of the Iraq War that resulted in a devastating loss of life and wounded tens of thousands of our troops. It makes no sense that two AUMFs remain in place against a country that is now a close ally. They serve no operational purpose, run the risk of future abuse by the President, and help keep our nation at permanent war.

I am proud to join Senator YOUNG in introducing a bill to repeal these outdated and unnecessary authorizations. I hope we can continue to find bipartisan compromise on these tough war power issues to include revising and replacing the 2001 AUMF.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA FOR UPHOLDING THE RULE OF LAW AND EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER ACTIONS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FROM THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA FOR THE EXTRADITION OF A HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD. EXECUTIVE

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 96

Whereas, on December 1, 2018, Canadian authorities detained Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. chief financial officer Meng Wanzhou based on an arrest warrant issued pursuant to a request made by the United States under the Extradition Treaty Between the

United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington December 3, 1971;

Whereas, on January 24, 2019, the United States filed a superseding indictment in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York against Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. ("Huawei"), Huawei Device Co. Inc., Skycom Tech Co. Ltd. ("Skycom"), and Meng Wanzhou;

Whereas the January 24, 2019, indictment charges two counts of bank fraud; two counts of conspiracy to commit bank fraud; one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud; two counts of bank fraud; one count of wire fraud; one count of conspiracy to defraud the United States; two counts of conspiracy to violate the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; two counts of violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; one count of money laundering conspiracy; and one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice;

Whereas the January 24, 2019, indictment charges that "Huawei operated Skycom as an unofficial subsidiary to obtain otherwise prohibited U.S.-origin goods, technology, and services, including banking services, for Huawei's Iran-based business while concealing the link to Huawei";

Whereas the United States Government is seeking the extradition of Meng Wanzhou;

Whereas Canadian authorities granted Meng Wanzhou access to Chinese consular officials, and she was able to engage a lawyer of her choice and was released on bail pending the outcome of the extradition hearing;

Whereas the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs strongly urged Canada "to immediately release" Meng Wanzhou and threatened that otherwise "it will definitely have grave consequences, and [Canada] will have to bear the full responsibility for it";

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China detained Canadian diplomat Michael Kovrig and Canadian executive Michael Spavor on December 10, 2018, in apparent retaliation for the arrest of Meng Wanzhou;

Whereas Michael Spavor and Michael Kovrig have faced harsh conditions while in detention that include limited consular access, no access to a lawyer, being unable to turn off the lights at night, and lengthy interrogations, including in the case of Mr. Kovrig, about his official activities during his previous tenure as an accredited diplomat in the People's Republic of China, potentially in violation of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961;

Whereas, on January 14, 2019, a third Canadian, Robert Schellenberg, in Chinese custody for drug smuggling, had his case reviewed and his 15-year sentence changed to the death penalty; and

Whereas the Department of State's Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 2017 stated that "[a]rbitrary arrest and detention remained serious problems" in China and that Chinese judges "regularly received political guidance on pending cases, including instructions on how to rule, from both the government and the CCP [Chinese Communist Party], particularly in politically sensitive cases": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and complying with its international legal obligations, including those pursuant to the Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington December 3, 1971;

(2) commends the Government of Canada for providing consular access and due process for Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. chief financial officer Meng Wanzhou;

(3) expresses concern over the Government of the People's Republic of China's apparent arbitrary detention and abusive treatment of Canadian nationals Michael Spavor and Michael Kovrig in apparent retaliation for the Government of Canada's detention of Meng Wanzhou; and

(4) joins the Government of Canada in calling for the immediate release of Michael Spavor and Michael Kovrig and for due process for Canadian national Robert Schellenberg.

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—ESTABLISHING THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 97

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Senate a Select Committee on the Climate Crisis (in this resolution referred to as the "Select Committee").

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Select Committee shall be composed of 16 Senators, of whom—

(A) 8 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader; and

(B) 8 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader.

(2) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—The Majority Leader and the Minority Leader shall each designate 1 member of the Select Committee to serve as a Co-Chairperson of the Select Committee.

(3) DEADLINE.—Not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, the Majority Leader and Minority Leader shall each appoint all members and designate the Co-Chairpersons of the Select Committee.

(4) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Select Committee.

(5) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the membership of the Select Committee—

(A) shall not affect its powers; and

(B) shall be filled not later than 14 days after the date on which the vacancy occurs, in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(6) DEPARTURE OF MEMBER.—If a member of the Select Committee ceases to be a Member of the Senate, the member is no longer a member of the Select Committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The expenses of the Select Committee shall be paid from the Contingent Fund of the Senate, in a total amount of—

(A) not more than \$1,500,000 for the period beginning on the date of adoption of this resolution and ending on September 30, 2019; and

(B) not more than \$2,600,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2019 and ending on September 30, 2020.

(2) APPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the expenses of the Select Committee shall be paid upon vouchers approved by the Co-Chairpersons of the Select Committee, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Senate.

(B) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(i) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(ii) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(iii) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(iv) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(v) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(vi) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(vii) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(d) STAFFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairpersons of the Select Committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of employees of the Select Committee in accordance with the guidelines for employees of the Senate and following all applicable rules and employment requirements of the Senate (including those relating to employees of standing committees of the Senate).

(2) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the Select Committee.

(e) JURISDICTION; FUNCTIONS.—

(1) INVESTIGATIVE JURISDICTION.—The Select Committee shall have the authority to investigate and make findings regarding how inaction on the climate crisis is harming the economic and national security interests of the United States.

(2) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Select Committee shall—

(i) meet at the call of the Co-Chairpersons; and

(ii) hold its first meeting to plan the activities of the Select Committee not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution.

(B) AGENDA.—Not later than 48 hours before any meeting of the Select Committee, the Co-Chairpersons shall provide an agenda to the members of the Select Committee.

(3) HEARINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Select Committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Select Committee considers advisable.

(B) ALL HEARINGS PUBLIC.—The hearings of the Select Committee in connection with any aspect of its investigative functions shall be public hearings.

(C) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—

(i) ANNOUNCEMENT.—Not later than 7 days before any hearing of the Select Committee, the Co-Chairpersons shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing, unless the Co-Chairpersons determine that there is good cause to hold the hearing at an earlier date.

(ii) EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF WITNESSES.—Each Co-Chairperson shall be entitled to select an equal number of witnesses for each hearing held by the Select Committee.

(iii) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the Select Committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 days before the appearance of the witness, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairpersons, following a joint determination that there is good cause for failure to comply with the requirement.

(4) MINIMUM NUMBER OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—The Select Committee shall hold not less than a total of 5 public meetings or public hearings.

(5) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairpersons, a Federal agency, including an agency in the legislative branch, shall provide technical assistance to the Select Committee in order for the Select Committee to carry out its duties.

(6) COORDINATION WITH STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.—The Select Committee shall, in conducting official business, coordinate with standing committees with relevant jurisdiction.

(7) NO LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION.—The Select Committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction and shall have no authority to take legislative action on any bill or resolution.

(f) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than July 31, 2020, the Select Committee shall submit to the Senate and any relevant committee of the Senate a comprehensive report of the results of its investigations and studies, together with such detailed findings as it may determine advisable.

(2) SEPARATE REPORTS.—If the Select Committee is not able to agree to a report described in paragraph (1) by a majority vote, each Co-Chairperson may submit to the Senate and any relevant committee of the Senate a report on behalf of the members of the Select Committee appointed by the Senate leader that appointed such Co-Chairperson regarding the results of the investigations and studies of the Select Committee.

(3) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a report under this subsection is submitted, the Select Committee shall make the report publicly available in widely accessible formats.

(g) TERMINATION.—The Select Committee shall terminate on October 1, 2020.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, maybe Leader McConnell doesn't realize this, but because of the political stunt vote he is planning on his version of the Green New Deal, for the first time in a long time, the Senate is finally debating the issue of climate change, and if you ask me, it is about time.

Climate change is an urgent crisis and an existential threat to our country and to our planet. The last 4 years have been the warmest 4 years on record. Sea levels are rising. Marine life and fishing communities are being destroyed. Wildfires have roared against the West. More powerful hurricanes have buffeted our coastlines.

Over the next few decades, climate change will affect every part of American life—our health, our economy, our national security, and even our geography. So if there were ever an issue that demanded particular focus from this Chamber, it is climate change. That is why today I am introducing a resolution to create a select committee on climate change to correspond with the House committee that was created this year for the same purpose.

For the same reason that we dedicate groups of Senators to focus on health, national security, judiciary, agriculture, and banking, we should have a bipartisan group of Senators who meet to focus on climate change, to hold hearings, to debate the issue, and to craft, refine, and enact legislation to address this problem.

I understand that my friends on the other side of the aisle don't like the Green New Deal. OK, that is fine. What is your plan?

Maybe a lot of Members think they can get away without having to answer the question. They will not. They will not. That is why we need a committee focused on this to bring Democrats and Republicans together on an issue that demands progress. So I will introduce a resolution to create a new committee on climate.

Democrats believe this is an issue of surpassing importance. What do our Republican colleagues believe? We sincerely hope that our Republican friends will come around and view it the same way. Yet we are still trying to get the Republican leadership, and Republicans in the Senate in general, to answer three key questions. I ask once again. I have asked them every day.

One, Leader McConnell, do you believe climate change is real?

Two, Leader McConnell, does human activity contribute to it?

And, three, should Congress take immediate action to address it?

Our Republican friends are silent—silent. Some have argued that it is because they get so much money from the oil industry. Some have argued that it is because they don't believe in science. It is amazing that they can't even answer a simple question that is one of the leading questions of our time when two-thirds of all Americans believe that climate change is real and urgent.

We are not trying to lock our Republican friends into any one or two solutions. We are not saying: Let's do it our way or the highway.

As a first step, we want Republicans, particularly their leader, to agree with us that climate change is a problem that must be addressed. And what do we get from our Republican friends? Either silence or a stunt—putting on the floor a bill they will not vote for. That doesn't say anything. That doesn't address the problem. It is a stunt. That is all they can do. They can't come forward with a single positive thing to say or do. So they put a bill on the floor that they will not vote for—what a ruse. What a mocking of the way the Founding Fathers wanted democracy to work—it is a disgrace.

That is why we need a committee. At least let them go forward with a committee, where Democrats and Republicans can discuss the issue, debate the issue, and perhaps come up with some bipartisan solutions. That is what we hope to achieve when we come to the floor and ask our friends, sincerely, if they agree with those three items, because climate change will not wait for the partisanship, which so often defines this Chamber, to ebb. It will not pause while one party is in power. Its impacts will not discriminate between red States and blue States.

It is time to put our party affiliations aside and agree that we face a major crisis that is caused by humans and that we have an immediate and glaring need to address it.

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—ESTABLISHING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FAMILY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR THE PLACEMENT IN OFFICES OF SENATORS OF CHILDREN, SPOUSES, AND SIBLINGS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE HOSTILE CASUALTIES OR WHO HAVE DIED FROM A TRAINING-RELATED INJURY

Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 98

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “SFC Sean Cooley and SPC Christopher Horton Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program Resolution”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “eligible individual” means an individual who is the child (including a stepchild), spouse, or sibling of a member of the Armed Forces who is a hostile casualty or died from a training-related injury;

(2) the terms “hostile casualty” and “training-related injury” have the meanings given those terms in section 2402(b) of title 38, United States Code; and

(3) the term “Program” means the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program established under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Senate the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program, under which an eligible individual may serve a 12-month fellowship in the office of a Senator.

(c) DIRECTION OF PROGRAM.—The Program shall be carried out under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate.

(d) PLACEMENT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OR A STATE OFFICE.—An individual may serve a fellowship under the Program at the office of a Senator in the District of Columbia or an office of the Senator in the State the Senator represents.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Program shall be carried out in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ERNST. Mr. President, I have 11 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, March 6, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “The state of the American maritime industry.”

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, March 6, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The economic benefits of highway infrastructure investment and accelerate project delivery.”

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Protecting American from abuse and neglect nursing homes.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, both of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Recommendation to reduce waste, fraud, and mismanagement in Federal programs.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of customs and border protection’s response to the smuggling of persons at the Southern border.”

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Library of Congress.”

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Small business and the American worker.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Mariah Shriner, may have privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1271 AND H.R. 1381

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1271) to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for pre-med students preparing to attend medical school.

A bill (H.R. 1381) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with a registered individual’s cause of death, and for other purposes

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7th; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Murphy nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico.

GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition today.

I rise today for the people. I am glad to be joined by Senator MERKLEY. We have worked a long time together on

government reform issues, campaign finance reform, and rules reform—some very, very important issues that face the country.

Today, in this country, there is a deep disconnect between what the American people are demanding from their leaders and what the President and the Congress have been giving them. Poll after poll shows that the American people want affordable healthcare. Yet the Republican leadership and this President have tried time and again to take away healthcare rights and healthcare protections.

Poll after poll shows that the American people want good-paying jobs. Yet the Republican leadership and this President gave a massive tax-cut windfall to the wealthiest individuals and the biggest corporations.

Poll after poll shows that the American people want clean air and clean water. They want Congress to tackle climate change. They want to protect our public lands. Yet for years the Republican leadership has done the opposite, and the Trump administration is dismantling environmental protections and sabotaging our efforts to fight climate change.

Poll after poll shows that the American people support commonsense gun safety laws. Yet for decades the Republican leadership has refused to take any action whatsoever on even the most basic safety laws, like universal background checks.

Poll after poll shows that the American people want Dreamers to stay in our country. They don't want children separated from their parents. They want comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken system. Yet the Republican leadership has opposed these priorities for many years, and now this President moves forward with his divisive and hateful immigration policies.

It is no wonder that trust in government is so low. According to a recent survey, just 19 percent overall trust the government to do what is right. Famously, root canals have a higher approval rating than Congress.

We are a representative democracy. Yet the people are not being represented. Their will has been stymied.

The situation has gotten dramatically worse under this President. There is no doubt about that. But these problems precede this President, and they will live much longer than his time in office unless we act.

To put it bluntly, some of our most basic, democratic institutions are broken—our voting rights system, our campaign finance system, and our ethics rules.

The American people know in their gut that this system is rigged. That is why the drug companies get what they want, and people pay through the nose. That is why the millionaires and billionaires get more tax cuts, and the working people get left behind. That is why the polluters get off scot-free, and the rest of us get dirty air and contaminated water.

Unrigging this system requires reform—real reform—so that we bring power back to the everyday Americans and out of the hands of the special moneyed interests that rule Washington.

Let's talk about how we do that. For years, I have stood with others in this Chamber to call for a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United, for an independent, non-partisan drawing of House districts, and for closing the revolving door in Washington.

In the past, some Senate Republicans were independent of their leadership and supported these ideas. The President had even promised to “drain the swamp.” As we all know by now, unfortunately, that promise was empty.

But with the change in leadership in the House of Representatives, Congress is now making progress to enact the reforms that the American people want.

The House will soon pass H.R. 1, the For the People Act—a major reform package to fix our broken system. It will be up to the Senate to follow suit.

Next week, my Senate colleagues and I will introduce our own “For the People Act”—a comprehensive set of reforms to move this effort forward. I hope we will have bipartisan support, but I was disappointed to hear the Republican leader deride this essential reform bill as “the Democrat Politician Protection Act.”

This is not only a warped political comment, but it is also cynical and totally misses the point, especially when you consider that the American people overwhelmingly—across party lines—support these kinds of reforms. It is the special interests who oppose them because they are threatened by them.

If the Republican leader feels the same way about this bill as the special interests do, perhaps the bill is not the problem.

Every Member of the Senate will have a choice. Do they support reform, where our ideas and policies can compete on a level playing field, or do they choose to side with the special interests to do their bidding in return for their protection and money during election season?

I have known plenty of Americans who oppose this system. John McCain was one of them. Senator Alan Simpson is another. Senator Cochran was a cosponsor of my constitutional amendment.

No party has to side with the big money and special interests. It is a choice. It is a choice we must make together to return our democracy to the people and to rid our system of corruption.

This bill will do just that. It will make it easier, not harder, to vote. It will bring an end to the dominance of big money and politics, and it will ensure that politicians actually serve the public interests.

First, on voting rights, for 50 years the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has stood as a bulwark against voter suppression

practices and enfranchised millions of voters, but in 2013 the Supreme Court eviscerated it in its *Shelby County v. Holder* decision, unleashing a torrent of State laws designed to suppress the vote among minorities.

The Court's 5-to-4 decision rendered the Voting rights Act's preclearance provisions ineffective and cleared the way for States to engage in voter suppression. Since *Shelby*, nearly 1,000 polling places have been closed across the country, many in southern Black communities. Voter ID laws have been tightened, and early voting has been slashed. Voter rolls have been purged, and House districts have been redrawn to dilute the minority vote.

One of the many egregious examples is North Carolina. Less than 2 months after *Shelby*, that State enacted far-reaching voter suppression requirements. North Carolina's law was struck down by a Federal court of appeals, finding that the law targeted African Americans “with almost surgical precision.”

Just this last midterm, we saw voter suppression tactics surge. For instance, in North Dakota, the State legislature passed a law right before the November election that took aim squarely at the Native vote. The law required voter IDs to list physical addresses—an impossibility for many Native American voters living on reservations. A Federal court found that 5,000 Native American voters did not have the necessary identification.

We have no choice but to respond and to restore the Voting Rights Act so States are stopped from closing off the franchise. That must also include the Native American Voting Rights Act to address voter suppression tactics in Indian Country and to make sure the Native vote is counted, not discounted.

Bills to restore lost voting rights protections have been introduced in both Chambers. I hope the Senate majority will work in a bipartisan way to restore this landmark legislation.

We should make it easier for voters to register, not harder. In a healthy democracy, automatic voter registration, online voter registration, and same-day voter registration for eligible voters would be noncontroversial.

Voting should be easy. Too often, for too many, it is hard. It is our duty to fix that, and this bill will do that.

Extreme political gerrymandering continues to skew State and congressional elections. Results from legislative races don't reflect the proportion of each party's voters. Voters should choose their representatives, not the other way around.

Congress must direct nonpartisan, independent line drawing in each State to draw congressional districts, and congressional districts must fairly reflect States' racial compositions so our representative government truly represents the electorate.

There is no other way to put it. Our campaign finance system is broken. The Supreme Court's 2010 *Citizens*

United decision opened the floodgates for unlimited contributions and dark money, and this Congress's negligence has allowed the flood to drown out regular people's voices.

Super PACs can raise and spend unlimited amounts of money on candidates. The super wealthy can and do try to buy elections. Dark money groups can receive unlimited amounts of money from big corporations and wealthy individuals, spend their unlimited sums to influence elections, and never disclose their dollars or what they wanted in return for their investment.

There was \$1.4 billion spent on the last Presidential race in 2016. This midterm's outside expenditures topped a billion dollars. The system is rigged right before our eyes.

How do we reverse course and return elections to the American people? For starters, Congress needs to shine a light on the dark money and require realtime disclosure, close loopholes that allow for foreign money, and create a small donor, public matching fund system for everyday contributions. Most critically, we must overturn Citizens United and related decisions. A Supreme Court that equates big money with speech puts campaigns for sale to the highest bidder.

Once again, I will offer an amendment to the Constitution to overturn Citizens United, as I have since 2016. Congress has a long way to go to push our popularity above a root canal and to restore the public's confidence.

We also need comprehensive ethics reform. Elected officials and public servants should not reap huge personal profit from their public positions. We need to tighten the revolving door. We need to tighten lobbying disclosure laws, and we must require Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates to disclose their tax returns.

Beyond that, Presidents and Vice Presidents must divest of any and all assets that create a conflict of interest. Candidate Trump promised to disclose his tax returns. He didn't. He then promised to disclose them after an alleged audit. He hasn't. That is unacceptable.

We know the President has business and financial ties with Russia and Saudi Arabia, and this may well explain his strange closeness with Vladimir Putin and Muhammed bin Salman. Transparency and divestiture are the only ways to avoid conflicts of interest and corruption. These issues go to the heart of what it means to be an American.

Our democracy is supposed to exist by the will of the people and by the consent of the governed. Congress has an amazing opportunity before it. The House of Representatives is starting debate on its comprehensive reform package. My colleagues and I will introduce our legislation next week.

To Republicans around the country: Don't fall for the majority leader's cynical name-calling. I know you love

your democracy as much as I do. This is not about protecting Democrats or Republicans; it is about protecting Americans from a rigged system. Let us commit to work together to pass reforms the American people hunger for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here on the floor with my colleague from New Mexico, who has been a champion for restoring our democracy, working year after year over the last decade toward that vision, and presenting tonight superb comments on the history of where we have been and where we should go.

This last weekend, I went to Alabama. I went with Congressman JOHN LEWIS to be there to look into the history of discrimination in our Nation, the history in which we had separate entries to buildings for Whites and for Blacks and separate water fountains. We had front doors for White America and back doors for Black America.

We were standing on the spot where Rosa Parks stood before she stepped onto the bus and said: I will not sit at the back of the bus. I will be treated like every other American. She asked for equality, and she started a big movement to break down discrimination.

Last weekend, we also gathered together in Selma, AL, at the foot of the Edmund Pettus Bridge. This spot is where JOHN LEWIS and a whole set of individuals took a stand. They were planning a march. They were going to march for voting rights—for voting rights in America, voting rights that had been taken away as a strategy of suppressing the voice of the people, particularly the voice of African Americans.

We have struggled in the history of our country toward full equality of opportunity—full equality to participate in this beautiful democratic Republic we call America. We started with a Constitution that was flawed by not recognizing the full equality of every American.

We fought a war over slavery, and after that war, a strategy was devised to continue to strip the right to vote from African Americans by taking African-American men, arresting them as felons, and then saying that felons can't vote—a determined strategy both to reenslave, because the constitutional amendment said that you could put people to work if they were a felon, and to strip voting rights from them.

That is a history we should be putting behind us—a history of voter intimidation and a history of voter suppression. Have we not come to the point where we can recognize that the real vision in our "we the people" democracy is that every person gets a full chance to participate, that we should be looking for voter empowerment, not voter suppression?

This beautiful document we have worked to perfect and fulfill over time.

It was President Lincoln who said: "America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves."

Aren't we at that point now, where the vision of government of, by, and for the people has been corrupted by voter suppression, by voter intimidation, by gerrymandering, and by dark money flooding our campaigns? Aren't we at that point now that our very essence of our constitutional vision of government by and for the people is being destroyed by these corrupting forces?

Here is what we have in America right now. We have a circle of power of those of great wealth and those of great privilege, and they want to run this government and write our laws to benefit those inside that circle.

That circle isn't that large. It is a small percent of our population, but they use their great wealth and their great leverage to continue to corrupt the vision of our Constitution because the last thing they want is a government that serves the people.

What they are invested in, what they fight for is government by the powerful few and for the powerful few. If anyone has any doubt that we have reached this point of huge corruption in this country, look simply at what happened in this Chamber in 2017 when the majority party said that we have two missions: Mission one, take down healthcare for 20 to 30 million Americans; mission two, raid the national Treasury for \$1½ trillion and give it to the very richest Americans and largest corporations.

That is what happens in a corrupted government by and for the powerful rather than by and for the people. That is what happens in dictatorships around the world where the elite raid the National Treasury and steal the money for themselves.

I will tell you what else happens. They don't invest in "we the people." They don't invest in the foundations for families to thrive. We know what those foundations are: good public education, debt-free college, employment programs that include apprenticeships and career technical education, a healthcare system that is simple and seamless and is there when your loved one is sick or injured, and it doesn't send you into bankruptcy, a system where drug companies can't gouge you and raise their prices dozens or even a hundredfold because the laws were written to let them do it, a system that invests in affordable housing so every family can have a decent home in a decent community, investment in infrastructure, rural broadband, repaired highways, expanded transit systems, all kinds of infrastructure that enable our economy to thrive and our people to do well.

Did we see what this corrupted system now in place of government by and for the powerful, did we see an investment in healthcare or housing or education or infrastructure or living-wage

jobs? We did not because this Chamber is now run by and for the powerful of the United States of America, not the people.

So along comes the other Chamber at the end of this hall, and this other Chamber says: We want to restore the vision of our Constitution, and they put together H. Res. 1. They said: Let's take this on. Let's take on the gerrymandering. Let's take on the voter suppression. Let's take on the dark money. They put together this bill for the people—for the people, not for the powerful.

They proceeded to say: Let's start with that challenge of gerrymandering. Let's make sure the people pick their leaders instead of their leaders picking their electors. Then they proceed to take on voter suppression and voter intimidation.

