



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019

No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLAY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable WM. LACY CLAY 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 would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLAY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in the people's House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of a world where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace, and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed Halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PENCE 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF CUMMINS ENGINE COMPANY

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the centennial anniversary of a company whose name is synonymous with my hometown of Columbus, Indiana. One hundred years ago, Cummins Engine Company was incorporated, charting a course that would change the world and serve to make Indiana a manufacturing powerhouse.

Today, with nearly 60,000 employees worldwide, Cummins remains a global power leader. From engines to power systems, components, and advanced technologies, the power of Cummins will continue to drive our State, our Nation, and indeed, the world.

In fact, this year has brought record sales to Cummins, proving that after one century, the best is still to come.

On behalf of the people of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, I congratulate Cummins, its incredible leadership, and its devoted employees on 100 years of improving lives by powering a more prosperous world.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 20, 2019, at 9:10 a.m.:

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.

H3965

That the Senate passed S. 744.
That the Senate passed S. 820.
That the Senate passed S. 998.
That the Senate passed S. 1379.
With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1602

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

GLOBAL FRAGILITY ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2116) to enhance stabilization of conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2116

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 "Global Fragility Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the United Nations, an unprecedented 68.5 million people around the world, the highest level ever recorded, are currently forcibly displaced from their homes.

(2) According to the World Bank, violence and violent conflict are now the leading causes of displacement and food insecurity worldwide, driving 80 percent of humanitarian needs, with the same conflicts accounting for the majority of forcibly displaced persons every year since 1991.

(3) According to the Institute for Economics and Peace, violence containment costs the global economy \$14.76 trillion a year, or 12.4 percent of the world's GDP.

(4) Violence and violent conflict underpin many of the United States Government's key national security challenges. Notably, violent conflicts allow for environments in which terrorist organizations recruit and thrive, while the combination of violence, corruption, poverty, poor governance, and

underdevelopment often enables transnational gangs and criminal networks to wreak havoc and commit atrocities worldwide.

(5) According to research by the University of Maryland and University of Pittsburgh, exposure to violence increases support for violence and violent extremism. Research increasingly finds exposure to violence as a predictor of future participation in violence, including violent extremism.

(6) United States foreign policy and assistance efforts in highly violent and fragile states remain governed by an outdated patchwork of authorities that prioritize responding to immediate needs rather than solving the problems that cause them.

(7) Lessons learned over the past 20 years, documented by the 2013 Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction Lessons Learned Study, the 2016 Fragility Study Group report, and the 2018 Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Lessons Learned Study on Stabilization, show that effective, sustained United States efforts to reduce violence and stabilize fragile and violence-affected states require clearly defined goals and strategies, adequate long-term funding, rigorous and iterative conflict analysis, coordination across the United States Government, including strong civil-military coordination, attention to the problem of corruption, and integration with and leadership from national and sub-national partners, including local civil society organizations, traditional justice systems, and local governance structures.

(8) The "Stabilization Assistance Review" released in 2018 by the Departments of State and Defense and the United States Agency for International Development states, "The United States has strong national security and economic interests in reducing levels of violence and promoting stability in areas affected by armed conflict." The Review further states, "Stabilization is an inherently political endeavor that requires aligning U.S. Government efforts—diplomatic engagement, foreign assistance, and defense—toward supporting locally legitimate authorities and systems to peaceably manage conflict and prevent violence."

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) ensure that all relevant Federal departments and agencies coordinate to achieve coherent, long-term goals for programs designed to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, including when implementing the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6;

(2) seek to improve global, regional, and local coordination of relevant international and multilateral development and donor organizations regarding efforts to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, and, where practicable and appropriate, align such efforts with multilateral goals and indicators;

(3) expand and enhance the effectiveness of United States foreign assistance programs and activities to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally;

(4) support the research and development of effective approaches to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, and data collection efforts relevant to such approaches; and

(5) improve the tools and authorities for assessment, monitoring, and evaluation needed to enable learning and adaptation by such relevant Federal departments and agencies working to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) STABILIZATION AND PREVENTION FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Stabilization and Prevention Fund" (in this subsection referred to as the "Fund"), to be administered by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and consisting of amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$200,000,000 for each of the five fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this paragraph are authorized to remain available until expended.

(3) PURPOSES OF THE FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund shall be used for economic and development assistance for any of the following:

(i) To support stabilization of conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, including through the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6.

(ii) To provide assistance to areas liberated or at risk from, or under the control of, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, other terrorist organizations, or violent extremist organizations, including for stabilization assistance for vulnerable ethnic and religious minority communities affected by conflict.

(B) ADDITION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund are in addition to any amounts otherwise made available for the purposes described in subparagraph (A).

(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days before amounts from the Fund are obligated, the Secretary of State or Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit notification of such obligation to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(b) COMPLEX CRISES FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Complex Crises Fund" (in this subsection referred to as the "Fund"), to be administered by USAID.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$30,000,000 for each of the five fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this paragraph are authorized to remain available until expended.

(3) PURPOSES OF THE FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except section 620M of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d), amounts in the Fund may be used to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to support programs and activities to prevent or respond to emerging or unforeseen foreign challenges and complex crises overseas, including through the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6.

(B) ADDITION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund are in addition to any amounts otherwise made available for the purposes described in subparagraph (A).

(4) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund may not be expended for lethal assistance or to respond to natural disasters.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than five percent of amounts in the Fund may be used for administrative expenses.

(5) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than five days before amounts from the Fund are obligated, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit notification of such obligation to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(6) WAIVER.—Notification in accordance with paragraph (5) may be waived if—

(A) notification by the deadline specified in such paragraph would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare; and

(B) the congressional committees specified in such paragraph—

(i) are notified not later than three days after an obligation of amounts from the Fund; and

(ii) are provided with an explanation of the emergency circumstances that necessitated such waiver.

(c) OTHER FUNDING AND COST MATCHING.—The Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6—

(1) may be supported by funds other than funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section; and

(2) shall seek to leverage funds from sources other than the United States Government in order to promote coordination and cost-matching to the maximum extent practicable.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ASSISTANCE FOR THE GLOBAL FRAGILITY INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of Congress that the President, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies should work with the appropriate congressional committees to provide sufficient types and levels of funding to—

(1) allow for more adaptive and responsive policy and program planning, implementation, and scaling under the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6, including through more flexible funding mechanisms and exemptions from specific and minimum funding levels when such exemptions would make such programs better able to respond to local needs, the results of monitoring and evaluation, or changed circumstances in relevant countries;

(2) better integrate the initiative and other conflict and violence reduction objectives and activities into other policy and program areas, where appropriate; and

(3) support transparent and accountable multilateral funds, initiatives, and strategies to enhance and better coordinate both private and public efforts to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally.

SEC. 6. GLOBAL FRAGILITY INITIATIVE.

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Secretary of Defense, the Atrocities Prevention Board (or any successor entity), and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall, in accordance with subsection (b), establish an interagency initia-

tive, to be referred to as the “Global Fragility Initiative”, to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally.

(2) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.—The Global Fragility Initiative required under this subsection shall be developed in consultation with representatives of local civil society and national and local governance entities, as well as relevant international development organizations with experience implementing programs in fragile and violence-affected communities, multilateral organizations and donors, and relevant private, academic, and philanthropic entities, as appropriate.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, the Atrocities Prevention Board (or any successor entity), and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an interagency plan regarding the establishment of the Global Fragility Initiative pursuant to subsection (a) that includes the following:

(1) Identification of the roles and responsibilities of each participating Federal department or agency, while ensuring that—

(A) the Department of State is the overall lead department for establishing United States foreign policy and advancing diplomatic and political efforts;

(B) USAID is the lead implementing agency for development, humanitarian, and related non-security program policy;

(C) where appropriate, the Department of Defense may support the activities of the Department of State and USAID by providing requisite security and support to civilian efforts with the joint-formulation, coordination, and concurrence of the Secretary of State and Administrator of USAID; and

(D) other Federal departments and agencies support the activities of the Department of State and USAID as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and Administrator of USAID.

(2) Identification of which officials of the Department of State, USAID, and the Department of Defense, with a rank not lower than Assistant Secretary or Assistant Administrator, as the case may be, will be responsible for overseeing and leading the initiative.

(3) Identification of the authorities, staffing, and other resource requirements needed to effectively implement the initiative.

(4) Descriptions of the organizational steps the Secretary of State, the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and the head of each other relevant Federal department or agency will take to improve planning, coordination, implementation, assessment, monitoring, evaluation, adaptive management, and iterative learning with respect to the programs carried out under the initiative.

(5) Descriptions of the steps the Secretary of State, the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and the head of each other relevant Federal department or agency will take to ensure appropriate host-country ownership and to improve coordination and collaboration under the initiative with international development organizations, international donors, multilateral organizations, and the private sector.

(6) Descriptions of potential areas of improved public and private sector research and development, including with academic, philanthropic, and civil society organizations, on data collection efforts and more effective approaches to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally.

(7) Descriptions of the processes for regularly evaluating and updating the initiative on an iterative basis, including regarding priority country and regional plans described in subsection (d).

(8) A list of priority countries and regions selected pursuant to subsection (c), including descriptions of the rationale for such selections.

(C) SELECTION OF PRIORITY COUNTRIES AND REGIONS.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID and the Secretary of Defense, and in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, shall select certain countries as “priority countries” and certain regions as “priority regions” for the Global Fragility Initiative—

(1) on the basis of—

(A) clearly defined indicators of the levels of violence or fragility in such country or region, such as the country or region’s—

(i) ranking on recognized global fragility lists, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development States of Fragility report, the Fund for Peace Fragile States Index, the World Bank Harmonized List of Fragile Situations, the Institute for Economics and Peace Global Peace Index, and Holocaust Museum Early Warning Project Risk Assessment;

(ii) ranking on select United States Government conflict and atrocity early warning watch lists; and

(iii) levels of violence, such as violence committed by armed groups, violent extremist organizations, gender-based violence, and violence against children and youth; and

(B) an assessment of—

(i) the capacity and commitment of national and sub-national government entities and civil society partners in such country or region to work with Federal departments and agencies on the initiative, including by demonstrating the willingness and making demonstrable efforts to improve governance, enhance rule of law, and protect human rights; and

(ii) the likelihood that selection as a priority country or priority region would allow the initiative to measurably stabilize conflict-affected areas or prevent violence and fragility in such country or region; and

(2) in a manner that ensures that—

(A) not fewer than three countries or regions are designated as “Stabilization Countries” or “Stabilization Regions”, as the case may be, in which current levels of violence are among the highest in the world;

(B) not fewer than three countries or regions are designated as “Prevention Countries” or “Prevention Regions”, as the case may be, in which current levels of violence are lower than such levels in Stabilization Countries or Stabilization Regions but risk factors for violence or fragility are significant;

(C) countries and regions selected are in the areas of responsibility of at least three geographic bureaus of the Department of State; and

(D) regions, rather than individual countries, are selected where the threat or spillover of violence, conflict, or fragility threatens multiple countries within a single geographic region.

(d) COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PLANS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, the Atrocities Prevention Board (or any successor entity), and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees ten-year plans to align and integrate under the Global Fragility Initiative required under subsection (a) all relevant diplomatic,

development, security assistance and cooperation, and other relevant activities of the United States Government with respect to each of the countries and regions selected pursuant to subsection (c). Each such country and regional plan shall include the following:

(1) Specific multi-year interagency plans for coordination and implementation under each such plan.

(2) An up-to-date baseline analysis for each such country or region, including an analysis of political dynamics, impacts of violence, and conditions that contribute to violence and fragility.

(3) Prioritized descriptions of the goals and objectives for stabilizing conflict-affected areas and preventing violence and fragility in each such country or region.

(4) Descriptions of how and when the relevant goals, objectives, plans, and benchmarks for each such country or region will be incorporated into relevant United States country plans and strategies, including Department of State Integrated Country Strategies, USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategies, and Department of Defense Campaign Plans, Operational Plans, and Regional Strategies, as well as any equivalent or successor plans or strategies.

(5) Interagency plans to ensure that appropriate local actors, including government and civil society entities and organizations led by women, youth, or under-represented communities, have an appropriate ownership stake in developing, implementing, assessing, monitoring, evaluating, and updating relevant activities under each such plan.

(6) Interagency plans to integrate existing and planned security assistance and cooperation programs in each such country or region with the initiative and to maximize positive outcomes and mitigate risks associated with such programs, including risks related to corruption, governance, and human rights.

(7) Assessment, monitoring, and evaluation frameworks for diplomatic, development, and security activities, which shall be informed by consultations with the stakeholders specified in subsection (a)(2), with clear, date-certain metrics for each such country or region, as well as interagency plans for using such frameworks to adapt such activities on a regular and iterative basis.

(8) Descriptions of available policy tools and how such tools will be used to stabilize conflict-affected areas or prevent violence and fragility in each such country or region.

(9) A description of how planning and implementation for each such country or region will be coordinated to ensure such planning and implementation are conducted in partnership between the United States Government and—

- (A) governments of such countries;
- (B) international development organizations;
- (C) relevant international donors;
- (D) multilateral organizations; and
- (E) the private sector.

(10) A regional component outlining plans to address relevant transnational issues in cases in which an individual country is selected and such country is affected by or at risk of regional fragility or violence.

(11) A component outlining plans to address national-level factors at the individual country level in cases in which a region is selected and such region is affected by or at risk of fragility or violence as a result of such national-level factors.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, and in consultation with the Atrocities Prevention Board (or any

successor entity), relevant United States ambassadors, USAID mission directors, geographic combatant commanders, and other relevant individuals with responsibility over activities in each priority country or region selected pursuant to subsection (c), shall ensure that—

(1) the Global Fragility Initiative required under subsection (a), including each of the country and regional plans under subsection (d), is implemented, updated, and coordinated on a regular and iterative basis; and

(2) such initiative is used to guide United States Government policy at a senior level and incorporated into relevant strategies and plans across the United States Government such that the activities of all Federal departments and agencies are consistent with such initiative.

SEC. 7. BIENNIAL REPORTS AND CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATION.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act and every two years thereafter until the date that is ten years after such date of enactment, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, the Atrocities Prevention Board (or any successor entity), and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an unclassified report, which may include a classified annex, on progress made and lessons learned with respect to the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6, including each country and regional plan required as part of such initiative, including the following:

(1) Descriptions of steps taken to incorporate the initiative and such country and regional plans into relevant strategies and plans that affect such countries and regions.

(2) Accountings of all funding received and obligated to implement each such country and regional plan during the previous two years, as well as funding requested, planned, and projected for the following two years.

(3) Descriptions of progress made towards the goals and objectives established for each such country and region, including progress made towards achieving specific targets, metrics, and indicators.

(4) Descriptions of updates made during the previous two years to the goals, objectives, plans of action, and other elements described in each such country and regional plan, as well as any changes made to programs based on the results of assessment, monitoring, and evaluation.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State, the Administrator of USAID, and the Secretary of Defense shall provide to any appropriate congressional committee upon the request of any such committee regular briefings on the implementation of this Act.

SEC. 8. GAO REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act and every two years thereafter until the date that is ten years after such date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives regarding opportunities for independent review of the activities under the Global Fragility Initiative established pursuant to section 6, including opportunities to—

(1) assess the extent to which United States Government activities in each country and region selected as part of the initiative are being implemented in accordance with the initiative and the relevant country or regional plan under the initiative;

(2) assess the processes and procedures for coordinating among and within each relevant Federal department or agency when implementing the initiative and each such country and regional plan;

(3) assess the monitoring and evaluation efforts under the initiative and each such country and regional plan, including assessments of the progress made and lessons learned with respect to each such plan, as well as any changes made to activities based on the results of such monitoring and evaluation;

(4) recommend changes necessary to better implement United States Government activities in accordance with the initiative, as well as recommendations for any changes to the initiative; and

(5) assess such other matters as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The heads of all relevant Federal departments and agencies shall ensure that all relevant data, documents, and other information is made available to the Comptroller General of the United States for purposes of conducting independent reviews pursuant to this section.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) RELEVANT FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY.—The term “relevant Federal department or agency” means the Department of the Treasury and any other Federal department or agency the President determines is relevant to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2116.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, we focus a great deal on the importance of diplomacy and development as pillars of American foreign policy. The reason why we do this is simple: diplomacy and development advance our interests and values in a way that saves lives, that prevents war, that stops crises before they start, and helps stabilize countries where conflicts have occurred.

These efforts strengthen old friendships and build new bridges of understanding with people and cultures and governments throughout the world.

We will always need a strong military, but sending our servicemembers

into harm's way should, likewise, always be a measure of last resort. So, on our committee, we look for ways to make our diplomacy and development more effective. We try to give our diplomats and development experts the tools and resources they need to carry out their critical work.

Today, the House is taking up six bills aimed at doing just that. The first is a bill of mine that I am glad is moving forward.

Let me thank our ranking member, my friend, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for joining as a cosponsor. This legislation gets at the heart of what we want to see from our diplomatic and development efforts around the world: helping places already torn apart by violence to recover and preventing the start of violence in other places where factors are ripe for its outbreak.

Over the past two decades, we have learned a great deal about what drives violence and instability in what are called fragile states. We know that it takes clearly defined goals and strategies. We know that it takes strong, sustained investment over the long term. We know that it takes serious research and analysis. And we know that it takes agencies across government working together toward the same goals.

This bill takes all that knowledge and establishes an overarching policy framework for the United States Government. It will help ensure that our government is working in lockstep to prevent violence and extremism and that we are working closely with civil society groups to assess internal and external drivers of instability, to implement these initiatives on the ground, and to constantly monitor and evaluate the work.

This bill takes into account the fact that no two countries are alike. Some will be willing partners in this work; others will require more rigorous engagement to get them on board. For this reason, the bill requires the selection of priority countries and regions based on a number of indicators, such as the challenges at hand and the commitments of respective governments.

The bill also establishes and authorizes the Stabilization and Prevention Fund and authorizes the Complex Crises Fund for the next 5 years, important steps in making sure this initiative has the resources needed for success.

This bill will make a real difference in the lives of some of the world's most vulnerable people and communities, and it will do so in a way that serves U.S. interests.

The United States must get ahead of the extremist threat if we want to ensure our own security. This bill helps us to do just that. I ask for the support of all Members to pass this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Global Fragility Act. I want to thank my good friend, Chairman ENGEL, for introducing this bill. I am proud to be the lead Republican on this vital bipartisan legislation.

Violent conflict costs the global economy more than \$14 trillion every year, killing tens of thousands of people and displacing millions from their homes. In the past, the United States has been investing billions of dollars to stabilize fragile states and conflict areas, often with little to show for it.

We are successful militarily. For example, we have destroyed the so-called caliphate in Iraq and Syria. But as former Secretary of Defense James Mattis once said: "The more that we put into the State Department's diplomacy, hopefully, the less we have to put into a military budget as we deal with the outcome. . . ."

Simply put, we need to be more effective in helping to prevent conflicts before they erupt. That is what this bill is designed to do.

Weak governance, corruption, and extreme poverty fuel instability. Jihadi groups prey on these conditions and plague key parts of the world with their violence and oppression. Fragile states provide fertile recruiting ground for these terrorists and, also, transnational criminal organizations.

Sadly, we are seeing jihadists expand in the Sahel region of Africa. Violent attacks linked to terror groups have doubled every year since 2016.

When I was in Africa last month, I heard tragic stories of this growing threat. I am glad that we are taking action here today to help bring stability to this vital region by passing the Global Fragility Act.

Our bill requires the administration to launch a new initiative to coordinate our assistance in fragile states. This will ensure that the United States takes a whole-of-government approach to preventing violent conflict rather than individual agencies funding piecemeal, uncoordinated activities.

The bill requires the State Department to coordinate with USAID, the Department of Defense, and other agencies in standing up a pilot program in a select number of countries. It also ensures consistent future funding in order to take a long-term approach to our programs and objectives in those key selected locations.

Madam Speaker, we must get this right. We are seeing unprecedented levels of instability, displacement, and humanitarian needs around the world in Syria, Venezuela, Yemen, the Sahel, South Sudan, and elsewhere. Preventing conflict and violence can save the U.S. taxpayer dollars and make our country and the rest of the world safer.

I want to recognize the development community and NGOs, like the ONE Campaign, for the important work that they have done on this critical humanitarian and national security issue. They have been extremely supportive of this bill, and I look forward to working with them to get to final passage.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to say that we have done a lot of good things in terms of defending this Nation. As chairman of Homeland Security, I think that we stopped probably 95 percent of the threats that we saw coming at us.

We have done very good offensively in our military, defeating and destroying extremist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS in Iraq and Syria and the collapse of the caliphate. But, Madam Speaker, I think where we have been probably not as good and where we need to do better is in prevention and getting at the root causes of the problems.

Getting to the root cause of the problems, particularly in Africa, is extremely important, as the military tells us the Sahel will be the next caliphate.

We have to pass this bill because it gets to the root cause. It is the prevention piece that the State Department, USAID, and the Department of Defense will work together to stop and prevent extremism at its core roots, and I believe it will make the world a safer place long term.

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

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

Madam Speaker, the United States works to prevent and stop violence when we help to build stronger, more secure communities around the world; when we try to make the most vulnerable regions more stable and prosperous, we are improving the lives of large numbers of people. We are also advancing our own interests by eliminating the root causes that allow extremism to fester and drive threats to our own security.

That is the aim of my bill. That is the aim of this bill we are considering today. It is a smart approach to a serious foreign policy challenge.

The House passed it in the last Congress. I hope the other body will take it up soon so we can get it to the President's desk.

Madam Speaker, I again thank the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL.

Policies like this should always be bipartisan. As I always stress, as does Mr. MCCAUL, we try to work in a bipartisan way on the House Foreign Affairs Committee because, after all, the work we are doing is work for all Americans. It helps all Americans. It helps our great Nation.

So I again want to thank the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL. I ask all Members to support this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2116.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

REFUGEE SANITATION FACILITY
SAFETY ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 615) to provide women and girls safe access to sanitation facilities in refugee camps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 615

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 “Refugee Sanitation Facility Safety Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. SECURE ACCESS TO SANITATION FACILITIES FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS.

Section 501 of the Foreign Relations Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 2601 note) is amended in subsection (a)—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(12) the provision of safe and secure access to sanitation facilities, with a special emphasis on women and girls, and vulnerable populations.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 615, the Refugee Sanitation Facility Safety Act 2019.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Ms. MENG and Mr. ZELDIN for authoring this important bipartisan measure.

We are facing a devastating refugee crisis around the world right now. Over 25 million people are currently refugees having fled from violence, conflict, and crisis. Many of these people are now living in refugee camps.

And let me be clear, we need a foreign policy that addresses the root causes of this crisis.

So I am pleased we just considered my Global Fragility bill, which works to prevent the kind of conflict and instability that leads to these refugee crises.

The United States also needs to open its doors to more of these families who have fled violence in search of a better life. America should be leading the world to help in relocating these displaced people, so they can find new homes and start anew.

And we need to make sure that when people are living in refugee camps,

they are cared for and treated with dignity.

Sadly, far too many women and girls in these camps face danger right now. Bathrooms and shower facilities have often become dangerous places with predators taking advantage of poor lighting to stage attacks.

After facing the trauma of being driven from their homes, women and girls in refugee camps should not have to worry about being sexually assaulted, period.

We need to do what we can to make sure that refugee camps have safe, accessible sanitation facilities for everyone. So I am pleased that we are considering legislation today that works to do just that.

Madam Speaker, with H.R. 615, the State Department, when providing overseas assistance for refugees, will seek to ensure safe access to sanitation facilities, especially for those most vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bipartisan bill. I am proud to support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Refugee Sanitation Facility Safety Act.