It was President Lyndon Johnson who said "the vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice."

That powerful instrument is at the heart of our Constitution. It is the instrument that the powerful and privileged want to diminish, destroy, and take away so they can continue to run this country by and for themselves.

So this bill says: Let's proceed to do voter empowerment. Let's extend early voting to all States. Let's ensure that there is an opportunity for people to register to vote, sign up to vote on the internet, and have same-day registration. Let's encourage vote by mail, which gives a full opportunity for everyone to participate without having to get to a poll on a day that it is difficult to get there, and let's make sure changes designed to suppress voting are not automatically approved, that we will restore the Voting Rights Act, which said we will protect the voting system, its sacred heart, the Constitution, and we will not let people's rights be stripped away.

If you look back at November 6, and you look at what happened across the country, you see the plot—the plot to prevent the poor from voting; the plot to prevent minorities from voting; the plot to prevent college students from voting. One State went so far as to say you can't vote if your ID doesn't have an expiration date because the college IDs in that State didn't have an expiration date—strategy after strategy, purging people off the voting rolls without their permission right before the election.

So this bill, the For the People Act that the House is working on right now and that we will introduce right here in this Chamber says: We believe in the Constitution of America; we believe in the power of the people, and we will protect the right to vote. The For the People Act takes on campaign finance. It proceeds to say: We will have disclosure of contributions. There is sunlight on the system that disinfects it—a phrase that so many of my colleagues used to say when they were opposing the McCain-Feingold limits. They said:

We oppose caps on donations, but we support disclosure. It is the sunshine that disinfects the system. Suddenly, when the bill that provides disclosure was up before this body, the individuals who said that said: "Oh, I was wrong, I don't want sunlight in the system," and voted against disclosure. So the House is saying: Let's do it. Let's create transparency.

There is an honest ads component that says people need to be able to know who is funding the ads they are seeing. I know I have seen in my campaigns, attack ad, after attack ad, after attack ad funded by front groups.

Wouldn't it be better for America if the folks behind those ads actually have to disclose that they are behind those ads?

We have in this bill a small-dollar match so individuals who seek to run for the House or the Senate with small-dollar donations, donations up to \$200, get a 6-to-1 match, encouraging breaking the grip of the vast dark money and the money that comes from the most affluent in large chunks, leveling the playing field for participation by regular Americans, freeing our elections from the grip of dark money.

This bill, the For the People Act, says let's improve the ethics. Let's reduce or try to eliminate the conflicts of interest that haunt this Chamber and haunt the House Chamber down the hall.

JOHN LEWIS stood on that bridge on Bloody Sunday. Congressman JOHN LEWIS, long before he was a Congressman, in 1965, stood on that bridge. He stood, and he was the very first person in line as the troops approached to beat up the protesters. They shoved him, they pushed him down, they struck him in the head, and then they proceeded to beat up and terrify the other protesters on that bridge.

Those protesters were standing for the vision of our Constitution, were standing for voting rights, the most powerful instrument, as Lyndon Johnson said.

They went back to that bridge the following Tuesday, and they marched up and were stopped, and they agreed to turn back—"Turn Back Tuesday." Then they reorganized again and more people joined. They came back a third time and they marched over that bridge and they marched all the way to Montgomery, AL, to fight for voting rights because it is the heart and soul of an individual's ability to participate in our democracy. JOHN LEWIS has said this:

There is still work to be done. Get out there, push and pull, until we redeem the soul of America.

The For the People Act that the House will pass and that we will introduce here in this Chamber is the fight to redeem the soul of America. Let's stand together—old-timers and new Members of the Senate, those who sit on the left of the aisle and those who sit on the right of the aisle, those who come from blue-collar communities

and those who come from circles of power—to stand behind the vision of our Constitution, the "we the people" vision, so this Chamber will do the work of the people. Let's restore the soul of America together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise in defense of the internet. This is a fight for innovation, for entrepreneurialism, for the American economy, a fight for free speech—the cornerstone of our democracy—a fight for the most powerful platform for commerce and communications in the history of the planet. This is a fight for net neutrality.

Today nearly every Member of the Senate Democratic caucus introduced a bill, the Save the Internet Act, to put net neutrality rules back on the books. Congressman MIKE DOYLE is leading the same effort over in the House.

In the Senate, we have already successfully passed the proposal. The newly introduced Save the Internet Act and the Congressional Review Act we approved last Congress will have the same effect—overturning the Trump administration's FCC's wrong-headed decision and restoring the open internet order.

Last May, in a historic, bipartisan CRA vote of 52 to 47, in the Senate on this floor, we sent a message to President Trump about what a free and open internet means, free of corporate control, open to all who want to communicate, engage, and innovate. We made clear this Congress will not fall for President Trump's special interest agenda and his broadband baron allies.

This bill does what the American people want. It restores the rules so people are not subject to higher prices, slower internet speeds, and even blocked websites because the big broadband providers want to pump up their profits. With this bill, we will do right by the people who sent us here and fight to protect the internet as we know it.

This is a fight which we can win. There is tremendous power on this issue. Republicans and Democrats alike agree we need net neutrality so the sky is the limit. Support for our position will only continue to grow.

The critics claim the sky hasn't fallen since the FCC repeal, so why do we need net neutrality at all?

The answer is simple. There is pending litigation right now in the DC Circuit Court challenging the FCC's repeal. So there is every reason in the world why they would not change their practices until the legal matter is settled in court. Any prudent business would act cautiously when there is an issue pending before a court, but once the issue is resolved in court, there are no rules. They can do what they want.

In fact, I attended the court hearing and listened to 5 hours of oral argument. I saw firsthand how the FCC and

broadband industry used tortured logic to defend the repeal of net neutrality and reclassification of broadband.

I also organized an amicus brief with 100 other Members of the Senate and House in defense of the net neutrality rules. I am confident we will prevail in court. Net neutrality is just another way of saying nondiscrimination, just another way of saying big companies can't discriminate against small companies; that big companies can't discriminate against small individuals; that they have equal access to the internet. They don't have to pay extra to gain access. Net neutrality means nondiscrimination. Those are the rules we need for the internet in order to see explosive economic growth because of the new ideas that are able to be introduced and at the same time so democracy can flourish because every voice is treated equally on the internet.

So whether it is in the Halls of Congress or in the courts, we will not stop fighting until net neutrality is fully restored. We are on the right side of history, and we will not give up this fight until we have won.

I thank you for the time.

At this point, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

WILLIAM B. KILBRIDE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2023, VICE ERIC MARTIN SATZ, TERM EXPIRED.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

JULIE REISKIN, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2019. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES C. SLIFE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. PAUL E. FUNK II

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES W. KILBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT D. CONN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DEE L. MEWBOURNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JON A. HILL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. STUART B. MUNSCH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND AS APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGES ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR CONTINUED STATUS AS APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGES PURSUANT TO THEIR ASSIGNMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 950F(B)(2), WHILE SERVING ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, ALL UNLAWFUL INFLUENCE PROHIBITIONS REMAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 949B(B).

To be colonel

JULIE HUYGEN
MICHAEL LEWIS
TOM POSCH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND AS APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGES ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR CONTINUED STATUS AS APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGES PURSUANT TO THEIR ASSIGNMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 950F(B)(2), WHILE SERVING ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, ALL UNLAWFUL INFLUENCE PROHIBITIONS REMAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 949B(B).

To be colonel

PAULA I. SCHASBERGER
JAN E. ALDYKIEWICZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND AS APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGE ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR CONTINUED STATUS AS AN APPELLATE MILITARY JUDGE PURSUANT TO THEIR ASSIGNMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 950F(B)(2), WHILE SERVING ON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW, ALL UNLAWFUL INFLUENCE PROHIBITIONS REMAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 949B(B).

To be commander

ANGELA TANG

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 6, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

CHAD A. READLER, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JESSICA LOPEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jessica Lopez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jessica Lopez is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jessica Lopez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jessica Lopez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PUEBLO EAST HIGH SCHOOL
WRESTLING TEAM TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pueblo East High School Eagles wrestling team for its first ever 4A State Championship win.

The Eagles finished first at the Colorado State Wrestling Tournament in Denver, Colorado, with 200 points. Pueblo County was runner-up with 181.5 points, while Centennial was in the top five with 76.5 points.

The Eagles performed well as a team, with every single wrestler scoring at least one point during the tournament. The team had three overall state champions, including Andy Garcia, Dominic Robles, and Zion Freeman. All three of these young men won their weight classifications.

Andy Garcia accomplished a first for the team, earning a 4–3 decision over his opponent and becoming the team’s first three-time champion, despite having an injured knee on competition day. Dominic Robles had a phenomenal performance, getting a pin at 1 minute and 36 seconds in the first period against an opponent from Canon City. Zion Freeman was the first Eagles wrestler to win a title at the tournament, ultimately scoring a perfect 38–0 record for the season.

Madam Speaker, we are proud to have these incredible students representing Pueblo and the people of the Third Congressional District. They have proven themselves to be individuals with sportsmanship, tenacity, and

perseverance. I offer them my sincere congratulations and I wish them luck in their future endeavors. I am eager to see what they will accomplish going forward.

CELEBRATING THE 1ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAUNCH OF EMERGENCY AIR MEDICAL SERVICES FOR THE BIG BEAR

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Big Bear Fire Department and Mercy Air on a successful year of Emergency Air Medical Services for the Big Bear Valley.

The mountain communities of my district are uniquely rugged, and ground based responses are oftentimes too slow or limited by terrain to provide lifesaving medical care in a timely fashion. Air ambulances have the ability to rapidly transport patients to treatment centers, and emergency air medical services improve the survival and recovery rate of those in need. On February 14, 2018, Big Bear Fire Authority (BBFA) and the BBFA Critical Care Medical Air Ship crew undertook their first flight. Over the past year, arrival times have decreased, lives have been saved, and over 300 missions have been safely and successfully flown.

I applaud the BBFA and the BBFA Critical Care Medical Air Ship crew, and their partners Mercy Air, Big Bear Valley Community Healthcare District, and Big Bear Airport District for their commitment and dedication to bringing this lifesaving service to the Big Bear Valley. I wish them many years of safety and success ahead as they work to keep our community safe.

MIGUEL LOPEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Miguel Lopez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Miguel Lopez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Miguel Lopez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Miguel Lopez for winning the Arvada Wheat

Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING BILL HEDGEPEETH: SELECT BANK & TRUST AND SELECT BANCORP INC., THE 2019 REALTOR CUP AWARD WINNER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Bill Hedgepeth with Select Bank and Trust and Select Bancorp Inc. for receiving the 2019 Realtor Cup award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

Bill has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Select Bank & Trust and Select Bancorp Inc. since 2008. This includes 19 branches in North Carolina and South Carolina. Bill is known for not just his exemplary work in real estate, but his commitment to lead in the community.

Throughout his career, Bill has been recognized for his effort and natural talent. He has been named a Paul Harris Fellow by the Rotary Foundation of Rotary International and in 2015 received the Business of the Year Award on behalf of Select Bank & Trust and Select Bancorp Inc.

Not only is Bill dedicated to seeking excellence in his career but he currently serves as the Board Chair of the United Way of Cumberland County, the Greater Fayetteville Chamber board Treasurer, the Fayetteville and Cumberland County Vision 2026 Board, the Highland Country Club Board of Directors and the Fayetteville Technical Community College Board of Trustees.

Bill is very deserving of this award, and I couldn’t be prouder of the example he set for our county and beyond.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Bill Hedgepeth on receiving the 2019 Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Realtor Cup.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, my apologies for my absence. During the roll call numbers listed below, I was at the Utah State Capitol addressing the state legislature. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 104, and “yea” on Roll Call No. 105.

● 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.

JESSIE MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jessie Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jessie Martinez is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jessie Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jessie Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OUTPATIENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2019

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Outpatient Mental Health Care Act of 2019.

Medicare Partial Hospitalization Programs (PHPs) provide a structured and clinically intensive alternative to hospitalization for patients who otherwise might require sustained inpatient psychiatric hospitalization. PHP psychiatric patients typically receive four to six hours of treatment per day, five to six days a week in hospital-based settings and community mental health centers. However, the severity of a patient's illness often prevents that individual from obtaining or seeking transportation to a PHP facility, or from accessing high quality food. Additionally, some psychiatric medications that are prescribed to the patient cannot be safely administered without food.