I want to commend my two colleagues from New York, Representatives MENG and ZELDIN, and also Chairman ENGEL for the good work on this bill.

Around the world, conflict and humanitarian disasters are causing unprecedented levels of displacement in places like South Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Nigeria, and Venezuela.

Some of these crises have dragged on for years and even decades. Generations of young people are growing up knowing only life in a refugee camp where conditions can be dire, and even dangerous, for women, children, and other vulnerable populations.

In these situations, things as basic as lights and locks can make a difference between safe restrooms and bathing facilities in dangerous environments where refugees are vulnerable to sexual violence and other crimes.

This bill amends the Foreign Relations Act to ensure support for safe sanitation facilities for refugees and displaced persons living in camps around the world.

The U.S. continues to be the largest donor to refugees and displaced persons around the world, and we will continue to lead, while encouraging other countries to step up and do more.

In closing, Madam Speaker, the United States is a leading donor of humanitarian assistance to refugees around the world. Through the work of UNHCR and NGO partners, we are saving millions of lives every day.

This bill does not increase those assistance levels but will help ensure that our funding is put to effective use

in protecting the safety and dignity of vulnerable refugees.

Madam Speaker, I want to, again, thank Chairman ENGEL and Representatives MENG and ZELDIN for their leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, in closing, let me say that we are facing a refugee crisis around the world. Wars, violence, instability—millions of people have fled their homes in search of safety.

We need to do what we can to help these people find new homes and start anew. And while they are living in temporary refugee camps, we need to make sure they have the tools to stay safe and healthy.

The Refugee Sanitation Facility Safety Act of 2019 provides refugee women and girls with safe access to sanitation facilities.

This is one clear, straightforward way we can help those most vulnerable people. It is a good, commonsense bill; I am pleased to support it. And I thank Mr. MCCAUL as well for his support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 615.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIGITAL GLOBAL ACCESS POLICY
ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1359) to promote Internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the Internet, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1359

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 “Digital Global Access Policy Act of 2019” or the “Digital GAP Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) encourage the efforts of developing countries to improve and secure mobile and fixed access to the Internet in order to catalyze innovation, spur economic growth and job creation, improve health, education, and financial services, reduce poverty and gender inequality, mitigate disasters, and promote free speech, democracy, and good governance;

(2) promote build-once policies and approaches and the multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance; and

(3) ensure the effective use of United States foreign assistance resources toward that end.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Internet access has been a driver of economic activity around the world. Bringing Internet access to the more than 4,000,000,000 people who do not have it could increase global economic output by \$6,700,000,000,000 and raise 500,000,000 people out of poverty.

(2) The number of Internet users has more than tripled from 1,000,000,000 to over 3,000,000,000 since 2005, including 2,000,000,000 living in the developing world, yet more than half of the world's population remains offline, living without the economic and social benefits of the Internet. By the end of 2016, over 80 percent of households in the developed world had Internet access, compared with just 40 percent of households in developing countries and just 11 percent in the world's least developed countries. Of the world's offline population, an estimated 75 percent live in just 20 countries, and rural, female, elderly, illiterate, and low-income populations are being left behind.

(3) Studies suggest that women are disproportionately affected by a digital gap in developing countries, where there are on average 23 percent fewer women online than men. Bringing an additional 600,000,000 women online could contribute \$13,000,000,000 to \$18,000,000,000 to annual GDP across 144 developing countries.

(4) The United States has been a leader in promoting access to an open, secure, interoperable Internet around the world. Recognizing that support for expanded Internet access furthers United States economic and foreign policy interests, including efforts to end extreme global poverty and enabling resilient, democratic societies, the Department of State launched a diplomatic effort called "Global Connect".

(5) Internet access in developing countries is hampered, in part, by a lack of infrastructure and a poor regulatory environment for investment. Build-once policies and approaches, which seek to coordinate public and private sector investments in roads and other critical infrastructure, can reduce the number and scale of excavation and construction activities when installing telecommunications infrastructure in rights-of-way, thereby reducing installation costs for high-speed Internet networks and serving as a development best practice.

SEC. 4. EXPANDING INTERNET ACCESS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) BROADBAND.—The term "broadband" means an Internet Protocol-based transmission service that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, graphics, or a combination thereof, using technologies including fiber optic, mobile, satellite, and Wi-Fi.

(3) BROADBAND CONDUIT.—The term "broadband conduit" means a conduit for fiber optic cables and other connectivity technologies that support broadband or wireless facilities for broadband service.

(4) BUILD-ONCE POLICIES AND APPROACHES.—The term "build-once policies and approaches" means policies or practices that encourage the integration of Internet infrastructure into traditional infrastructure projects that minimize the number and scale of excavation and construction activities when installing telecommunications infrastructure in rights-of-way to reduce costs,

such as by laying fiber optic cable simultaneously with road construction.

(5) STAKEHOLDERS.—The term "stakeholders" means the private sector, the public sector, cooperatives, civil society, the technical community that develops Internet technologies, standards, implementation, operations, and applications, and other groups that are working to increase Internet access or are impacted by the lack of Internet access in their communities.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to consult, partner, and coordinate with the governments of foreign countries, international organizations, regional economic communities, businesses, civil society, and other stakeholders in a concerted effort to close the digital gap by increasing public and private investments in secure Internet infrastructure and creating conditions for universal Internet access and usage worldwide by promoting—

(1) first-time access to fixed or mobile broadband Internet by 2027 for at least 1,500,000,000 people living in urban and rural areas in developing countries;

(2) Internet deployment and related coordination, capacity building, and build-once policies and approaches in developing countries, including actions to encourage—

(A) standardization of build-once policies and approaches for the inclusion of broadband conduit in rights-of-way projects that are funded, co-funded, or partially financed by the United States or any international organization that includes the United States as a member, in consultation with telecommunications providers, unless a cost-benefit analysis determines that the cost of such approach outweighs the benefits;

(B) adoption and integration of build-once policies and approaches into the development and investment strategies of national and local government agencies of developing countries and donor governments and organizations that will enhance coordination with the private sector for road building, pipe laying, major infrastructure projects, and development-related construction such as schools, clinics, and civic buildings;

(C) provision of increased financial support by international organizations, including through grants, loans, technical assistance, and partnerships to expand information and communications access and Internet connectivity; and

(D) avoidance of vendors and contractors likely to be subject to extrajudicial direction from a foreign government;

(3) policy and regulatory approaches that promote a competitive market for investment and innovation in Internet infrastructure and service to encourage first-time, affordable access to the Internet in developing countries, including actions to encourage, as appropriate—

(A) the integration of universal and gender-equitable Internet access and adoption goals, to be informed by the collection of related gender disaggregated data and research on social norms that often limit women's and girls' use of the Internet, into national development plans and United States Government country-level strategies;

(B) effective, transparent, and efficient spectrum allocation processes and reforms of competition laws that may impede the ability of companies to provide Internet services; and

(C) efforts to improve procurement processes to help attract and incentivize investment in secure Internet infrastructure;

(4) the removal of tax and regulatory barriers to Internet access, as appropriate;

(5) the use of the Internet to increase economic growth and trade, including, as appropriate—

(A) policies and strategies to remove restrictions to e-commerce, cross-border information flows, and competitive marketplaces; and

(B) entrepreneurship and distance learning enabled by access to technology;

(6) the use of the Internet to bolster democracy, government accountability, transparency, gender equity, and human rights, including through the establishment of policies, initiatives, and investments that—

(A) support the development of national broadband plans or information and communication technologies strategies that are consistent with fundamental civil and political rights, including freedom of expression, religion, belief, assembly, and association;

(B) expand online access to government information and services to enhance government accountability and service delivery, including for areas in which government may have limited presence; and

(C) support expression of free speech and enable political organizing and activism in support of human rights and democracy through activities that expand access to independent sources of news and information and safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms online, in compliance with international human rights standards;

(7) programs and mechanisms that actively promote and advance access to and adoption of Internet and other information and communications technologies by women, people with disabilities, minorities, low-income and marginalized groups, and underserved populations, such as programs that address social norms and barriers to women's active participation in the digital economy or Internet policymaking;

(8) mechanisms for public and private financing of rural broadband connectivity and digital inclusion;

(9) public Internet access facilities and Wi-Fi networks in places such as libraries, government buildings, community centers, and schools;

(10) the creation and support of research and educational networks;

(11) cybersecurity, data protection, and privacy, including international use of the latest version of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity; and

(12) interagency coordination and cooperation across all executive branch agencies regarding the promotion of Internet initiatives as a part of United States foreign policy.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with other agencies, multilateral institutions, foreign countries, and stakeholders, shall advance the policy articulated in this Act and promote expanded Internet connectivity worldwide, as appropriate, by—

(1) encouraging foreign countries to prioritize secure Internet connectivity in development plans;

(2) promoting the formation of region-specific multi-sector working groups to ensure technical and regulatory best practices; and

(3) encouraging the development of digital literacy programs in developing countries.

(d) USAID.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) should advance the policy articulated in this Act and support expanded Internet connectivity worldwide, as appropriate, by—

(1) supporting efforts to expand secure Internet infrastructure and improve digital literacy, and other appropriate measures to improve Internet connectivity and usage, in close coordination with the Secretary of State;

(2) encouraging public and private investment in Internet infrastructure and services

of developing countries that takes into consideration the data security and integrity risks attendant to the products and services of vendors likely to be subject to extrajudicial direction from a foreign government;

(3) integrating efforts to expand Internet access, develop appropriate, sustainable, and equitable technologies, and enhance digital literacy and the availability of relevant local content across development sectors, such as USAID health, education, agriculture, and economic development programs;

(4) expanding the utilization of information and communications technologies in humanitarian aid and disaster relief responses and United States operations involving reconstruction and stabilization to improve donor coordination, reduce duplication and waste, capture and share lessons learned, and augment disaster preparedness and risk mitigation strategies;

(5) establishing and promoting guidelines for the protection of personal information of individuals served by humanitarian, disaster, and development programs directly through the United States Government, and through contracts funded by the United States Government and by international organizations; and

(6) establishing programs that directly address and seek to close gaps in access, adoption, and use of the Internet and other information and communications technologies by women, minorities, and other marginalized groups.

(e) PEACE CORPS.—Section 3 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (e); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) It is the sense of Congress that access to the Internet can transform agriculture, community economic development, education, environment, health, and youth development, which are the sectors in which Peace Corps develops positions for volunteers.

“(g) In giving attention to the programs, projects, training, and other activities referred to in subsection (f), the Peace Corps should develop positions for volunteers that include leveraging the Internet, as appropriate, for development, education, and social and economic mobility.”

(f) LEVERAGING INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT.—In pursuing the policy described in this Act, the President should direct United States representatives to appropriate international bodies to use the influence of the United States, consistent with the broad development goals of the United States, to advocate that each such body—

(1) commit to increase efforts and coordination to promote affordable, open, and gender-equitable Internet access, in partnership with stakeholders and consistent with host countries' absorptive capacity;

(2) integrate affordable and gender-equitable Internet access data into existing economic and business assessments, evaluations, and indexes such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation constraints analysis, the Doing Business reports, International Monetary Fund Article IV assessments and country reports, and the Affordability Drivers Index;

(3) standardize the inclusion of broadband conduit as part of highway or comparable construction projects in developing countries, in consultation with telecommunications providers, unless—

(A) such inclusion would create an undue burden;

(B) such inclusion is not necessary based on the availability of existing broadband infrastructure;

(C) such inclusion would require the incorporation of the hardware, software, or maintenance of vendors likely to be subject to extrajudicial direction from a foreign government; or

(D) a cost-benefit analysis determines that the cost of such inclusion outweighs the benefits;

(4) provide technical assistance to the regulatory authorities in developing countries to remove unnecessary barriers to investment and develop regulations to support market growth and development;

(5) utilize clear, accountable, and metric-based targets, including targets with gender-disaggregated data, to measure the effectiveness of efforts to promote Internet access; and

(6) promote and protect human rights online, such as the freedoms of expression, religion, belief, assembly, and association, through resolutions, public statements, projects, and initiatives, and advocating that member states of such bodies are held accountable for violations.