Currently, Medicare does not cover the costs of nutritional planning, meals or transportation for patients who receive psychiatric treatment in PHP programs. Therefore, PHP facilities are responsible for the cost of providing food and transportation. This exacerbates financial burdens that many PHPs and countless other community organizations are experiencing in these difficult economic times.

Medicare also does not provide for vocational counseling. However, this counseling provides a direction for patients that they might not find on their own. Therefore, vocational counseling is vital for individuals while they work through their treatment allowing them to set employment goals and develop a plan to meet those goals.

Madam Speaker, my bill will require Medicare to reimburse PHPs for providing transpor-

tation, food, nutritional services and vocational counseling. The bill also establishes a Behavioral Health Advisory Committee in which a diverse group of behavioral health stakeholders would examine and provide recommendations on how to address the persisting challenges of access, stigma, quality and operability in the mental health delivery system.

PHPs are a cost effective alternative that can prevent mentally ill individuals from facing expensive inpatient care, incarceration, or institutionalization. The growing role of mental health PHPs in our health care system requires that we amend the law to assist PHPs in delivering the services, care and support to those who are living with severe and chronic mental illness.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critically important legislation.

HONORING GARY ROGERS, THE 2019 FAYETTEVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AMBASSADOR OF THE YEAR AWARD WINNER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Gary Rogers for receiving the 2019 Ambassador of the Year award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

Gary is a Senior Marketing Consultant with the Beasley Media Group that represents many of our local radio stations. He has an esteemed passion for radio and an unmatched drive that makes him a sound resource for our community.

This prestigious honor is not the first for Gary. He was included in the Fayetteville 40 Under 40 Class of 2018, Ambassador of the Year in 2016, and was the recipient of the Chairman's Award in 2017. He continues to serve his community by investing and volunteering with non-profit organizations such as the Media Team and Children's Ministry at Breezewood Church.

While he is dedicated to his career and service in the community, it is clear his real passion is his marriage to his wife and being a father to his three year old, Charlie. In his efforts to set a wonderful example for his son, he serves as an ambassador with the Greater Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce and has been for the last four years.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Gary Rogers on receiving the 2019 Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Ambassador of the Year award.

JEMIMA NGOMA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jemima Ngoma for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jemima Ngoma is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jemima Ngoma is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jemima Ngoma for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING KRISTINE PETERSEN IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Kristine Petersen, whose long-term service in law enforcement has had a significant impact on Southern Florida.

Over thirty years ago, Kristine, a single parent, moved to Hendry County and worked as a waitress and secretary. In 1986, she began her career in law enforcement as a dispatcher with the Hendry County Sheriff's Department. After successfully completing the Southwest Florida Criminal Justice Academy, Kristine was appointed as a Sheriff's Deputy for Hendry County, making her the second female to do so. Through this role, Kristine helped build Hendry County's Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) Program, an important initiative that teaches middle schoolers the danger of substance abuse. During this time, she dedicated her evenings to working as an instructor with the Criminal Justice Academy for the Lee County School Board. Her passion for community service is of the highest caliber, and her selfless character is truly demonstrated in her work for public safety.

In 1998, Kristine began working as a detective for the City of Clewiston's Police Department. In 2003, she became the Assistant Police Chief where she served in this role until 2012. Her honorable work ethic and determination has extended beyond law enforcement. Kristine was appointed to Clewiston's City Commission where she won consecutive four year terms in 2014 and 2018. She also served as Vice Mayor from December of 2014 to December of 2016. Currently, Kristine is employed by the Hendry County School Board to serve as Clewiston High School's Public Safety Academy Teacher. In addition to this role, Kristine also participates in the City of Clewiston's Chamber of Commerce Board.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to know Ms. Petersen and it is a privilege to acknowledge the dedicated work she has done for Hendry County. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 104, and YEA on Roll Call No. 105.

ANTONIO PORTILLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Antonio Portillo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Antonio Portillo is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Antonio Portillo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Antonio Portillo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING ON-AFTER BAR AND GRUB FOR RECEIVING THE 2019 FAYETTEVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUSINESS OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate On-After Bar and Grub for receiving the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Business of the Year Award.

On-After Bar and Grub has established itself as a staple in the community and does more than just serve a great meal. They have proven to be a reliable leader in the community and continue to go above and beyond to support the community where ever it is needed.

Joseph Dewberry, or known around the bar as Bear, has been a driving force in adding meaning to their slogan "Our day begins, when your shift ends." Over the past few years they have hosted events like the Autism Awareness cook off, Hurricane Florence Relief, Every Child Deserves a Christmas, and Domestic Violence Awareness and Prevent Day. In addition to hosting events they emphasize the importance of recognizing the service our local law enforcement, emergency services, and military provide. The entire community is grateful for On-After Bar and Grub, myself included.

Bear and all the staff at On-After Bar and Grub are deserving of this award and I wish them success as they continue to provide excellent service to our community. I personally look forward to my next visit while I'm traveling across the district!

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Joseph Dewberry and On-After Bar and Grub Restaurant on receiving the 2019 Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Business of the Year Award.

ADRENA ROCHA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adrena Rocha for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Adrena Rocha is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adrena Rocha is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Adrena Rocha for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

VETERANS-SPECIFIC EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW'S HEALTH PROFESSIONALS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVEN C. WATKINS, JR.

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 5, 2019

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1271, the Vet HP Act.

The Vet HP Act would be a significant advancement for two critical issues burdening Eastern Kansans.

My district, being both rural and home to tens of thousands of veterans, is a medically underserved district. With both VA and rural hospitals lacking a steady pipeline of health professionals, access to quality health care is not guaranteed for many of these folks back home.

Secondly, aspiring health professionals from underserved areas are not afforded the same opportunities for clinical observation hours as medical school applicants in major cities, putting them at a disadvantage during the admissions process.

The Vet HP Act would provide an opportunity for health students to gain clinical observation hours at VA hospitals, prioritizing students in health professional shortage areas, first-generation college students, students referred by minority-serving institutions and veterans, and, importantly, students who wish to

train and stay in health professions experiencing staff shortages.

This is a true two-birds-one-stone approach. Across the country we have aspiring health professionals who lack opportunity, and we have VA and rural hospitals desperately in need of a health professional pipeline. The Vet HP Act is a massive step forward for both issues.

I urge passage of this common-sense, bipartisan bill.

RECOGNIZING ANA MARIA RODRIGUEZ IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Ana Maria Rodriguez, who has faithfully served the City of Doral and the wider Miami region for many years.

Born and raised in South Florida to Cuban exiles, Ana Maria has been heavily involved in the Southern Florida community since graduating from Florida International University in 1999 with a Bachelor's degree in communications. In 2009, she furthered her education by gaining her Master's degree in leadership from the H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business at Nova Southeastern University. Ana Maria worked for a number of years in public relations and the governmental affairs sector, where she presently serves as the Vice President of Government Affairs for the Miami Association of REALTORS.

Ana Maria's dedication to supporting Southern Florida's community is further demonstrated in her position as an elected official. Elected in 2018, Ana Maria currently serves as a Florida House State Representative for the 105th District. Prior to this impressive achievement, she served as Vice Mayor for the City of Doral and previously on the City Council. Ana Maria executed these roles in a professional and honest manner at all times, proving to be a true asset to the City of Doral.

Her passion for community work goes beyond elected service. In 2007, Ana Maria launched the Southeast Region for Connect Florida, a leadership development program, and in 2009 served as Statewide Chair. For over a decade, she has been a dedicated and active member of the Doral Business Council and also served as Vice Chair for the City of Doral's Parks & Police 4 Kids Advisory Board.

It would be remiss to honor Ana Maria without touching on the number of awards she has received for her ongoing commitment to her community. In 2011, she was selected as Humanitarian of the Year by the March of Dimes and in 2015 she received Advocate of the Year by the Miami Association of REALTORS. In 2017, Ana Maria was presented the Public Service Award by the South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and most recently, in 2018, the Salute to Miami's Leaders Government Award by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce. These accolades are a just a small testament to Ana Maria's determined and selfless character. It is truly a privilege to know that she will continue to make a significant difference in the community she serves and the people that she touches.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to know Ana Maria Rodriguez and to have the opportunity to acknowledge her amazing work for Southern Florida. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual.

ESMERALDA ROJAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Esmeralda Rojas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Esmeralda Rojas is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Esmeralda Rojas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Esmeralda Rojas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING SHARON MOYER, THE
2019 ATHENA AWARD WINNER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Sharon Moyer for receiving the 2019 Athena Award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

The Athena award is highly coveted and is presented to the individual that represents the greatest support for the goals of professional women. Recipients of this award demonstrate excellence, creativity, and initiative in their profession and provides valuable service by contributing time and energy to improve the lives of others in the community.

Sharon Moyer has proven worthy of this award time and again with her innovative thinking, natural leadership, and ability to meet competitive deadlines. She inspires others with her personable attitude and her willingness to work hard and invest in the growth and success of others around her. Sharon has been an active part of the Partnership for Children program and initiated "Historic Hauntings: A Ghastly Ghost Tour" to help children learn the history of Fayetteville. I have personally attended one of her annual soirees for the Partnership for Children and have seen the product of her leadership firsthand.

There are many children in our community more prepared to reach their full potential due to Sharon's philosophy "persistence beats resistance." Our community is better because of Sharon and I am thrilled she is being recognized for her talent and dedication.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Sharon Moyer on receiving the

2019 Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Athena Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, my return flight to Washington, D.C., was delayed due to technical difficulty, and I was unable to attend the legislative session on March 5, 2019.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 104, and "yea" on Roll Call No. 105.

SIDNY ROJAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sidny Rojas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sidny Rojas is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sidny Rojas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sidny Rojas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE
WALTER B. JONES, JR.

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 2019

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of our colleague, and my dear friend, Congressman Walter Jones.

Walter was a man of principle and patriotism.

Who was dedicated to serving his District and his country.

He was deeply concerned about the state of our nation's politics.

Especially the growing inequities within our campaign finance system.

I had the distinct privilege of working closely with Walter over the past three years.

As co-founders and co-chairs of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Caucus.

And throughout our work together, I witnessed firsthand his willingness to reach across the aisle and put people before politics.

Walter was a model public servant who held tightly to his passions and his unyielding faith.

His independence in this chamber demonstrated his relentless devotion to doing what he believed was right.

It's no surprise that he was widely respected and admired throughout these halls.

My thoughts are with Walter's family and his Congressional staff at this time.

And I ask my colleagues to join me in taking a moment to celebrate the life of our friend, Walter.

And to honor his legacy of honesty and integrity.

HONORING SANDY AMMONS, THE
2019 FAYETTEVILLE CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE CHAIRMAN
AWARD WINNER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Sandy Ammons for receiving the 2019 Chairman's Award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

Sandy has been a constant positive force in the community when it comes to the world of business development and marketing services. She currently serves as the Director of Business Development and Human Resources for Highland Construction and Restoration where she oversees marketing and communication, business development, and administrative functions including human resources and recruitment.

Sandy is a highly valued and trusted resource who is always generous in offering guidance to others. She has been conquering all aspects of this industry since 1999 and owned her own successful marketing firm for 14 years. Her ability to capture elegant and innovative design is only part of her unmatched talent. During her time with Methodist University she was able to provide unparalleled guidance as the Vice President for Advancement and University Relations. She continues to serve the community with her fierce work ethic and amazing attention to detail.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Sandy Ammons on receiving the 2019 Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce Chairman's Award.

JASON SENA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jason Sena for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jason Sena is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jason Sena is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels

strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jason Sena for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF DOUGLAS
CORBIN

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Douglas Corbin for his dedication and service in the Bay Area.

Born in Rochester, New York, Douglas attended St. Lawrence University before receiving a law degree from George Washington University. After working as a patent attorney in Washington, D.C., his work brought him to San Francisco.

In San Francisco, Douglas became involved in local politics and eventually transitioned to public defense. In his new role, Douglas defended the Bay Area's LGBT community from harassment and submitted bids on houses on behalf of African American families who had seen their own bids unfairly rejected.

After meeting his wife Rosemary, the couple moved to Richmond where Douglas was named Contra Costa County's first Juvenile Court Referee. In addition to this new role, Douglas co-chaired the effort to designate Pt. Pinole as a regional park. His wife Rosemary also went on to be the first woman elected to serve as Mayor of Richmond.

In his retirement and between excursions to Spain and Mexico, Douglas continued to be active in the East Bay community. He served for decades as a board member and chairman for the Early Childhood Mental Health Program, as well as a supervisor for the development of town homes in Richmond by Habitat for Humanity.

Douglas will long be remembered for his knowledge, spirit, and commitment to the Richmond community.

RECOGNIZING PRISCILLA W.
GRANNIS IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S
HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to recognize Priscilla Grannis, whose inspiring life journey and determined work ethic has had a major impact on those around her and the wider Southern Florida community.

Throughout her eventful life, Priscilla has proved that she is a strongminded and driven person who has risen to match many challenges in a multitude of areas. After receiving

her undergraduate degree in music from Florida State University and a Master's of Music from Yale University, she joined the Miami Opera and performed with them for two seasons. She then furthered her music career by moving to Germany and performed overseas. While in Germany, Priscilla joined Hewlett Packard and became the Executive Assistant to the German CEO for a number of years.

Her sheer will to achieve has constantly been displayed in her ability to adapt to any line of work. After moving back to Florida due to the unexpected death of her father, she took over the management of her family's cattle farm despite having no prior knowledge or experience in the industry. With her natural determination and enthusiasm, Priscilla turned the farm into a largely successful business centered on an ethical and responsible management style.

In the late 1980s, Priscilla made the decision to enroll in Miami's St. Thomas University's law school, where she was a high-achieving student and graduated with honors. She then became an attorney in Naples and practiced law until retiring from the legal profession in 2014. Throughout her life, she has been heavily involved in politics and remains active in public affairs today. Priscilla previously served two years as the third Vice President of the Women's Republican Club of Naples Federated until being elected President of the Club, where she honorably served for six years before becoming treasurer, a position that she still holds today. Her dedicated involvement to the Women's Republican Club of Naples cannot be understated. Under her leadership, the club grew from about seventy-five members to over two hundred. Presently, Priscilla works for Florida House Representative Bob Rommel as his District Secretary.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to know Ms. Grannis and I greatly admire her commitment to Southern Florida. Her natural motivation and determination have allowed her to make an impact everywhere she goes and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual.

GABE SIMON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Gabe Simon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Gabe Simon is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Gabe Simon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Gabe Simon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING THE MILLER FAMILY

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joel Miller and his wife, Megan Bel Miller, on the birth of their daughter, Caroline Frances Miller.

Caroline was born on Saturday, January 12, 2019, at 8:25 p.m. Joel and Megan's pride and joy came into this world weighing in at 8 pounds, 5 ounces and 20 inches in length.

With Joel, my previous Deputy Chief of Staff and Legislative Director as her father, and Megan, also a long-time Capitol Hill staffer, as her mother, I trust Caroline will have a bright and successful future ahead of her.

Joel recently went on to a new opportunity after being an integral part of the legislative operation in my office for over five and a half years. I am thrilled to witness him continue in his most important role yet, as a father. I have no doubt that Joel and Megan will be wonderful and inspiring parents, who are devoted to their daughter's well-being.

Congratulations and best wishes to the Miller and Bel families.

HONORING PASTOR FRANKLIN
WOOD, SR.

HON. GREG PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Pastor Franklin Wood, Sr., of Whittier Lane Baptist Church who has played an integral role in his community and congregation for nearly half a century. The United States of America was founded by patriots like Pastor Wood who believed that faith and freedom of religion was of paramount importance to building a strong society.

That truth is evident in our National Motto: in God We Trust.

Faith remains the bedrock of American life, and one of the reasons for that is the Church. Local churches, such as Whittier Lane Baptist Church in New Castle, IN, have always been at the forefront of service to communities large and small. As worshipers put their trust in God, they looked to Pastor Wood for guidance and counsel. I have no doubt that Pastor Wood's leadership played a vital role in the spiritual health and wellbeing of so many individuals in his congregation.

As he begins a well-deserved retirement, I want to acknowledge Pastor Wood and sincerely thank him for dedicating his life to serve God and the Church. It is a true honor to serve a Hoosier who has demonstrated such deep commitment to his community. I wish him all the best in his retirement.

HONORING HANNA BRITT, THE 2019 FAYETTEVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE YOUNG PROFESSIONAL OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Hanna Britt for receiving the 2019 Young Professional of the Year award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

I have a profound respect for successful individuals taking the time and patience to offer mentorship to other aspiring young professionals. Hanna has been with H&H Homes since 2013 and is currently serving as the Corporate Director of Marketing.

After receiving a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Marketing from Appalachian State University, Hanna taught English in South Korea. She came back to Fayetteville in 2013, and has been passionate about supporting the community. She is a member of the Fayetteville Young Professional program and served on the leadership committee for two years. Additionally, she is a past member of the Junior League of Fayetteville.

Hanna is well deserving of this award and provides a wonderful example for other young professionals in our community. Her passion is shown in all that she does and it is with great pride that I acknowledge her achievements today.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Hanna Britt on receiving the 2019 Young Professional of the Year award from the Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING MR. ROBERT "BOB" CAMACHO ON HIS 34 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a genuine public servant and friend, Chief Robert "Bob" D. Camacho on his retirement from the Antonio B. Won Pat Guam International Airport Authority (GIAA) police department after 34 years of service to Guam and to the nation.

Bob has a long history in public service. After serving 11 years in the United States Army, where he received numerous awards and decorations, Bob began his civilian career as a parole officer in the Guam Department of Corrections, eventually advancing to the post of Director of the Department. As Director, Bob's innovations included making the Department of Correction a tobacco-free environment and effectively restructuring prison food services. These changes significantly reduced health-care costs for employees as well as inmates and saved millions of dollars in food costs and wastage for the government of Guam.

Bob served in other senior executive positions within the law enforcement field including in the Guam Customs and Quarantine Agency

and the Guam Police Department. It is no surprise that Bob also excelled in these other positions, constantly exemplifying the definition of a public servant.

Appointed to the Chief of the Guam International Airport Authority police department in 2009, Bob effectively responded to the increased security risks imposed by the tragedy on September 11, 2001. Bob continued to ensure that the GIAA and his department kept pace with new and constantly changing U.S. Department of Homeland Security and Transportation Security Administration mandates as well as keeping pace with the constantly growing passenger and freight workload. He was instrumental in promoting and securing funding for "Project Hulo," a much needed, and significant increase, in services, operations, and security for the airport, which has become a major Pacific hub for both domestic and international travel and freight.

Bob continued to trailblaze in the Guam law enforcement community when he served as Chairman of the Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission, setting appropriate standards for hiring, training, ethical conduct, and retention of peace officers throughout the territory of Guam. Bob has dedicated his life serving our community, exemplified the best in leadership qualities, and has continued inspire those around him. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the People of Guam, offering my greatest appreciation for Bob's commitment to public service. I congratulate him on his retirement and offer him best wishes on his well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE RECRUIT CLASS 2018-02 OF THE PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF FIRE AND RESCUE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the recent graduates of the Prince William County Public Safety Academy. These men and women will soon join the ranks of those who have served and continue to serve in the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue.

Since its inception in 1966, the Department of Fire and Rescue has led the way. In 1967, Prince William County became the first jurisdiction on the East Coast to implement the 911 System. That same year, Prince William became the first county in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the National Capital Region to implement a physical ability exam for career firefighters. In 1994, Mary Beth Michos was hired as Chief and became the first female fire and rescue chief of a metro-sized department. The Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue continues to maintain one of the most forward-thinking combination fire departments in the country, and its legacy of "firsts" continues. It is one of only three jurisdictions in the Commonwealth of Virginia with delegated training authority, granted by the Virginia Department of Fire Programs.

Class 18-2 spanned 3 seasons: Summer, Fall, and Winter. They encountered everything from sun and humidity with unseasonably high temperatures, to frigid cold and wind. Dealing

with some rain events and even snow and ice at times. This rigorous training process exceeded 1,300 hours. Upon successful completion of this program, each recruit is eligible to graduate and become a Fire and Rescue Technician with the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue.

The training and certification required to achieve the status of a Fire and Rescue Technician cannot be accomplished without significant dedication and hard work. Today's graduates have completed more than 600 hours of the required coursework for certification in Emergency Medical Technician, Infection Control, CPR, Firefighter I & II, Advanced Fire Behavior, Hazardous Materials Operations, LPG Emergencies, Rural Water Supply, Stress First Aid, MAYDAY Firefighter Down, Rapid Intervention Team Operations, Technical Rescue Modules 1 & 2, Vehicle Rescue Level I, and Emergency Vehicle Operator I, II, & III.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following names of the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue recruit class graduates: Nicholas A. Beede, Ashford P. Bemby, Mollie L. Bodmer, Dominic J. Clarke, William B. Cornwell, Brent A. Corrinne, Pierre L. D'Elia, Sean K. Denise, Andrew R. Denner, Kevin W. Fagga, Ian E. Franklin, Matthew K. Harris, Talia B. Hedley, Aaron M. Kearns, Joshua J. Labuhn, Michael D. Lamb Jr., Zachery E. Lloyd, Tobi A. Olafisoye, Alexander J. Otto, Jeffery R. Payne, Rachel K. Payne, Kimberly C. Peele, Logan J. Penry, Lawrence J. Price, Brandon S. Rice, Lindsay E. Savat, Matthew G. Truslow, Juliana C. Veloso, Jacob W. Vetter, Randy L. Williams, Brian T. Zimmerman.

As the newest members of the Department of Fire and Rescue, these graduates join the department as integral parts of the emergency response and community safety team.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the newest members of the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue. I am confident that recruit class 2018-02 will serve the residents of Prince William County with honor and distinction. In the tradition of their new firefighting family, I say: "Stay safe."

RECOGNIZING PAUL RECKLAU ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Paul Recklau on the occasion of his retirement from the General Services Administration following a 40-year career in the federal government. I thank him for his life-long dedication to public service and to our country.

Paul Recklau was born and raised in Feasterville, Pennsylvania. He graduated from Pennsylvania State University in 1978 with a degree in Accounting. He began his career in civil service in January of 1979 in a 16-month training program at the Savannah Army Depot in Illinois. Paul trained to be a QUASAS, a Quality Assurance Specialist, Ammunition Surveillance, which is the oldest career program in the Department of Army. Paul then got his

first duty assignment at the Pueblo Army Depot in Colorado continuing to gain experience as an ammunition inspector and an explosives safety expert. After serving a couple of years there, he received his second assignment at the Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant in Texas. He was then transferred to Longhorn Ammunition Plant in Karnack, Texas to act as a GS-11 level QUASAS.

Paul then spent 6 years at the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant in Kansas, south of De Soto. In 1988, only 9 years into his career, he was promoted to a GS-12 and acted as Chief of Quality Assurance at the plant. In 1990, he moved into a new role as an Industrial Specialist for the Defense Logistics Agency in Columbus, Ohio. For 9 months, Paul commuted to Dayton, Ohio and performed his duties at the Defense Electronic Supply Center. Upon returning to Columbus he became a Contract Specialist. In 1999, he was promoted to a GS-13 as an Acquisition Specialist for the Military Traffic Management Command in Northern Virginia. Then, Paul started at the General Services Administration in 2002 working for the Federal Systems Integration and Management Center (FEDSIM) as an IT Specialist. Approximately 2 years later he was promoted to a GS-14 Senior Project Manager. After 10 years at FEDSIM, Paul moved to the Office of Strategy Management within GSA and finally in 2014, ended up in the Office of General Supplies and Services as a Program Analyst where he ended his career on March 1, 2019. Throughout his career, Paul successfully worked with other federal employees as well as outside contractors to complete projects and keep day to day processes running smoothly. Civil servants like Paul are vital to the continuous operation of the government and I am grateful to Paul for spending the entirety of his career in service to our country.

Paul resides in Woodbridge, Virginia with his wife, Maureen, who has been a reading tutor at a local Prince William County public elementary school for 15 years. Their daughter, Jean Recklau, is a junior at the University of Virginia studying Public Policy. In retirement, Paul plans to travel and complete home improvement projects around the house. In addition, he will continue to serve on his local homeowner's association board of which he has been a member for 18 years, including 4 years as president.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating my constituent, Paul Recklau on his retirement and in wishing him all the best in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN D. JENKINS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize my dear friend, Supervisor John D. Jenkins, who passed away on February 6, 2019. John was the longest serving incumbent supervisor in Prince William County, proudly serving as the Neabsco Supervisor for 36 years. In 2009, I entered a tribute to John Jenkins into the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of his dedication to the community and his work with the Boy Scouts

of America. I am sad to do it again under these circumstances, but honored to do so for a great man and the legacy he is leaving behind.