(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on efforts to implement the policy described in this Act and, to the extent practicable, describe efforts by the United States Government to—

(1) provide technical and regulatory assistance to promote Internet access in developing countries;

(2) strengthen and support development of regulations that incentivize market growth that contributes to increased Internet access in developing countries;

(3) encourage public and private investment in Internet infrastructure, including broadband networks and services, in developing countries;

(4) increase gender-equitable Internet access and close gender gaps in Internet and other information and communications technology adoption and use, especially in countries in which social norms limit such adoption and use by women and girls, and otherwise encourage or support Internet deployment, competition, and adoption; and

(5) conduct outreach and explore partnership opportunities with the private sector on activities that advance the policy described in this Act.

SEC. 5. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to infringe upon the related functions of any Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) vested in such agency under any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1359.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, when we talk about our development efforts around the world, we often focus on very big concepts, promoting democracy and human rights, making governments more open and accountable, expanding economic opportunity.

Those are, of course, very important ideas, and we need to keep those big-picture goals in mind. But we also need to be working constantly to develop the specific day-to-day tools and efforts that will help us advance towards those goals.

In the 21st century, a lot of those tools have to do with technology. Think of the way the internet has changed the global economy; the way technology has improved communication; the sharing of information; the ability of people to participate in worldwide markets and conversations.

Now, think of the fact that 4 billion people around the developing world do not have access to the internet; think of the untapped potential, the number of people who cannot participate in a constantly expanding online marketplace of goods and services and ideas.

The number of people with stories to tell, whether they are about life in remote communities or the corruption of a repressive government, but who cannot get their hands on the modern-day tools we use to communicate with one another; the number of people who cannot get information about a new opportunity or an impending disaster because they don't have a laptop or a smart phone.

As technology continues to rush forward in so many aspects of modern life, unfortunately, far too many people are being left behind. This bill aims to help close that so-called digital gap.

This legislation would push the State Department, USAID, the Peace Corps, and American representatives in international bodies to incorporate internet access into development planning.

There are a number of ways we want to do this:

Through diplomacy, advising other governments to prioritize this issue; through development, by incorporating this priority into our work on the ground, especially with respect to women, minorities, and other marginalized groups; and in the international and multilateral groups conducting assessments and evaluations of development progress, we want to see access to the internet as an important goal and metric.

This legislation builds on our country's longstanding leadership role in this area.

Let's not forget, the United States created and advanced the internet in the first place, and Congress has been working on this for decades, starting with the High Performance Computing Act of 1991, which is credited for helping create the first internet browser.

It is an important legacy to build on. And it coincides with an important foreign policy goal.

So I want to thank Mr. WRIGHT of Texas, this bill's author, along with

Ranking Member MCCAUL and Representatives LIEU and BERA, two able members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their hard work.

I am glad to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Digital GAP Act of 2019, which I was proud to introduce with Ranking Member MCCAUL and Representatives LIEU and BERA.

In our increasingly connected world, internet access is a tremendous driver of economic growth. But 60 percent of the world's population remains offline and out of reach of U.S. businesses, organizations, and educators—largely due to a lack of telecommunications infrastructure.

The Digital GAP Act will promote commonsense “build once” policies to help ensure that companies have opportunities to incorporate telecommunications into new infrastructure construction projects.

This will provide opportunities to the private sector and reduce the cost of bringing new communities online.

The bill also presses for the removal of onerous tax and regulatory barriers to Internet access, and calls on the State Department, USAID, and other government agencies, to partner with businesses to increase private investment in internet infrastructure in developing countries.

As we compete overseas with an increasingly aggressive China, we must make America's assistance and development strategies more effective.

Bills like the Digital GAP Act and the Championing American Business through Diplomacy Act, which passed 2 weeks ago, will do just that by strengthening the United States partnership with the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, the internet is an incredible tool that has shaped the world in the last generation.

It allows entrepreneurs in emerging markets to sell their products in global markets. It allows citizens and journalists living under oppressive regimes or in war zones to get information out to the world.

This bill will establish that our foreign policy is to help advance these positive developments.

I urge its passage. It passed the House in the last Congress, and I hope the other body will take it up soon.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1359.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION INFORMATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1952) to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1952

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 “Intercountry Adoption Information Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS.

(a) REPORT ELEMENTS.—Section 104(b) of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(9) A list of countries that established or maintained a significant law or regulation that prevented or prohibited adoptions involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether such adoptions occurred under the Convention.

“(10) For each country listed under paragraph (9), the date on which the law or regulation was initially implemented.

“(11) Information on efforts taken with respect to a country listed under paragraph (9) to encourage the resumption of halted or stalled adoption proceedings involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether the adoptions would have occurred under the Convention.

“(12) Information on any action the Secretary carried out that prevented, prohibited, or halted any adoptions involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether the adoptions occurred under the Convention.

“(13) For each country listed pursuant to paragraph (12), a description of—

“(A) what policies, procedures, resources, and safeguards the country lacks, or other shortcomings or circumstances, that caused the action to be carried out;

“(B) what progress the country has made to alleviate those shortcomings; and

“(C) what steps the Department of State has taken in order to assist the country to reopen intercountry adoptions.

“(14) An assessment of the impact of the fee schedule of the Intercountry Adoption Accreditation and Maintenance Entity on families seeking to adopt internationally, especially low-income families, families seeking to adopt sibling groups, or families seeking to adopt children with disabilities.”.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—Section 104 of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall make the information contained in the report required under subsection (a) available to the public on the website of the Department of State.”.

(c) PRIVACY CONCERNS.—In complying with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, disclosing any personally identifiable information relating to United States citizens or the adoptees of such citizens.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 104(a) of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914(a)) is amended by striking “International Relations” and inserting “Foreign Affairs”.

(e) APPLICATION DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 104 of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914) beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1952, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I thank Mr. COLLINS and Mr. LANGEVIN for their hard work on this bill that would help ease some of the problems parents face when they are trying to adopt children from other countries.

Madam Speaker, the process of adopting a child is a tough one, especially when that child is overseas. It is expensive and often emotionally taxing for the parents. It is filled with legal twists and turns and often difficult requirements, but it is worth it for these loving parents who want to give children from faraway places a home and the chance to be part of a family and a good future.

What can make this process even more daunting is when foreign governments change their laws without any sort of notice or explanation. For parents who have to deal with this, it is like having the rug pulled out from under them.

In 2018, the number of intercountry adoptions to the United States declined by roughly 600. We saw a similar decline the year before. Part of the reason is that China and the Democratic Republic of the Congo changed their policies, for example.

I can't imagine the frustration and anxiety of parents who learned their adoption has been delayed or derailed. This bill helps to make things easier on those families.

It would require the State Department to stay up to date on laws and policies dealing with intercountry adoptions and make sure American

families get that information. This will make the adoption process safer and more transparent for both parents and children.

This is a good bill. It passed the House last Congress. After we pass it again today, I hope the other body, the Senate, will act quickly as well to pass it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Intercountry Adoption Information Act authored by my friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The world today is full of orphaned children, but it is also full of loving families who are ready and eager to adopt them. All too often, American families encounter policy obstacles that delay and prevent those adoptions. Some countries have halted adoption processing, suspended foreign adoptions, or banned adoption altogether.

This information doesn't always make it across the world to waiting American families. Many times, they are already midway through the difficult adoption process when these policy changes occur.

Without full information, they cannot understand the impact on their own cases. This leaves adoptive parents in wrenching situations, separated from their child and unsure how to proceed.

This bill ensures that American families are not left in the dark by requiring the State Department to publicly report on legal and policy changes other countries make that may impact the adoption process. It also requires the State Department to explain its efforts to resume stalled adoption proceedings so that American parents know what their country is doing to successfully bring their children to their new home.

As a father of three, I can say that there is no greater feeling than being a dad. I know other parents in this Chamber feel the same way. This bill is an opportunity for both parties to come together to do something positive for American families.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we hear far too many gut-wrenching stories about American families who have trouble adopting children overseas. This legislation will help make that easier, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the lead Republican on the Judiciary Committee and the author of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the two gentlemen from Texas, and I appreciate the kind words so far on this bill.

This is something, Madam Speaker, that we can definitely rise in support of, and I appreciate the kind words that have been spoken so far.

I rise in support my legislation, H.R. 1952, the Intercountry Adoption Information Act. This legislation is a critical step forward in ensuring American families have access to the information they need to pursue adoptions from a foreign country.

American families hoping to adopt internationally face many obstacles on the road to being united with their adoptive children. Too often, these challenges require parents to navigate confusing and complicated foreign adoption practices.

I have witnessed firsthand how families in my home State of Georgia have struggled to navigate shifting adoption policies and changing international standards.

In 2012, Pam and Mark Romano, a family in northwest Georgia, traveled to Russia in hopes of adopting a young boy named Bogdon. This was not a quick decision, but one that required months and months of thoughtful prayer and family discussion.

While overseas, the Romanos discovered that Bogdon had a brother, Yura. Although the boys were living separately, the family immediately felt a calling to welcome both boys into their home, and they began the process of adopting Yura as well.

The Romanos were in the midst of the adoption process when Russia instituted a ban on adoptions to the United States, tragically halting the Romanos from bringing both Bogdon and Yura home to Georgia.

The Romanos were, of course, left completely devastated. They had worked for months to be reunited with their sons, but they lacked concrete information about the intercountry adoption process and what was happening in Russia as well as diplomatically.

Since that time, Pam Romano has refused to give up on welcoming Yura and Bogdon into her family. Her boys' room is still furnished and ready for their arrival, and she won't stop fighting until her sons are home.

Pam and her family have been tireless advocates for their sons but also for families across the country who are facing similar threats. They have also taken up their cause.

Today, American families like the Romanos are still in need of the most accurate and up-to-date information as they labor to bring their adoptive children into loving homes. Changing foreign practices can leave the adoptive parents heartbroken and desperately seeking answers as they pursue intercountry adoption.

The Intercountry Adoption Information Act takes steps to shrink this information gap by ensuring families pursuing intercountry adoptions are equipped with a more thorough outlook on the status of intercountry adoptions in specific countries and on the State

Department's actions to resume adoptions that currently remain stalled.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL of the Foreign Affairs Committee for moving this critical bill forward. I also thank my cosponsors, Representatives LANGEVIN, FITZPATRICK, LAMBORN, LYNCH, SMITH, and others for their steadfast commitment to advocating on behalf of these loving families and innocent children in need of homes.

Most importantly, I would like to recognize my constituents, Pam and Mark Romano, and the entire Romano family for their advocacy not only for their own sons but for children all across the world who are waiting to be welcomed home.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the many American families who would greatly benefit from a consistent, reliable source of information as they seek to welcome some of the world's most vulnerable children into loving homes and support the Intercountry Adoption Information Act.

This is something we have done before. This is something that brings us together, and the families who are brought together by this make a lasting impact in the world in which we live.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I again thank Representative COLLINS for this bill. American parents ought to know how foreign policy decisions impact their lives. They also deserve to know what our government is doing to help unite them with their children.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and I urge support from all Members.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1952, the Intercountry Adoption Information Act, and thank my colleague from Georgia, Representative COLLINS, for his partnership on this bipartisan effort. I would also like to thank Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for working together to ensure its expeditious consideration by their committee and by the full House.

Whether adopting at home or abroad, every family should have the information they need to navigate the process successfully. Yet, families hoping to adopt from foreign countries can be unaware of political and legal obstacles that may prevent them from doing so.

Russia's adoption ban in 2012 and the Democratic Republic of Congo's intercountry adoption ban in 2013 are just two examples of policies that left families in limbo while they were already in the process of adopting.