John Jenkins dedicated his life to public service. John served honorably and with distinction in the United States Army for more than 25 years, including two tours of duty in Vietnam. He was highly decorated, earning a National Defense Service Medal, a Meritorious Service Medal, a Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, and was awarded the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Clusters. He retired from the Army in December, 1980, reaching the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

In 1973, John moved to Dale City with his beloved wife, Ernestine. Although he was still serving in the U.S. Army, he immediately became involved in the community by joining the Dale City Civic Association. John and Ernestine also mentored area youth. They were involved in the Dale City Little League, Dale City Sports Club, Boy Scouts of America, and Gar-Field Senior High School Athletic Boosters Club. John also devoted countless hours to assisting veterans through his leadership in several veteran service organizations.

In 1982, two years after his retirement from the U.S. Army, John was appointed to the Board of County Supervisors to fill the Neabsco District seat which was vacated by James McCoart. While serving the constituents of the Neabsco District was always John's primary objective, he was also able to effect change and shape progress for all of Prince William County. He advocated successfully for the construction of the Dale City Recreation Center, the McCoart Administration Center, Pfitzner Stadium, the county's Boys' and Girls' Home, the Hilda Barg Homeless Prevention Center, Chinn Park Regional Library, and many more major civic investments including numerous schools, public safety facilities, and senior centers. John worked tirelessly to improve our local schools and the quality of public education. He was a champion of economic and infrastructure development in the county.

But what everyone loved most about John was his care for all people. Regardless of sex, race, or creed, John supported all rights. As a life-long civil and human rights supporter, John asked the board to initiate a local investigation of a Dale City restaurant for refusal of service based on race. Then just last year in 2018, John supported a vote on the board to make June "LGBTQ and More Pride Month." Throughout his tenure, John worked for the people of Prince William County, making sure their next day was better than the last. Through the past four decades John was both elected and appointed to several distinguished committee seats. John served two terms as Vice Chairman of the Prince William Board of County Supervisors as well as two terms as Chairman of the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, State President of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions, State President of the Virginia Association of Counties, Chairman of the Virginia Railway Express Operations Board, and Chairman of the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission.

John served as a member of the Washington Council of Governments Transportation Planning Board and was appointed by two governors, Governor MARK WARNER and Governor TIM KAINE, to serve as a member of the

Virginia Geographical Information Network (VGIN) Advisory Board. In addition, John served on numerous boards and steering committees, including the Virginia Municipal League, the Virginia Association of Counties, and the National Association of Counties, and represented the Board of County Supervisors on the Quantico Marine Corps and Fort Belvoir Base Realignment and Closing (BRAC) advisory committees.

John received numerous awards in recognition of his life-long commitment to service including the Robert W. Baker Award and the Blue Victory Award. In addition, in 2015 the Virginia Railway Express honored him for his key role in establishing a commuter rail service by having his name placed on the front of a VRE locomotive. Gar-Field High School also honored John for his support of athletic and academic programs as a booster club president, parent, and county supervisor.

John is survived by his wife Ernestine who is also a dedicated community activist as well as a former public school employee, who worked in Prince William County Public Schools for 30 years as a teacher's assistant and staff member. Ernestine has been John's rock for more than six decades. She was just as involved in John's public service as anyone. John is also survived by his three sons, Warren, Mark, and Gordon and numerous grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, Prince William County and the entire northern Virginia region has lost a great leader, mentor, public servant, and icon. John Jenkins' life was one spent in service to his country and his community. He could and would move heaven and earth for his constituents. John knew your name, he knew your kids' names, he probably even knew your grandkids' names. He cared about people and made sure they knew it. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the memory and honorable service of Supervisor John D. Jenkins. He was my dear friend, mentor, a colleague, and his absence will create a void in Northern Virginia that will be impossible to fill.

HONORING THE 136TH ANNIVERSARY OF EBENEZER BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 136th anniversary of Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Ebenezer Baptist Church was founded by Reverend Lewis Henry Bailey. After being separated from his family in Alexandria, Virginia, Lewis Henry Bailey was sold into slavery and was enslaved in Texas throughout his youth and early adulthood. Once Bailey was freed, he walked from Texas to Virginia to rejoin his family. He found employment with a railroad company and later graduated from Wayland College. In 1882, he was ordained as an itinerant minister at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Alexandria. With aspirations of sharing the Gospel with residents of the Town of Occoquan, Reverend Bailey walked to and from the town to hold religious services for the black members of the community. In appreciation of his tireless efforts, white members of

the community provided land for a church and a place for Reverend Bailey to live. The Clerk of the Court for Prince William County approved the deed on March 8, 1883, and Ebenezer Baptist Church celebrates its anniversary on the first Sunday of March in recognition of this momentous occasion.

Bailey started the New School in Occoquan, serving as a precursor to the establishment of the New School Baptist Church, which later became Ebenezer Baptist Church. The cornerstone of the church was laid on the first Sunday in May 1883 and the building was dedicated in 1885. Reverend Bailey, who had long been the inspiration and driving force for the establishment of this church, led the congregation from 1885–1891.

The church has endured setbacks and faced community challenges during its 136 year history. After the original church structure burned to the ground in 1923, Ebenezer Baptist Church was rebuilt in 1924 where it remains today in the same historical site. The church was also instrumental in the integration of the county's public schools in the 1960s, as well as several other Civil Rights accomplishments. I was honored to include the oral histories of three members of Ebenezer Baptist Church in my Northern Virginia Civil Rights Archive project.

Throughout its history, Ebenezer Baptist Church has been led by pastors who have served the church and the congregation faithfully. Their most recent pastor, Reverend Charles A. Lundy, was called to the pulpit to lead the church and has done so righteously since June 23, 1990. Under Reverend Lundy's leadership, Ebenezer Baptist Church has flourished and its membership has expanded from 120 members to more than 800 today. To accommodate this growing church family, weekly worship at Ebenezer Baptist Church has been relocated to Telegraph Road. Ebenezer Baptist Church has been and remains a monumental, historical, and spiritual structure in our community.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the 136th anniversary of Ebenezer Baptist Church and in thanking the church and congregation for their contributions to our community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GEORGE
WILLIAM "BILLY" ELLIS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of George William "Billy" Ellis, former Chief of the Vienna Volunteer Fire Department. Chief Ellis recently passed away at the age of 81 following a brief illness, surrounded by his friends and loved ones.

My congressional district includes the town of Vienna, Virginia, a vibrant and active community of 16,000 residents. In 2013, Money Magazine ranked it the third best place to live in the nation. If you were to ask the residents of Vienna, they would unanimously say that it should have taken first place.

There are many reasons why residents of Vienna take such pride in their town—the annual town festivals and concerts, the incredible

Vienna Youth sports program, the outstanding schools and services, and even a local restaurant that serves the best chili dogs. Perhaps the most important reasons are the community spirit that is so prevalent, and the willingness of the residents to work together for the betterment of all. This of course includes the men and women who protect the town as members of law enforcement and the Vienna Volunteer Fire Department.

Chief Ellis joined the Vienna Volunteer Department at the age of 18. For more than 50 years, he epitomized the spirit of volunteerism, devoting his time and energy to serving his community. In 1980, he became the chief of the department, a position he held until 2001 when he and his wife, Joan, decided to move to Culpepper County where he lived up until his passing. But even a move to a quieter community couldn't keep Chief Ellis away from a fire station. Following the move, he quickly joined the Salem Volunteer Fire Department and spent many more years driving apparatus to emergencies. Serving others was in his DNA.

Chief Ellis was preceded in death by a son, Charles. He leaves behind a wife of 58 years, Joan Scott Ellis, his sons David (Jennifer) and Robert (Lori), his daughter Jennifer, and his four grandchildren, Alison, Jacob, Ashley and Hunter. He also leaves behind an incredible legacy of charity, commitment and dedication in a community that will be indebted to this great man for years to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the selfless dedication and commitment to serve of Chief George William "Billy" Ellis, and in extending my deepest condolences to his family. May you rest in peace, Chief Ellis.

RECOGNIZING GUAM'S AUTISM
COMMUNITY TOGETHER AS THEY
CELEBRATE THEIR 12TH ANNUAL
AUTISM AWARENESS FAIR

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Guam's Autism Community Together (ACT) as they celebrate their 12th annual Autism Awareness Fair, appropriately themed "Get Your Blue on Guam, Support Autism." During Autism Awareness Month, ACT and organizations across the country work together to provide every individual with autism spectrum disorder with the opportunity to achieve the highest possible quality of life. This year, ACT and their partners want to do more than just promote autism awareness. They want to motivate friends and collaborators to become active partners in the movement towards acceptance and appreciation. As the father of an autistic child, I am aware of the impact that autism has on parents, family, and friends. It is imperative that the whole community becomes involved. Although much has been accomplished, much more remains to be done to raise worldwide awareness of these issues.

ACT is an organization based in Guam as a support group for families with autistic children. It is one of Guam's principal organizations leading the efforts to increase autism

awareness across our community. ACT is dedicated to helping individuals and parents find resources, support, and training while making diligent efforts to increase the awareness of autism spectrum disorders. ACT advocates for effective services to meet the unique needs of individuals with autism and their families.

Madam Speaker, I further commend Autism Community Together as it continues to host the 12th Annual Autism Awareness Fair World Autism Day. The Autism Awareness Fair is the largest event hosted by ACT throughout the year and brings together government agencies, non-profit organizations, service providers, and support vendors with the intent to provide information and resources on the various disability-related programs and services available on Guam. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of Guam, I thank Guam's Autism Community Together and all government agencies and community partners for their assistance in spreading autism awareness and acceptance. I look forward to future contributions by Autism Community Together to provide more opportunities for those in community living with autism.

CONGRATULATING THE ELECTED
OFFICERS OF THE FAIRFAX
COUNTY FEDERATION OF CITI-
ZENS ASSOCIATIONS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations (the "Federation") and to congratulate its recently elected officers who will serve in leadership positions for the 2018–2019 term.

Founded in 1940 and re-incorporated in 1995, the Federation is a coalition of civic and homeowners associations who work together to promote and support initiatives that will benefit the community as a whole. The Federation realized early in its existence that by joining with other civic and homeowners associations from every corner of the county and speaking with one unified voice, its influence and contributions would be far more powerful and effective.

The Federation is comprised of thousands of volunteers who actively participate in matters of local and state government that impact their communities. Individual members serve on countless task forces, boards and commissions to help preserve the quality of life that is enjoyed by all who call Fairfax County home. As a former two-term President of the Federation, I understand that those who volunteer their time, energies, and talents to civic activities play a vital role in making Fairfax County one of the best places in the nation in which to live, work, and raise a family.

The Federation would not be nearly as successful and effective without the leadership of its officers. It is my great honor to include in the RECORD the names of the following newly elected Federation officers:

President: William S. Barfield. Bill resides in the Braddock District and has an extensive history of civic engagement including serving as President of the Country Club View Civic

Association, Chairman of the Braddock District Council of Community Associations, founding member and vice-chair of the Braddock District Land Use and Environmental Committee, and 2nd Vice President of the Federation.

First Vice President: Matt Dunne. Matt and his family live in the Mount Vernon District. He is active in the Stratford Landing Citizens Association and serves as the Educational Liaison to the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations.

Second Vice President: Alejandro Mattiuzzo. Alejandro and his wife live in the Mason District and he is an accounting professional by trade. He has served as Treasurer for the Federation and is committed to using his skills to best suit the mission of the organization.

Treasurer: Leslie Braun. Leslie resides in the Sully District and has served on the Franklin Farm Community Association Board and the Foxfield Community Association Board. In addition, Leslie served for more than two years as Treasurer of the Northern Virginia Section of the American Society of Quality.

Recording Secretary: Flint Webb. Flint resides in the Providence District and is a member of the Dunn Loring Gardens Civic Association. In 2011, he received the Providence District Council's Community Service Award. In addition, he has served as Chair and Co-chair of the Environmental Committee of the Federation and has represented it on the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee Technical Advisory Committee.