More recently, more than 200 American families and Ethiopian children with pending adoptions were stuck in heartbreaking uncertainty—unable to unite their families—when

the Ethiopian government halted all foreign adoption processing.

As countries like Russia and Ethiopia change intercountry adoption processes, or ban adoptions to the United States altogether, families must have up-to-date information regarding policies that could make the adoption process difficult, or even impossible. No family members should be left in the dark, oceans away from each other, wondering if they'll ever be united.

Under the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000, the State Department is required to provide an annual, public report on intercountry adoptions. H.R. 1952 is simple. It would ensure that this report also includes information on policies that may prevent or prohibit adoptions to the United States.

This information would help families navigate the adoption process successfully. I'm proud to lead this effort with Congressman COLLINS, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1952, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GLOBAL ELECTORAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 2019

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 753) to promote international exchanges on best election practices, cultivate more secure democratic institutions around the world, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 753

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 "Global Electoral Exchange Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) recent elections globally have illustrated the urgent need for the promotion and exchange of international best election practices, particularly in the areas of cybersecurity, results transmission, transparency of electoral data, election dispute resolution, and the elimination of discriminatory registration practices and other electoral irregularities;

(2) the advancement of democracy worldwide promotes American interests, as stable democracies provide new market opportunities, improve global health outcomes, and promote economic freedom and regional security;

(3) credible elections are the cornerstone of a healthy democracy and enable all persons

to exercise their basic human right to have a say in how they are governed;

(4) inclusive elections strengthen the credibility and stability of democracies more broadly;

(5) at the heart of a strong election cycle is the professionalism of the election management body and an empowered civil society;

(6) the development of local expertise via peer-to-peer learning and exchanges promotes the independence of such bodies from internal and external influence; and

(7) supporting the efforts of peoples in democratizing societies to build more representative governments in their respective countries is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 3. GLOBAL ELECTORAL EXCHANGE.

(a) GLOBAL ELECTORAL EXCHANGE.—The Secretary of State is authorized to establish and administer a Global Electoral Exchange Program to promote the utilization of sound election administration practices around the world.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Global Electoral Exchange Program described in subsection (a) shall include the promotion and exchange of international best election practices, including in the areas of—

(1) cybersecurity;

(2) results transmission;

(3) transparency of electoral data;

(4) election dispute resolution;

(5) the elimination of discriminatory registration practices and electoral irregularities;

(6) equitable access to polling places, voter education information, and voting mechanisms (including by persons with disabilities); and

(7) other sound election administration practices.

(c) EXCHANGE OF ELECTORAL AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may, in consultation, as appropriate, with the United States Agency for International Development, make grants to any United States-based 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 with experience in and a primary focus on foreign comparative election systems or subject matter expertise in the administration or integrity of such systems that submits an application in such form, and satisfying such requirements, as the Secretary may require.

(2) TYPES OF GRANTS.—An organization described in paragraph (1) may receive a grant for one or more of the following purposes:

(A) To design and implement programs bringing election administrators and officials, including government officials, poll workers, civil society representatives, members of the judiciary, and others who participate in the organization and administration of public elections in a foreign country that faces challenges to its electoral process to the United States to study election procedures in the United States for educational purposes.

(B) To design and implement programs taking the United States or another country's election administrators and officials, including government officials, poll workers, civil society representatives, members of the judiciary, and others who participate in the organization and administration of public elections to study and discuss election procedures for educational purposes.

(3) LIMITS ON ACTIVITIES.—Activities administered under the Global Electoral Exchange Program may not—

(A) include observation of an election for the purposes of assessing the validity or legitimacy of that election;

(B) facilitate any advocacy for a certain electoral result by a grantee when participating in the Program; or

(C) be carried out without proper consultation with State and local authorities in the United States that administer elections.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should establish and maintain a network of Global Electoral Exchange Program alumni, to promote communication and further exchange of information regarding sound election administration practices among current and former program participants.

(5) FURTHER LIMITS.—A recipient of a grant under the Global Electoral Exchange Program may use such grant for only the purpose for which such grant was awarded, unless otherwise authorized by the Secretary of State.

(6) NOT DUPLICATIVE.—Grants made under this subsection may not be duplicative of any other grants made under any other provision of law for similar or related purposes.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and in each of the following two years thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a briefing on the status of any activities carried out pursuant to this Act during the preceding year, which shall include, among other information, the following:

(1) A summary of all exchanges conducted under the Global Electoral Exchange Program, including information regarding grantees, participants, and the locations where program activities were held.

(2) A description of the criteria used to select grantees under the Global Electoral Exchange Program.

(3) Any recommendations for the improvement of the Global Electoral Exchange Program, based on the purpose specified in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 753.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 753, the Global Electoral Exchange Act of 2019. I would first like to thank my colleague Representative MARK MEADOWS for his important work on this measure that he and I introduced.

We passed this bill last Congress, and I urge my colleagues to do the same

this Congress. This time, I hope that the Senate acts on this small but important measure that will promote best practices in election administration worldwide.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of State to establish an exchange program for election officials like poll workers, judges, ballot designers, and civil society to promote best practices in election administration around the world.

We would send U.S.-based election administrators and officials abroad or bring foreign administrators and officials to the United States in order to train and exchange best practices when it comes to election administration.

This bill is a good idea and is needed now more than ever. Election irregularities, voter fraud, election manipulation, discriminatory registration, access to polls, intimidation and harassment while voting, and violence at polling stations are problems that have plagued countries around the world. This bill brings people together to tackle some of these problems and to ensure that best practices are promoted worldwide.

Credible, transparent, and peaceful elections are the cornerstones of a stable and robust democracy. This bill furthers that principle.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the passage of H.R. 753, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Global Electoral Exchange Act authored by my friend and fellow Texan, Mr. CASTRO.

Authoritarian regimes are a threat to personal liberty, international security, and economic progress all around the world. Countries like China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Venezuela present major roadblocks to global peace and prosperity, but there is nothing that dictators fear more than free markets and free people. This is why tyrants use repressive tactics to stifle dissent and crack down on public protests.

The world is a safer, more prosperous place when individuals are governed as citizens, not subjects. This is why promoting democracy abroad has always been a bipartisan cause.

The United States must maintain its leadership in keeping the flame of freedom burning. This legislation gives us another opportunity to be that leader.

The Global Electoral Exchange Act would facilitate the international exchange of election monitors, poll workers, and civil society leaders who participate in the administration of elections. By promoting best practices and empowering foreign societies to conduct elections that truly recognize the will of the people, these exchanges will strengthen democratic institutions in other countries.

Let's pass this bill and demonstrate that America remains a beacon of hope

and freedom to the world by empowering free and fair elections.

Madam Speaker, I do want to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for their hard work on this bill. Friends of democracy have an interest in free and fair elections that are credible and protected from manipulation. This bill promotes that and deserves our unanimous support.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure. Once again, I thank my colleague MARK MEADOWS from North Carolina for his support and hard work on this bill.

The exchanges under this bill would be administered by the State Department and by USAID and would promote best practices and strengthen electoral institutions around the world.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 753.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1645

DENOUNCING FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION/CUTTING AS VIOLATING HUMAN RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND GIRLS

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 106) denouncing female genital mutilation/cutting as a violation of the human rights of women and girls and urging the international community and the Federal Government to increase efforts to eliminate the harmful practice.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 106

Whereas female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) is recognized internationally as a violation of the human rights of women and girls;

Whereas FGM/C comprises all procedures that involve partial or total removal of the external female genitalia, or other injury to the female genital organs for nonmedical reasons;

Whereas an estimated 200 million girls and women alive today have been victims of FGM/C, with girls 14 and younger representing 44 million of those who have been cut;

Whereas more than 3 million girls are estimated to be at risk of FGM/C annually;

Whereas the practice is mostly carried out on young girls between infancy and age 15;

Whereas the practice is rooted in gender inequality and is often linked to other elements of gender-based violence and discrimination, such as child marriage;

Whereas the World Health Organization asserts that FGM/C has no health benefits for women and girls, and can have long-term impacts on their physical, psychological, sexual, and reproductive health;

Whereas the impacts of FGM/C on the physical health of women and girls can include bleeding, infection, obstetric fistula, complications during childbirth, and death;

Whereas, according to UNICEF, FGM/C is reported to occur in all parts of the world, but is most prevalent in parts of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia;

Whereas, although the practice of FGM/C is highly concentrated in specific regions and associated with several cultural traditions, it is not tied to any one religion;

Whereas, in 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention published a report estimating that 513,000 women and girls in the United States were at risk or may have been subjected to FGM/C;

Whereas, in 2015, the United Nations adopted a set of 17 Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 that includes a target to eliminate FGM/C, having previously recognized in 2010 that "the abandonment of this harmful practice can be achieved as a result of a comprehensive movement that involves all public and private stakeholders in society";

Whereas the elimination of FGM/C has been called for by numerous intergovernmental organizations, including the African Union, the European Union, and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, as well as in 3 resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas the Department of State reports on FGM/C in its Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, including information on whether FGM/C is prevalent, the type and category of genital cutting that is most common, as well as international and governmental efforts being taken to address the practice;

Whereas the Federal Government recognized FGM/C as a form of gender-based violence in the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, released in August 2012 and updated in June 2016, and the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, released in March 2016;

Whereas a Government Accountability Office report released in 2016 concluded that "State and USAID currently have limited international assistance efforts to address FGM/C."; and

Whereas, in 2012, the United Nations General Assembly designated February 6 as the International Day of Zero Tolerance for Female Genital Mutilation to enhance awareness of and encourage concrete actions by states and individuals against the practice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) denounces female genital mutilation/cutting as a violation of the human rights of women and girls;

(2) affirms the importance of ending the practice of female genital mutilation/cutting globally for the safety and security of women;

(3) calls upon the international community to increase efforts to accelerate the elimination of female genital mutilation/cutting; and

(4) urges the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in their gender programming to incorporate coordinated efforts to eliminate female genital mutilation/cutting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 106, denouncing female genital mutilation, or cutting.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First, I want to thank my colleagues, Ms. FRANKEL and Mr. PERRY, for introducing this important bipartisan measure.

Every year, 3 million girls around the world are at risk of facing female genital mutilation, or cutting, also known as FGMC. It is a horrific practice that mutilates girls without their consent and can lead to chronic, long-term health problems, and it can even be fatal.

Madam Speaker, the United States rightly considers female genital mutilation, or cutting, a violation of women's rights. Here in the United States, it is a Federal crime to perform this procedure on girls under the age of 18, and many other countries have similar laws banning the practice.

But despite a rising global awareness about the egregious nature of FGMC, it is still a reality for millions of women around the world. It is estimated that over 200 million women and girls today have been subjected to this heinous mistreatment.

We need to speak out against this injustice. That is why I am pleased to support H. Res. 106, a resolution that denounces female genital mutilation, cutting, as a violation of the human rights of women and girls and urges the international community and the Federal Government to ramp up our efforts to eliminate this harmful practice.

We need to do everything we can to combat the systemic mistreatment and injustice women face around the world. So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to denounce FGMC.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to denounce female genital mutilation as a violation of the human rights of women and girls.

I want to thank my committee colleagues, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL and Congressman SCOTT PERRY, for introducing the resolution and for their sustained engagement on the issue.

An estimated 200 million women and girls have been victims of FGM, which

has dangerous and lasting health implications. The United States and many other countries and international organizations have called for an end to this highly invasive practice.

Every year, the Department of State reports on the prevalence of FGM as part of the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and this is an important tool for raising awareness of where this abuse persists.

This resolution urges the Department of State and USAID to go further and to incorporate anti-FGM efforts into their existing programming around the world. U.S. leadership is important to putting an end to this human rights violation.

Speaking as the father of a daughter and a grandfather of five granddaughters, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), the author of this resolution.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, let me start by first of all thanking my colleague, Mr. CASTRO, for yielding time, and Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for their bipartisan leadership.