Corresponding Secretary: Erica Yalowitz. Erica resides in the Providence District and serves on the board and various other committees of the Rotunda Condominium Association where she resides. She is the current Vice-President of the Providence District Council and a member of the Emerging Leaders Council of the Tysons Partnership.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking all of the individual members of the Fairfax Federation of Civic Association and in congratulating the 2018–2019 officers on being elected to lead this dynamic organization. I commend them for their efforts on behalf of the community and wish them continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ANTIOCH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Pastor Marshal L. Ausberry and the congregation of Antioch Baptist Church on the occasion of their 30th anniversary.

Founded on January 8, 1989 by Pastor John Q. Gibbs, Antioch Baptist Church has been a thriving member of the Fairfax County community. Pastor Gibbs was responsible for many of the significant milestones in the church's history, including the purchase of the land where the current building now stands, as well as the construction of the building that would become the new and expanded sanctuary.

Just as the physical presence of Antioch Baptist Church has expanded over time, so too has their presence in the community. The congregation provides witness to their faith through a variety of missions, including programs assisting the homeless population, the elderly, those suffering from illness and those who are incarcerated. The congregation has also participated in international relief efforts, such as the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in Haiti in 2010.

As someone who attended seminary and seriously considered entering the Catholic priesthood, I can attest that being called to ministry is a special responsibility. The burdens and rewards that are represented by this calling are neither widely understood nor appreciated, but they are uniquely enriching.

I have often found a pastoral aspect to my constituent service work as a Member of Congress and I trust that Antioch Baptist will continue to be a pastoral force in the community for many years and decades to come. I am confident that Antioch Baptist Church will continue to prosper and provide the community with the spiritual guidance so needed in today's complex world. Their dedication to ministry and to their faith is to be commended, and I thank them for their dedication to their congregation and our community.

On behalf of the 11th Congressional District, I again congratulate Pastor Ausberry and the entire congregation on this momentous anniversary. I ask my colleagues to please join me in offering their congratulations to in wishing Antioch Baptist Church continued success in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING NACHA—THE ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS ASSOCIATION, ONE OF THE 2019 BEST PLACES TO WORK IN VIRGINIA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize NACHA—The Electronic Payments Association, and to congratulate them on their recent designation as one of the 2019 Best Places to Work in Virginia by the Virginia Business and Best Companies Group. Determined by a statewide survey competition, the annual list honors the best places of employment in Virginia.

NACHA's designation as one of the 2019 Best Places to Work in Virginia is a fitting acknowledgment of its many contributions to Virginia's economy, workforce, and business community. Headquartered in Herndon, Virginia, NACHA proudly employs 61 Virginians, and three of their 42 Direct Members are based in the Commonwealth: Navy Federal Credit Union, Capital One, and ePayResources.

NACHA serves as trustee of the Automated Clearing House (ACH) Network, enabling payments such as direct deposit and direct payment via ACH. Today, NACHA's work is more important than ever, as more than 80 percent of U.S. workers now receive their regular pay using Direct Deposit via ACH, and consumers

now pay 800 million bills each month with Direct Payment via ACH. In 2018 alone, 23 billion ACH payments, valued at a total of \$50 trillion, moved across the ACH Network.

I am thrilled to recognize NACHA's commitment to creating and fostering an award-winning work environment, and I commend them on their efforts to strengthen the ACH Network. I am proud to represent in Congress one of the 2019 Best Places to Work in Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing NACHA's successes, and in congratulating them on the well-deserved honor of being named one of the 2019 Best Places to Work in Virginia.

RECOGNIZING THE NOMINEES FOR THE 2018–2019 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the nominees for the 2018–2019 Prince William County Public Schools Principal of the Year Award.

Principals who meet the criteria for the award are those who effectively manage, demonstrate, and encourage creativity and innovation, foster cooperation between the school and community by maintaining an open dialogue with students, parents, faculty, and staff, and exemplify commitment to providing a quality education for all students to learn and develop. The selected winner will be named the Prince William County Principal of the Year.

As the second largest school division in the Commonwealth of Virginia, Prince William County Public Schools educates 90,000 students in ninety-eight schools. The efficiency and impact of these teachers is apparent as PWCS ranked the highest in the entire state with their on-time graduation rate.

I extend my personal congratulations to the following nominees for the 2018–2019 Prince William County Public Schools Principal of the Year Award: Neil Beech, Osbourn Park High School; Mary Jane Boynton, Parkside Middle School; Hamish Brewer, Fred Lynn Middle School; Kathryn Forgas, Coles Elementary School; Latiesa Green, Potomac View Elementary School; Sheila Huckestein, Saunders Middle School; Richard Nichols, Stonewall Jackson High School; Jennifer Perilla, Tyler Elementary School; Amy Schott, Rockledge Elementary School; Aerica Williams, River Oaks Elementary School.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the nominees for 2018–2019 Prince William County Public Schools Principal of the Year Award and in thanking them for their dedication and leadership to the students, teachers, and faculty to ensure a bright future for all who pass through the doors of their schools. Their continued service is truly commendable and worthy of our highest praise, and their efforts ensure that our Prince William County students are provided a world-class education in a vibrant learning community.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF
THE 2019 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2019 Prince William County Human Rights Commission Awards.

The Prince William Board of County Supervisors (BOCS) implemented the Human Rights Ordinance January 15, 1993, formally establishing the Human Rights Commission. Two years prior, the BOCS formed the Human Rights Study Committee to explore the needs of a community that was growing in population and diversity. An exhaustive effort that included numerous committee meetings and public hearings identified a strong community desire for a human rights ordinance and an agency to enforce it. The Human Rights Ordinance prohibits discriminatory practices based on race, color, sex, national origin, religion, marital status, or disability, as well as in the consideration of employment, housing, public accommodations, education, and credit, in Prince William County.

The BOCS approved the ordinance in September 1992 to ensure that “each citizen is treated fairly, provided equal protection of the law, and equal opportunity to participate in the benefits, rights, and privileges of community life.” Residents enlist the services of the commission if they feel their rights have been violated in the areas of employment, fair housing, credit, education and public accommodation.

In celebration of Universal Human Rights Day, the Human Rights Commission recognizes individuals and organizations that promote the principles of human rights in Prince William County. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the recipients of the 2019 Prince William County Human Rights Commission Awards: Phyllis Aggrey, John Harper, The National Coalition of 100 Black Women—Prince William County Chapter, Potomac Health Foundation, Graham Park Middle School, Minnieville Elementary School’s Family Engagement Team.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the recipients of the 2019 Prince William County Human Rights Commission Awards. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to these honorees for their efforts to safeguard our most basic rights and remind us of our common humanity. Let us use their example to rededicate ourselves to the fight against inequity and injustice.

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, March 7, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 11

5:40 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Joseph V. Cuffari, of Arizona, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

S-216

MARCH 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s Semi-Annual Report to Congress.

SD-538

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael J. Fitzpatrick, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, and Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador, both of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on simplifying the Free Application for Federal Student Aid and reducing the burden of verification.

SD-430

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD-G50

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the road ahead for the World Trade Organization.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

To hold hearings to examine artificial intelligence initiatives within the Department of Defense.

SR-232A

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine the impact of broadband investments in rural America.

SH-216

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine recommendations from the President’s

task force on the United States Postal Service, focusing on a path to sustainability.

SD-342

MARCH 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SR-328A

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Air Force.

SD-192

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the new space race, focusing on ensuring United States global leadership on the final frontier.

SD-G50

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, “Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2019”.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine a new approach for an era of United States-China competition.

SD-419

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the most significant threats to United States Naval Forces and how Naval Forces plan to operate in a contested environment.

SVC-217

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020.

SD-608

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian programs on the Government Accountability Office High Risk List.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Intellectual Property

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine cyber crime, focusing on the threat to small businesses.

SR-428A

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense budget posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor,
Health and Human Services, and Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the Ebola
outbreak in the Democratic Republic

of the Congo and other emerging
health threats.

SD-124

Committee on Banking, Housing, and
Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Financial
Stability Oversight Council nonbank
designations.

SD-538

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1671–S1716

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 668–690, S.J. Res. 13, and S. Res. 96–98. **Pages S1704–06**

Murphy Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Pages S1698–S1702**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 38), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1698**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 12:30 p.m., on Thursday, March 7, 2019; that following disposition of the nomination, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, that the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination be withdrawn, and the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of John Fleming at 1:45 p.m. **Page S1702**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 7, 2019. **Page S1702**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 37), Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Pages S1671–98, S1716**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

William B. Kilbride, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2023.

Julie Reiskin, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2019.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.
1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
5 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.
Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy. **Page S1716**

Messages from the House: **Page S1704**

Measures Referred: **Page S1704**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1704, S1712**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S1704**

Executive Communications: **Page S1704**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1704**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1706–07**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S1707–12

Additional Statements: **Pages S1702–04**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1712**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1712**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—38) **Pages S1697–98**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:37 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 7, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1712.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PREVENTION OF AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the military services' prevention of and response to sexual assault, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant Commander Erin Leigh Elliott, USN, Elizabeth P. Van Winkle, Office of Force Resiliency, Lieutenant General Charles N. Pede, USA, Judge Advocate General of the Army, Vice Admiral John G. Hannink, USN, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Lieutenant General Jeffrey A. Rockwell, USAF, Judge Advocate

General of the Air Force, and Major General Daniel J. Lecce, USMC, Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense; Colonel Don M. Christensen, USAF (Ret.), Protect our Defenders; Colonel Ellen Haring, USA (Ret.), Service Women's Action Network; Colonel Doug James, USAF (Ret.), Save Our Heroes; and Angela Bapp.

MARITIME INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the American maritime industry, after receiving testimony from Matt Woodruff, American Maritime Partnership, and Matthew Paxton, Shipbuilders Council of America, both of Washington, D.C.; Thomas Allegretti, The American Waterways Operators, Arlington, Virginia; Austin Golding, Golding Barge Line, Vicksburg, Mississippi; and Berit Eriksson, Sailor's Union of the Pacific, Seattle, Washington.

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic benefits of highway infrastructure investment and accelerated project delivery, after receiving testimony from Michael Replogle, New York City Department of Transportation, New York, New York; Patrick K. McKenna, Missouri Department of Transportation and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.; and Steve Demetriou, Jacobs Engineering Group Inc., Dallas, Texas, on behalf of the Business Roundtable Infrastructure Committee.

NURSING HOME ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting Americans from abuse and neglect in nursing homes, after receiving testimony from Kate Goodrich, Director, Center for Clinical Standards and Quality, and Chief Medical Officer, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; Antoinette T. Bacon, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; Keesha R. Mitchell, Office of the Ohio Attorney General, Columbus; David C. Grabowski, Harvard Medical School Department of Health Care Policy, Cambridge, Massachusetts; David Gifford, American Health Care Association, Washington, D.C.; Patricia Olthoff-Blank, Shell Rock, Iowa; and Maya Fischer, Plymouth, Minnesota.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, who was introduced by Senator Sullivan, and Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine recommendations to reduce risk of waste, fraud, and mismanagement in Federal programs, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General, Cathleen Berrick, Managing Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Nikki Clowers, Managing Director, Health Care, Elizabeth Curda, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Mark Gaffigan, Managing Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Nick Marinos, Director, Information Technology and Cybersecurity, and Chris Mihm, Managing Director, Strategic Issues, all of the Government Accountability Office.

SMUGGLING OF PERSONS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine Customs and Border Protection's response to the smuggling of persons at the southern border, after receiving testimony from Kevin K. McAleenan, Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Michael J. Fisher, Advanced Technology Systems Company, McLean, Virginia; Julie M. Linton, American Academy of Pediatrics, Washington, D.C.; and Timothy Ballard, Operation Underground Railroad, Anaheim, California.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Library of Congress, after receiving testimony from Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress.