I am rising in support of a bipartisan resolution brought by myself and Representative SCOTT PERRY of Pennsylvania denouncing female genital mutilation and cutting, known as FGM.

Every girl, no matter where she is born, has a right to be free of violence, and FGM is a barbaric violation of girls' and women's human rights. It is defined by the World Health Organization as any procedure that involves partial or total removal of the external female genitalia or other injury to the female genital organs for nonmedical reasons.

Madam Speaker, there is no developmental, religious, or health-related justification for this harmful practice. FGM poses immediate risks to girls' health, including severe pain and bleeding, difficulty in passing urine, infections, and even death due to hemorrhage or shock.

The practice often leaves girls with long-term scars as well: post-traumatic stress disorder, chronic pain, HIV infection, cysts, abscess, genital ulcers. I could go on.

Girls who have undergone FGM also face an increased risk of complications affecting their menstrual cycles, sometimes resulting in infertility. And as my colleagues pointed out, more than 200 million women and girls living today around the world, including women right here in the United States of America, have been cut.

And now here is a horrible statistic: UNICEF predicts that, if there is no reduction in this practice within the next 30 years, the number of girls being mutilated each year is going to grow from 3.6 million a year to 6.6 million a year.

Madam Speaker, I want you to know that, with resources and advocacy, we

can stop this horrific practice. Just look at Jaha, a very, very courageous young woman from Gambia who was a week old when she was mutilated and forced into marriage at age 15. Now, she escaped that marriage. She could easily have fallen into despair. Instead, she spoke out because she never wanted her daughter or any other child to go through the suffering of FGM. Because of her hard-fought efforts, FGM is now banned in her home country.

Like Jaha, we must all do more. So, today, I am asking the United States Congress to pass this bipartisan resolution denouncing female genital mutilation, recognizing it as a violation of the human rights of women and girls, affirming the importance of ending its practice for the safety and security of women, calling upon the international community to increase its efforts to accelerate the elimination, and urging our State Department of the United States, in their gender programming, to incorporate coordinated efforts to eliminate FGM.

Today, we are going to send a clear message that this practice must stop; and the United States, as one of the largest donors in the global health programs, can help end this cruel practice.

There are things that we can do, like allocating resources annually to continue our efforts to eliminate FGM, codifying the U.S. strategies to prevent and respond to gender-based violence; and we must—I want to say this emphatically—we must restore funding to the U.N. Population Fund, the world's largest program to end FGM, that works with 17 countries and more than 3 million survivors.

Madam Speaker, ending FGM will help millions of girls have a better life. And when they have a better life, that means that their communities will be more prosperous and more peaceful, because when women succeed, the world succeeds.

It is imperative that we end female genital mutilation now. And I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of this critical resolution.

Mr. WRIGHT. In closing, I again want to thank Representative FRANKEL and Representative PERRY for their persistence in this fight.

Every case of female genital mutilation is one too many. This resolution calls on the nations of the world to do more to stop this awful violation of the dignity and safety of women and girls. It deserves our unanimous support.

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

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

We all agree that female genital mutilation, or cutting, is a horrific form of child abuse and a violation of women's rights.

The resolution before us today is a signal to the rest of the world that the United States Congress is paying attention to this issue; we stand with the millions of women who are still being

subjected to this practice; and we will not stop fighting for their right to dignity and respect.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 106, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 106.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STRONGER CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2480) to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2480

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 “Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Repeal of findings.

Sec. 102. Repeal of Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Sec. 103. National clearinghouse for information relating to child abuse.

Sec. 104. Research and assistance activities.

Sec. 105. Grants to States, Indian Tribes or tribal organizations, and public or private agencies and organizations.

Sec. 106. Grants to States for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment programs.

Sec. 107. Miscellaneous requirements.

Sec. 108. Reports.

Sec. 109. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 110. Monitoring and oversight.

Sec. 111. Electronic interstate data exchange system.

Sec. 112. Technical and conforming amendments.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY-BASED GRANTS FOR THE PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Sec. 201. Purpose and authority.

Sec. 202. Eligibility.

Sec. 203. Amount of grant.

Sec. 204. Application.

Sec. 205. Local program requirements.

Sec. 206. Performance measures.

Sec. 207. National network for community-based family resource programs.

Sec. 208. Definitions.

Sec. 209. Rule of construction.

Sec. 210. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 211. Study and report.

TITLE III—ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 301. Purpose.

Sec. 302. Report and guidance on unregulated custody transfers.

Sec. 303. Information and services.

Sec. 304. Study and report on successful adoptions.

Sec. 305. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Sec. 401. Technical and conforming amendments to other laws.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROGRAM

SEC. 101. REPEAL OF FINDINGS.

Section 2 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note) is repealed.

SEC. 102. REPEAL OF ADVISORY BOARD ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

Section 102 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5102) is repealed.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR INFORMATION RELATING TO CHILD ABUSE.

Section 103 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5104) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “early learning programs and” after “including”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(C)—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iv), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) the number of child fatalities and near fatalities due to maltreatment, as reported by States in accordance with the uniform standards established pursuant to subsection (d), and any other relevant information related to such fatalities;”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) UNIFORM STANDARDS FOR TRACKING AND REPORTING OF CHILD FATALITIES RESULTING FROM MALTREATMENT.—

“(1) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Secretary shall develop and issue final regulations establishing uniform standards for the tracking and reporting of child fatalities and near-fatalities resulting from maltreatment. As a condition on eligibility for receipt of funds under section 106, the standards established under this paragraph shall be used by States for the tracking and reporting of such fatalities under subsection (d) of such section.

“(2) MAINTENANCE OF STATE LAW.—Notwithstanding the uniform standards developed under paragraph (1), a State that defines or describes such fatalities for any purpose other than tracking and reporting under this subsection may continue to use that definition or description for such purpose.

“(3) NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING.—In developing regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit such regulations to a negotiated rulemaking process, which shall include the participants described in paragraph (4).

“(4) PARTICIPANTS DESCRIBED.—The participants described in this paragraph are—

“(A) State and county officials responsible for administering the State plans under this Act and parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 670 et seq.);

“(B) child welfare professionals with field experience;

“(C) child welfare researchers;

“(D) domestic violence researchers;

“(E) domestic violence professionals;

“(F) child development professionals;

“(G) mental health professionals;

“(H) pediatric emergency medicine physicians;

“(I) child abuse pediatricians, as certified by the American Board of Pediatrics, who specialize in treating victims of child abuse;

“(J) forensic pathologists;

“(K) public health administrators;

“(L) public health researchers;

“(M) law enforcement;

“(N) family court judges;

“(O) prosecutors;

“(P) medical examiners and coroners;

“(Q) a representative from the National Center for Fatality Review and Prevention; and

“(R) such other individuals and entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.”.

SEC. 104. RESEARCH AND ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.

Section 104 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5105) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) TOPICS.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with other Federal agencies and recognized experts in the field, carry out a continuing interdisciplinary program of research, including longitudinal research, that is designed to provide information needed to improve primary prevention of child abuse and neglect, better protect children from child abuse or neglect, and improve the well-being of victims of child abuse or neglect, with at least a portion of such research being field initiated. Such research program may focus on—

“(A) disseminating evidence-based treatment directed to individuals and families experiencing trauma due to child abuse and neglect, including efforts to improve the scalability of the treatments and programs being researched;

“(B) developing a set of evidence-based approaches to support child and family well-being and developing ways to identify, relieve, and mitigate stressors affecting families in rural, urban, and suburban communities;

“(C) establishing methods to promote racial equity in the child welfare system, including a focus on how neglect is defined, how services are provided, and the unique impact on Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian communities;

“(D) improving service delivery or outcomes for child welfare service agencies engaged with families experiencing domestic violence, substance use disorder, or other complex needs;

“(E) the extent to which the number of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and false reported cases of child abuse or neglect have contributed to the inability of a State to respond effectively to serious cases of child abuse or neglect;

“(F) the extent to which the lack of adequate resources and the lack of adequate professional development of individuals required by law to report suspected cases of child abuse and neglect have contributed to the inability of a State to respond effectively to serious cases of child abuse and neglect;

“(G) the extent to which unsubstantiated reports return as more serious cases of child abuse or neglect;

“(H) the incidence and outcomes of child abuse and neglect allegations reported within the context of divorce, custody, or other

family court proceedings, and the interaction between family courts and the child protective services system;

“(I) the information on the national incidence of child abuse and neglect specified in clauses (i) through (xi) of subparagraph (J); and

“(J) the national incidence of child abuse and neglect, including—

“(i) the extent to which incidents of child abuse and neglect are increasing or decreasing in number and severity;

“(ii) the incidence of substantiated and unsubstantiated reported child abuse and neglect cases;

“(iii) the number of substantiated cases that result in a judicial finding of child abuse or neglect or related criminal court convictions;

“(iv) the extent to which the number of unsubstantiated, unfounded and false reported cases of child abuse or neglect have contributed to the inability of a State to respond effectively to serious cases of child abuse or neglect;

“(v) the extent to which the lack of adequate resources and the lack of adequate education of individuals required by law to report suspected cases of child abuse and neglect have contributed to the inability of a State to respond effectively to serious cases of child abuse and neglect;

“(vi) the number of unsubstantiated, false, or unfounded reports that have resulted in a child being placed in substitute care, and the duration of such placement;

“(vii) the extent to which unsubstantiated reports return as more serious cases of child abuse or neglect;

“(viii) the incidence and prevalence of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse and physical and emotional neglect in substitute care;

“(ix) the incidence and prevalence of child maltreatment by a wide array of demographic characteristics such as age, sex, race, family structure, household relationship (including the living arrangement of the resident parent and family size), school enrollment and education attainment, disability, grandparents as caregivers, labor force status, work status in previous year, and income in previous year;

“(x) the extent to which reports of suspected or known instances of child abuse or neglect involving a potential combination of jurisdictions, such as intrastate, interstate, Federal-State, and State-Tribal, are being screened out solely on the basis of the cross-jurisdictional complications; and

“(xi) the incidence and outcomes of child abuse and neglect allegations reported within the context of divorce, custody, or other family court proceedings, and the interaction between family courts and the child protective services system.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “paragraph (1)(O)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(J)”;

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate a report that contains the results of the research conducted under paragraph (2).

“(B) NATIONAL INCIDENCE.—The Secretary shall ensure that research conducted, and data collected, under paragraph (1)(J) are reported in a way that will allow longitudinal comparisons as well as comparisons to the

national incidence studies conducted under this title.”; and

(D) by striking the second paragraph (4); (2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) AREAS OF EMPHASIS.—Such technical assistance—

“(A) shall focus on—

“(i) implementing strategies that can leverage existing community-based and State funded resources to prevent child abuse and neglect and providing education for individuals involved in prevention activities;

“(ii) reducing racial bias in child welfare systems, including how such systems interact with health, law enforcement, and education systems;

“(iii) promoting best practices for families experiencing domestic violence, substance use disorder, or other complex needs; and

“(iv) providing professional development and other technical assistance to child welfare agencies to improve the understanding of and to help address the effects of trauma and adverse childhood experiences in parents and children in contact with the child welfare system; and

“(B) may include the identification of—

“(i) various methods and procedures for the investigation, assessment, and prosecution of child physical and sexual abuse cases;

“(ii) ways to mitigate psychological trauma to the child victim;

“(iii) effective programs carried out by the States under titles I and II; and

“(iv) effective approaches being utilized to link child protective service agencies with health care, mental health care, and developmental services and early intervention to improve forensic diagnosis and health evaluations, and barriers and shortages to such linkages.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (3); and

(4) by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 105. GRANTS TO STATES, INDIAN TRIBES OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND PUBLIC OR PRIVATE AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 105 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (11);

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) through (6) and inserting the following:

“(1) PREVENTION SERVICES.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to establish or expand prevention services that reduce incidences of child maltreatment and strengthen families.

“(2) TRAUMATIC STRESS.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to address instances of traumatic stress in families due to child abuse and neglect, especially for families with complex needs or families that exhibit high levels of adverse childhood experiences.

“(3) PROMOTING A HIGH-QUALITY WORKFORCE.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out programs or strategies that promote a high-quality workforce in the child welfare system through—

“(A) improvements to recruitment, support, or retention efforts; or

“(B) education for professionals and paraprofessionals in the prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

“(4) IMPROVING COORDINATION.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out activities to improve intrastate coordination within the child welfare system. Such activities may include—

“(A) aligning information technology systems;

“(B) improving information sharing regarding child and family referrals; or

“(C) creating collaborative voluntary partnerships among public and private agencies, the State’s child protective services, local social service agencies, community-based family support programs, State and local legal agencies, developmental disability agencies, substance use disorder treatment providers, health care providers and agencies, domestic violence prevention programs, mental health services, schools and early learning providers, religious entities, and other community-based programs.

“(5) PRIMARY PREVENTION.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out or expand primary prevention programs or strategies that address family or community protective factors.

“(6) NEGLECT DUE TO ECONOMIC INSECURITY.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out programs or strategies that reduce findings of child neglect due in full or in part to family economic insecurity.

“(7) EDUCATION OF MANDATORY REPORTERS.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities for projects that involve research-based strategies for innovative education of mandated child abuse and neglect reporters, and for victims to understand mandatory reporting.

“(8) SENTINEL INJURIES.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to identify and test effective practices to improve early detection and management of injuries indicative of potential abuse in infants to prevent future cases of child abuse and related fatalities.

“(9) INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out innovative programs or strategies to coordinate the delivery of services to help reduce child abuse and neglect via partnerships among health, mental health, education (including early learning and care programs as appropriate), and child welfare agencies and providers.

“(10) REDUCING CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT DUE TO THE SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER OF A PARENT OR CAREGIVER.—The Secretary may award grants under this subsection to entities to carry out activities to reduce child abuse and neglect due to the substance use disorder of a parent or caregiver.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE HOTLINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award a grant under this subsection to a nonprofit entity to provide for the ongoing operation of a 24-hour, national, toll-free telephone hotline to provide information and assistance to youth victims of child abuse or neglect, parents, caregivers, mandated reporters, and other concerned community members, including through alternative modalities for communications (such as texting or chat services) with such victims and other information seekers.

“(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants described in this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants with experience in operating a hotline that provides assistance to victims of child abuse, parents, caregivers, and mandated reporters.

“(C) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant described in this paragraph, a nonprofit entity shall submit an application to the Secretary that shall—

“(i) contain such assurances and information, be in such form, and be submitted in such manner, as the Secretary shall prescribe;

“(ii) include a complete description of the entity’s plan for the operation of a national

child abuse hotline, including descriptions of—

“(I) the professional development program for hotline personnel, including technology professional development to ensure that all persons affiliated with the hotline are able to effectively operate any technological systems used by the hotline;

“(II) the qualifications for hotline personnel;

“(III) the methods for the creation, maintenance, and updating of a comprehensive list of prevention and treatment service providers;

“(IV) a plan for publicizing the availability of the hotline throughout the United States;

“(V) a plan for providing service to non-English speaking callers, including service through hotline personnel who have non-English language capability;

“(VI) a plan for facilitating access to the hotline and alternative modality services by persons with hearing impairments and disabilities;

“(VII) a plan for providing crisis counseling, general assistance, and referrals to youth victims of child abuse; and

“(VIII) a plan to offer alternative services to calling, such as texting or live chat;

“(iii) demonstrate that the entity has the capacity and the expertise to maintain a child abuse hotline and a comprehensive list of service providers;

“(iv) demonstrate the ability to provide information and referrals for contacts, directly connect contacts to service providers, and employ crisis interventions;

“(v) demonstrate that the entity has a commitment to providing services to individuals in need; and

“(vi) demonstrate that the entity complies with State privacy laws and has established quality assurance practices.”; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

“(b) GOALS AND PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary shall ensure that each entity receiving a grant under this section—

“(1) establishes quantifiable goals for the outcome of the project funded with the grant; and

“(2) adequately measures the performance of the project relative to such goals.

“(c) PERFORMANCE REPORT REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each entity that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a performance report that includes—

“(A) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the project funded with the grant relative to the goals established for such project under subsection (b)(1); and

“(B) data supporting such evaluation.

“(2) SUBMISSION.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(d) CONTINUING GRANTS.—The Secretary may only award a continuing grant to an entity under this section if such entity submits a performance report required under subsection (c) that demonstrates effectiveness of the project funded.”.

SEC. 106. GRANTS TO STATES FOR CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION GRANTS.—Subsection (a) of section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make grants to the States, from allotments under subsection (f) for each State that applies for a grant under this section, for purposes of assisting the States in improving and imple-

menting a child protective services system that is family-centered, integrates community services, and is capable of providing rapid response to high-risk cases, by carrying out the following:

“(1) Conducting the intake, assessment, screening, and investigation of reports of child abuse or neglect.

“(2) Ensuring that reports concerning a child’s living arrangements or subsistence needs are addressed through services or benefits and that no child is separated from such child’s parent for reasons of poverty.

“(3) Creating and improving the use of multidisciplinary teams and interagency, intra-agency, interstate, and intrastate protocols to enhance fair investigations; and improving legal preparation and representation.

“(4) Complying with the assurances in section 106(b)(2).

“(5) Establishing State and local networks of child and family service providers that support child and family well-being, which shall—

“(A) include child protective services, as well as agencies and service providers, that address family-strengthening, parenting skills, child development, early childhood care and learning, child advocacy, public health, mental health, substance use disorder treatment, domestic violence, developmental disabilities, housing, juvenile justice, elementary and secondary education, and child placement; and

“(B) address instances of child abuse and neglect by incorporating evaluations that assess the development of a child, including language and communication, cognitive, physical, and social and emotional development, the need for mental health services, including trauma-related services, trauma-informed care, and parental needs.

“(6) Ensuring child protective services is addressing the safety of children and responding to parent and family needs, which shall include—

“(A) family-oriented efforts that emphasize case assessment and follow up casework focused on child safety and child and parent well-being, which may include—

“(i) ensuring parents and children undergo physical and mental health assessments, as appropriate, and ongoing developmental monitoring;

“(ii) multidisciplinary approaches to assessing family needs and connecting the family with services, including prevention services under section 471 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671);

“(iii) organizing a treatment team with the goal of preventing child abuse and neglect, and improving parent and child well-being;

“(iv) case monitoring that supports child well-being; and

“(v) differential response efforts; and

“(B) establishing and maintaining a rapid response system that responds promptly to all reports of child abuse or neglect, with special attention to cases involving children under 3 years of age.

“(7) Educating caseworkers, community service providers, attorneys, health care professionals, parents, and others engaged in the prevention, intervention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect, which shall include education on—

“(A) practices that help ensure child safety and well-being;

“(B) approaches to family-oriented prevention, intervention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect;

“(C) early childhood, child, and adolescent development, and the impact of adverse childhood experiences on such development;

“(D) the relationship between child abuse and domestic violence, and support for non-abusing parents;

“(E) strategies to work with families impacted by substance use disorder and mental health issues (and, when appropriate, be coordinated with prevention efforts funded under section 471 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671));

“(F) effective use of multiple services to address family and child needs, including needs resulting from trauma;

“(G) efforts to improve family and child well-being;

“(H) support for child welfare workers affected by secondary trauma; and

“(I) supporting families and caregivers to combat and prevent unsubstantiated, unfounded, or false reports, including through education on the rights of families and caregivers.

“(8) Creating or improving data systems that allow for—

“(A) the identification of cases requiring prompt responses;

“(B) real-time case monitoring that tracks assessments, service referrals, follow-up, case reviews, and progress toward parent and child goals; and

“(C) sharing basic identifying data with law enforcement, as necessary.

“(9) Improving the general child protective system by developing, improving, and implementing safety assessment tools, providing that such tools, protocols, and systems shall not authorize the separation of any child from the legal parent or guardian of such child solely on the basis of poverty, or without a judicial order, except in the case of imminent harm.”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STATE PLAN.—Paragraph (1) of section 106(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) STATE PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall submit to the Secretary a State plan that—

“(i) specifies how the grant will be used, and the State’s strategic plan, to treat child abuse and neglect and enhance community-based, prevention-centered approaches that attempt to prevent child abuse and neglect while strengthening and supporting families whenever possible; and

“(ii) meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(B) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—

“(i) COORDINATION.—Each State, to the maximum extent practicable, shall coordinate its State plan under this subsection with its State plan under part B of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) relating to child and family services and, in States electing to provide services under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) relating to foster care prevention services, its State plan under such part E.

“(ii) CONSULTATION.—In developing a State plan under this subsection, a State shall consult with community-based prevention and service agencies, parents and families affected by child abuse or neglect in the State, law enforcement, family court judges, prosecutors who handle criminal child abuse cases, and medical professionals engaged in the treatment of child abuse and neglect.

“(C) DURATION AND SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Each State plan shall—

“(i) be submitted not less than every 5 years; and

“(ii) if necessary, revised by the State to inform the Secretary of any substantive changes, including—

“(I) any changes to State law or regulations, relating to the prevention of child

abuse and neglect that may affect the eligibility of the State under this section; or

“(II) any changes in the State’s activities, strategies, or programs under this section.”.

(2) CONTENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 106(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) CONTENTS.—A State plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain a description of the activities that the State will carry out using amounts received under the grant to achieve the objectives of this title, including—

“(A) an assurance in the form of a certification by the Governor of the State that the State has in effect and is enforcing a State law, or has in effect and is operating a statewide program, relating to child abuse and neglect that includes—

“(i) provisions or procedures for an individual to report known and suspected instances of child abuse and neglect, including a State law for mandatory reporting by individuals required to report such instances;

“(ii) procedures for the immediate screening, risk and safety assessment, and prompt investigation of such reports of alleged abuse and neglect in order to ensure the well-being and safety of children;

“(iii) procedures for immediate steps to be taken to ensure and protect the safety of a victim of child abuse or neglect and of any other child under the same care who may also be in danger of child abuse or neglect and ensuring their placement in a safe environment;

“(iv) methods to preserve the confidentiality of all records in order to protect the rights of the child and of the child’s parents or guardians, including requirements ensuring that reports and records made and maintained pursuant to the purposes of this Act shall only be made available to—

“(I) individuals who are the subject of the report;

“(II) Federal, State, or local government entities, or any agent of such entities, as described in clause (xi) of this subparagraph;

“(III) child abuse citizen review panels;

“(IV) child fatality review panels;

“(V) a grand jury or court, upon a finding that information in the record is necessary for the determination of an issue before the court or grand jury; and

“(VI) other entities or classes of individuals statutorily authorized by the State to receive such information pursuant to a legitimate State purpose;

“(v) provisions and procedures requiring that in every case involving a victim of child abuse or neglect which results in a judicial proceeding, a guardian ad litem, who has received education appropriate to the role, including education in early childhood, child, and adolescent development, and domestic violence, and who may be an attorney or a court appointed special advocate who has received education appropriate to that role (or both), shall be appointed to represent the child (who, for purposes of this section, shall have any age limit elected by the State pursuant to section 475(8)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675(8)(B)(iii)) in such proceedings—

“(I) to obtain first-hand, a clear understanding of the situation and needs of such child; and

“(II) to make recommendations to the court concerning the best interests of such child;

“(vi) the establishment of citizen review panels in accordance with subsection (c);

“(vii) provisions and procedures to require that a representative of the child protective services agency shall, at the initial time of contact with the individual subject to a child abuse or neglect investigation, advise the in-

dividual of the complaints or allegations made against the individual, in a manner that is consistent with laws protecting the rights of the informant;

“(viii) provisions, procedures, and mechanisms—

“(I) for the expedited termination of parental rights in the case of any infant determined to be abandoned under State law; and