THE AMERICAN WORKER

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine small business and the American worker, after receiving testimony from Oren M. Cass, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, New York, New York; Betsey Stevenson, University of Michigan Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, Ann Arbor; Caryn York, Job Opportunities Task Force, Washington, D.C.; and John W. Lettieri, Economic Innovation Group, Baltimore, Maryland.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the complex web of prescription drug prices, focusing on patients struggling with ris-

ing costs, after receiving testimony from Michelle Dehetre, Lewiston, Maine; Pamela Holt, Granger, Indiana; Donnette Smith, Huntsville, Alabama; Sheldon Armus, Boynton Beach, Florida; and Barbara and David Cisek, Rural Ridge, Pennsylvania.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 30 public bills, H.R. 1549–1578; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 180–181 were introduced. **Pages H2502–04**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2505–06**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Bustos to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2373**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:27 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2377**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H2377, H2390**

For the People Act of 2019: The House considered H.R. 1, to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, March 7th. **Pages H2390–H2498**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–7, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–16, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill. **Page H2409**

Agreed to:

Suozzi amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires the Federal Elections Commission to conduct an audit after each Federal election cycle to determine the incidence of illicit foreign money in the election; within 180 Days, the FEC will submit to Congress a report containing audit results and recommendation(s) to address the presence of illicit foreign money; **Pages H2479–80**

Butterfield amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that ensures states locate polling locations for early voting in rural areas of the state and ensure that those polling places are located

in communities that will give rural residents the best opportunity to vote during the early voting period; **Pages H2480–81**

Hastings amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires states to submit a report to Congress not later than 120 days after the end of a Federal election cycle regarding the number of ballots invalidated by signature mismatch, the attempts to contact voters to provide notice, and the cure process and results; **Pages H2483–84**

Scanlon amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that establishes a fourth committee comprised of election security experts to review grant requests to ensure funds for election infrastructure are best spent; **Pages H2485–57**

Scanlon amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requests a study by the Federal Election Commission to specifically assess whether the small donor match cap and the six-to-one ratio in H.R. 1 is appropriately scaled for both House and Senate elections; **Pages H2487–88**

Morelle amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that changes pre-election registration deadlines from 30 days to 28 days before election day to ensure the deadline does not fall on a legal public holiday; **Page H2488**

Shalala amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires the Office of Government Ethics to submit a report to Congress regarding the implications of the retroactive application of the ethics waiver process; **Pages H2488–89**

Biggs amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that provides that State DMV's shall require individuals applying for a driver's license to indicate whether the individual resides in another State or resided in another State prior to applying, and whether the individual intends for the State to serve as the primary residence for voting; **Page H2489**

Ted Lieu (CA) amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that prohibits political appointees from using Federal funds to pay for travel on non-commercial, private, or chartered flights for

official business; exceptions are made if no commercial flight is available during the time at which travel is necessary; any senior political appointee who travels on a non-commercial, private, or chartered flight under the above exception must submit a written statement to Congress certifying that no commercial flight was available; **Pages H2489–90**

Jayapal amendment (No. 13 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that directs the Office of Government Ethics to promulgate rules to apply ethics laws to unpaid employees of the Executive Office of the President and the White House; **Pages H2490–91**

Jayapal amendment (No. 14 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that prohibits compensation for lobbying contacts on behalf of foreign countries identified by the Secretary of State as engaging in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; **Pages H2491–92**

Jayapal amendment (No. 15 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that directs the Office of Government Ethics to promulgate regulations establishing limits on gifts and donations to legal defense funds; the regulations shall, at a minimum, set basic requirements on transparency and prohibit mixing federal employees with non-federal employees to ensure federal employees cannot obtain money from prohibited sources; **Pages H2492–94**

Connolly amendment (No. 16 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that establishes a Race to the Top model to award supplementary grants to state applicants based on evidence of previous voting system security reforms and plans for implementing additional innovations; **Page H2494**

Foxx amendment (No. 17 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that codifies a Senate rule that brings transparency to sources of compensation for Congressional fellowships, applying it to both chambers; **Pages H2494–95**

Lawrence amendment (No. 18 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that adds Cabinet members to the list of individuals prohibited from benefiting from an agreement with the U.S. Government; **Pages H2495–96**

Rouda amendment (No. 20 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires that all paper ballots used in an election for Federal office must be printed on recycled paper; this requirement applies to all elections occurring on or after January 1, 2021; **Page H2496**

Rouda amendment (No. 21 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that directs the Election Assistance Commission to conduct a study of the best ways to design ballots used in elections for public office to minimize confusion, including paper and digital ballots to minimize confusion and user errors;

the EAC must submit to Congress this report no later than January 1, 2020; and **Pages H2496–97**

Rouda amendment (No. 22 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that directs the Postmaster General to modify paper change of address forms used by the United States Postal Service to include a reminder that any individual using the form should update the individual's voter registration as a result of any change in address. **Pages H2497–98**

Proceedings Postponed:

Raskin amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that seeks to prevent corporate expenditures for campaign purposes unless the corporation has established a process for determining the political will of its shareholders; and **Pages H2481–83**

Cole amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that seeks to restore a provision currently in law that bars government contractors from disclosing campaign contributions as part of the bidding process. **Pages H2484–85**

H. Res. 172, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 107, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 106. **Pages H2379–88**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2387–88 and H2388.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Committee Meetings

PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING—TRIBAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held an oversight hearing on the Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from John V. Kelly, Acting Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD MODERNIZATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related

Agencies held a hearing entitled “Electronic Health Record Modernization and Information Technology Oversight”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: James M. Byrne, General Counsel, Performing the Duties of the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs; James P. Gfrerer, Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology and Chief Information Officer; and John H. Windom, Executive Director, Office of Electronic Health Record Modernization.

PROTECTING STUDENT BORROWERS: LOAN SERVICING OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Protecting Student Borrowers: Loan Servicing Oversight”. Testimony was heard from Bryon Gordon, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Inspector General, Department of Education; Shennan Kavanagh, Assistant Attorney General and Deputy Chief of Consumer Protection Division, Office of Massachusetts Attorney General; and public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman McGovern, Chairman Engel, and Representatives Case, Espaillat, Yoho and Wagner.

PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING—TRIBAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held an oversight hearing on U.S. Central Command. Testimony was heard from General Joseph L. Votel, Commander, U.S. Central Command. This hearing was closed.

OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR DETERRENCE POLICY AND POSTURE UPDATE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Outside Perspectives on Nuclear Deterrence Policy and Posture Update”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET: MEMBER'S DAY

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Budget: Member’s Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Johnson of Texas, Chairman McGovern, and Representatives Case, Cole, Plaskett, Olsen, Malinowski, Cohen, Adams, Miller, Luján, Scanlon, Bucshon, Burgess, Haaland, Hoyer, McAdams, Cline, Houlahan, Biggs, Cloud and Arrington.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 582, the “Raise the Wage Act”. H.R. 582 was ordered reported, as amended.

STRENGTHENING OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: LEGISLATION TO LOWER CONSUMER COSTS AND EXPANDING ACCESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Strengthening Our Health Care System: Legislation to Lower Consumer Costs and Expanding Access”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INCLUSION IN TECH: HOW DIVERSITY BENEFITS ALL AMERICANS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a hearing entitled “Inclusion in Tech: How Diversity Benefits All Americans”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a business meeting on the Views and Estimates of the Committee on Financial Services on Matters to be Set Forth in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2020. The Committee’s Budget Views and Estimates were adopted, as amended.

THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN YEMEN: ADDRESSING CURRENT POLITICAL AND HUMANITARIAN CHALLENGES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The Humanitarian Crisis in Yemen: Addressing Current Political and Humanitarian Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE WAY FORWARD ON BORDER SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Way Forward on Border Security”. Testimony was heard from Kirstjen Nielsen, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

PROTECTING DREAMERS AND TPS RECIPIENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Protecting Dreamers and TPS Recipients”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE POLICIES AND PRIORITIES OF THE BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, THE BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT, AND THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Examining the Policies and Priorities of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, and the U.S. Geological Survey”. Testimony was heard from Walter Cruickshank, Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; and Doug Morris, Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior.

EXAMINING PFAS CHEMICALS AND THEIR RISKS

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “Examining PFAS Chemicals and their Risks”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fitzpatrick and Kildee; Dave Ross, Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, Environmental Protection Agency; and Maureen Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment, Department of Defense.

GAO’S 2019 HIGH RISK REPORT

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “GAO’s 2019 High Risk Report”. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

MAINTAINING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Science and Technology”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a business meeting on the Committee’s Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2020. The Committee’s Budget Views and Estimates were adopted.

REBUILDING AMERICA: SMALL BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Rebuilding America: Small Business Perspective”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. MARITIME AND SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRIES: STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE REGULATION, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES, AND COMPETITIVENESS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “U.S. Maritime and Shipbuilding Industries: Strategies to Improve Regulation, Economic Opportunities, and Competitiveness”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral John Nadeau, Assistant Commandant for Prevention Policy, U.S. Coast Guard; Rear Admiral Mark H. Buzby, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Administrator, Maritime Administration; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a business meeting on the Views and Estimates Letter to the Committee on the Budget. The Committee’s Budget Views and Estimates were adopted, without amendment.

OUR NATION’S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Our Nation’s Crumbling Infrastructure and the Need for Immediate Action”. Testimony was heard from Chairman DeFazio and Representative Graves of Missouri; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

VFW LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, after receiving testimony from Vincent Lawrence, Bob Wallace, Ryan Gallucci, Carlos Fuentes, and Darrell Bencken, all of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
MARCH 7, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the chain of command's accountability to provide safe military housing and other building infrastructure to servicemembers and their families, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Security, to hold hearings to examine China, focusing on challenges for United States commerce, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider the nominations of Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary (Nuclear Energy), William Cooper, of Maryland, to be General Counsel, Christopher Fall, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Science, and Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, all of the Department of Energy; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine an overview of the multiple values and unique issues of access and development associated with public lands in the western United States, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues, to hold hearings to examine United States-Venezuela relations and the path to a democratic transition, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine private sector data breaches, 10 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, and Michael H. Park, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Greg Girard Guidry, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, and Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD-G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine the complex web of prescription drug prices, focusing on untangling the web and paths forward, 10 a.m., SD-138.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs", 9 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Library of Congress, 9:15 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the Executive Office for Immigration Review, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Addressing the Public Health Emergency of Gun Violence", 10:30 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Stakeholder Perspectives: Affordable Housing Production", 10:30 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "VA Whole Health, Mental Health and Homelessness", 11 a.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Energy Workforce Opportunities and Challenges", 1 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs", 1 p.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Supreme Court, 1:30 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, oversight hearing on the U.S. European Command, 3 p.m., H-140 Capitol. This hearing will be closed.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in the Greater Middle East and Africa", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; and Subcommittee on Readiness, joint hearing entitled "U.S. Transportation Command and Maritime Administration: State of the Mobility Enterprise", 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education And Labor, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled "The Cost of Inaction: Why Congress Must Address the Multiemployer Pension Crisis", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "Wasted Energy: DOE's Inaction on Efficiency Standards and Its Impact on Consumers and the Climate", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Putting Consumers First? A Semi-Annual Review of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 75, strongly condemning the January 2019 terrorist attack on the 14 Riverside Complex in Nairobi, Kenya; H.R. 739, the "Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2019"; H. Res. 156 calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov; H.R. 596, the "Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act"; and H.R. 295, the "End Banking for Human Traffickers Act of 2019", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, hearing entitled “The Status of American Hostages in Iran”, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled “CBP Workforce Challenges: Exploring Solutions to Address Recruitment and Retention”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled “Diagnosing the Problem: Exploring the Effects of Consolidation and Anticompetitive Conduct in Health Care Markets”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing entitled “Examining the Threats to the North Atlantic Right Whale”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Trump Administration’s Response to the Drug Crisis”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “The Energy Water Nexus: Drier Watts and Cheaper Drops”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Small but Mighty: A Review of the SBA Microloan Program”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled “The Clean Water State Revolving Fund: How Federal Infrastructure Investment Can Help Communities Modernize Water Infrastructure and Address Affordability Challenges”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “Hearing with the National Taxpayer Advocate on the IRS Filing Season”, 10 a.m., 2020 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Promoting Competition to Lower Medicare Drug Prices”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support, hearing entitled “Leveling the Playing Field for Working Families: Challenges and Opportunities”, 2 p.m., 2020 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting on Adoption of the Committee’s Views and Estimates Letter, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This meeting will be closed.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 12:30 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 1—For the People Act of 2019.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Rob, Utah., E251
 Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E256, E256, E257, E257, E258,
 E258, E259, E259, E259, E260
 Cook, Paul, Calif., E251
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E255

Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E252, E253, E255
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E255
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E252
 Hudson, Richard, N.C., E251, E252, E253, E254, E254,
 E256
 McHenry, Patrick T., N.C., E253
 McNeerney, Jerry, Calif., E254

Pence, Greg, Ind., E255
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E251, E251, E252, E252, E253,
 E253, E254, E254, E254, E255
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E254
 San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E256, E258
 Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E251
 Watkins, Steven C., Jr., Kans., E253



Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.