“(II) by which individuals who disagree with an official finding of child abuse or neglect can appeal such finding;

“(ix) provisions addressing the professional development of representatives of the child protective services system regarding the legal duties of the representatives, which may consist of various methods of informing such representatives of such duties (including providing such education in different languages if necessary), in order to protect the legal rights and safety of children and their parents and caregivers from the initial time of contact during investigation through treatment;

“(x) provisions for immunity from civil or criminal liability under State and local laws and regulations for individuals making good faith reports of suspected or known instances of child abuse or neglect, or who otherwise provide information or assistance, including medical evaluations or consultations, in connection with a report, investigation, or legal intervention pursuant to a good faith report of child abuse or neglect;

“(xi) provisions to require the State to disclose confidential information to any Federal, State, or local government entity, or any agent of such entity, that has a need for such information in order to carry out its responsibilities under law to protect children from child abuse and neglect;

“(xii) provisions requiring, and procedures in place that facilitate the prompt expungement of any records that are accessible to the general public or are used for purposes of employment or other background checks in cases determined to be unsubstantiated or false, except that nothing in this section shall prevent State child protective services agencies from keeping information on unsubstantiated reports in their casework files to assist in future risk and safety assessment;

“(xiii) provisions and procedures for requiring criminal background record checks that meet the requirements of section 471(a)(20) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)) for prospective foster and adoptive parents and other adult relatives and non-relatives residing in the household;

“(xiv) provisions for systems of technology that support the State child protective services system and track reports of child abuse and neglect from intake through final disposition;

“(xv) provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(12) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102 (12)));

“(xvi) provisions, procedures, and mechanisms that assure that the State does not require reunification of a surviving child with a parent who has been found by a court of competent jurisdiction—

“(I) to have committed murder (which would have been an offense under section 1111(a) of title 18, United States Code, if the offense had occurred in the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States) of another child of such parent;

“(II) to have committed voluntary manslaughter (which would have been an offense under section 1112(a) of title 18, United States Code, if the offense had occurred in the special maritime or territorial jurisdic-

tion of the United States) of another child of such parent;

“(III) to have aided or abetted, attempted, conspired, or solicited to commit such murder or voluntary manslaughter;

“(IV) to have committed a felony assault that results in the serious bodily injury to the surviving child or another child of such parent;

“(V) to have committed sexual abuse against the surviving child or another child of such parent; or

“(VI) to be required to register with a sex offender registry under section 113(a) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16913(a)); and

“(xvii) an assurance that, upon the implementation by the State of the provisions, procedures, and mechanisms under clause (xvi), conviction of any one of the felonies listed in clause (xvi) constitute grounds under State law for the termination of parental rights of the convicted parent as to the surviving children (although case-by-case determinations of whether or not to seek termination of parental rights shall be within the sole discretion of the State);

“(B) an assurance that the State has in place procedures for responding to the reporting of medical neglect (including instances of withholding of medically indicated treatment from infants with disabilities who have life-threatening conditions), procedures or programs, or both (within the State child protective services system), to provide for—

“(i) coordination and consultation with individuals designated by and within appropriate health-care facilities;

“(ii) prompt notification by individuals designated by and within appropriate health-care facilities of cases of suspected medical neglect (including instances of withholding of medically indicated treatment from infants with disabilities who have life-threatening conditions); and

“(iii) authority, under State law, for the State child protective services system to pursue any legal remedies, including the authority to initiate legal proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction, as may be necessary to prevent the withholding of medically indicated treatment from infants with disabilities who have life-threatening conditions;

“(C) an assurance or certification that programs and education conducted under this title address the unique needs of unaccompanied homeless youth, including access to enrollment and support services and that such youth are eligible for under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 670 et seq.) and meet the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.);

“(D) a description of—

“(i) policies and procedures (including appropriate referrals to child welfare service systems and for other appropriate services (including home visiting services and mutual support and parent partner programs) determined by a family assessment) to address the needs of infants born with and identified as being affected by substance use or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure, or a Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder, including a requirement that health care providers involved in the delivery or care of such infants notify the child protective welfare service system of the occurrence of such condition in such infants, except that—

“(I) child protective services shall undertake an investigation only when the findings of a family assessment warrant such investigation; and

“(II) such notification shall not be construed to—

“(aa) establish a definition under Federal law of what constitutes child abuse or neglect; or

“(bb) require prosecution for any illegal action;

“(ii) the development of a multi-disciplinary plan of safe care for the infant born and identified as being affected by substance use or withdrawal symptoms or a Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder to ensure the safety and well-being of such infant following release from the care of health care providers, including through—

“(I) using a risk-based approach to develop each plan of safe care;

“(II) addressing, through coordinated service delivery, the health and substance use disorder treatment needs of the infant and affected family or caregiver as determined by a family assessment; and

“(III) the development and implementation by the State of monitoring systems regarding the implementation of such plans of safe care to determine whether and in what manner local entities are providing, in accordance with State requirements, referrals to and delivery of appropriate services for the infant and affected family or caregiver;

“(iii) policies and procedures to make available to the public on the State website the data, findings, and information about all cases of child abuse or neglect resulting in a child fatality or near fatality, including a description of—

“(I) how the State will not create an exception to such public disclosure, except in a case in which—

“(aa) the State would like to delay public release of case-specific findings or information (including any previous reports of domestic violence and subsequent actions taken to assess and address such reports) while a criminal investigation or prosecution of such a fatality or near fatality is pending;

“(bb) the State is protecting the identity of a reporter of child abuse or neglect; or

“(cc) the State is withholding identifying information of members of the victim’s family who are not perpetrators of the fatality or near fatality; and

“(II) how the State will ensure that in providing the public disclosure required under this clause, the State will include—

“(aa) the cause and circumstances of the fatality or near fatality;

“(bb) the age and gender of the child; and

“(cc) any previous reports of child abuse or neglect investigations that are relevant to the child abuse or neglect that led to the fatality or near fatality;

“(iv) how the State will use data collected on child abuse or neglect to prevent child fatalities and near fatalities;

“(v) how the State will implement efforts to prevent child fatalities and near fatalities;

“(vi) the cooperation of State law enforcement officials, court of competent jurisdiction, and appropriate State agencies providing human services in the investigation, assessment, prosecution, and treatment of child abuse and neglect;

“(vii) the steps the State will take to improve the professional development, retention, and supervision of caseworkers and how the State will measure the effectiveness of such efforts;

“(viii) the State’s plan to ensure each child under the age of 3 who is involved in a substantiated case of child abuse or neglect will be referred to the State’s child find system under section 635(a)(5) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1435(a)(5)) in order to determine if the child is an infant or toddler with a disability (as defined in section 632(5) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1432(5)));

“(ix) the State’s plan to improve, as part of a comprehensive State strategy led by law enforcement, professional development for child protective services workers and their appropriate role in identifying, assessing, and providing comprehensive services for children who are sex trafficking victims, in coordination with law enforcement, juvenile justice agencies, runaway and homeless youth shelters, and health, mental health, and other social service agencies and providers;

“(x) the services to be provided under the grant to individuals, families, or communities, either directly or through referrals, aimed at preventing the occurrence of child abuse and neglect;

“(xi) the State’s efforts to ensure professionals who are required to report suspected cases of child abuse and neglect are aware of their responsibilities under subparagraph (A)(i) and receive professional development relating to performing such responsibilities that is specific to their profession and workplace;

“(xii) policies and procedures encouraging the appropriate involvement of families in decisionmaking pertaining to children who experienced child abuse or neglect;

“(xiii) the State’s efforts to improve appropriate collaboration among child protective services agencies, domestic violence services agencies, substance use disorder treatment agencies, and other agencies in investigations, interventions, and the delivery of services and treatment provided to children and families affected by child abuse or neglect, including children exposed to domestic violence, where appropriate;

“(xiv) policies and procedures regarding the use of differential response, as applicable, to improve outcomes for children; and

“(xv) the State’s efforts to reduce racial bias in its child protective services system.”.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 106(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “LIMITATION” and inserting “LIMITATIONS”;

(B) by striking “With regard to clauses (vi) and (vii) of paragraph (2)(B),” and inserting the following:

“(A) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.—With regard to subparagraphs (A)(iv) and (D)(iii) of paragraph (2).”;

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to limit the State’s flexibility to determine State policies relating to public access to court proceedings to determine child abuse and neglect, except that such policies shall, at a minimum, ensure the safety and well-being of the child, parents, and families.”.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (4) of section 106(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DEFINITIONS” and inserting “DEFINITION”;

(B) by striking “this subsection” and all that follows through “means an act” and inserting the following: “this subsection, the term ‘near fatality’ means an act”;

(C) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) CITIZEN REVIEW PANELS.—Section 106(c) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “EXCEPTIONS.” and all that follows through “A State may” and inserting “EXCEPTION.—A State may”;

(2) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “and where appropriate, specific cases,”; and

(B) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “foster care and adoption programs” and inserting “foster care, prevention, and permanency programs”;

(3) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (6) to read as follows: “Each panel established under paragraph (1) shall prepare and make available to the State and the public, on an annual basis, a report containing a summary of the activities of the panel, the criteria used for determining which activities the panel engaged in, and recommendations or observations to improve the child protective services system at the State and local levels, and the data upon which these recommendations or observations are based.”.

(d) ANNUAL STATE DATA REPORTS.—Section 106(d) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(d)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (13) to read as follows:

“(13) The annual report containing the summary of the activities and recommendations of the citizen review panels of the State required by subsection (c)(6), and the actions taken by the State as a result of such recommendations.”;

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(D)(i)”;

(3) in paragraph (16), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxi)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(D)(viii)”;

(4) in paragraph (17), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxiv)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(A)(xv)”;

(5) in paragraph (18)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(D)(i)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The number of child fatalities and near fatalities from maltreatment and related information in accordance with the uniform standards established under section 103(d).”.

(e) ALLOTMENTS.—Section 106(f) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) LIMITATION.—For any fiscal year for which the amount allotted to a State or territory under this subsection exceeds the amount allotted to the State or territory under such subsection for fiscal year 2019, the State or territory may use not more than 2 percent of such excess amount for administrative expenses.”.

SEC. 107. MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS.

Section 108 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting “Indian tribes, and tribal organizations,” after “States,”;

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

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PROTECTING AGAINST SYSTEMIC CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE.—

“(1) REPORTING AND TASK FORCE.—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention

and Treatment Act, each State task force established under section 107(c) and expanded as described in paragraph (2) shall study and make recommendations on the following, with a focus on preventing systemic child sexual abuse:

“(A) How to detect systemic child sexual abuse that occurs in an organization.

“(B) How to prevent child sexual abuse and systemic child sexual abuse from occurring in organizations, which shall include recommendations to improve—

“(i) practices and policies for the education of parents, caregivers, and victims, and age appropriate education of children, about risk factors or signs of potential child sexual abuse; and

“(ii) the efficacy of applicable State laws and the role such laws play in deterring or preventing incidences of child sexual abuse.

“(C) The feasibility of making available the disposition of a perpetrator within an organization to—

“(i) the child alleging sexual abuse or the child’s family; or

“(ii) an adult who was a child at the time of the sexual abuse claim in question or the adult’s family.

“(2) TASK FORCE COMPOSITION.—For purposes of this subsection, a State task force shall include—

“(A) the members of the State task force described in section 107(c) for the State; and

“(B) the following:

“(i) Family court judges.

“(ii) Individuals from religious organizations.

“(iii) Individuals from youth-serving organizations, including youth athletics organizations.

“(3) REPORTING ON RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after a State task force makes recommendations under paragraph (1), the State maintaining such State task force shall—

“(A) make public the recommendations of such report;

“(B) report to the Secretary on the status of adopting such recommendations; and

“(C) in a case in which the State declines to adopt a particular recommendation, make public the explanation for such declination.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘child sexual abuse’ and ‘sexual abuse’ shall not be limited to an act or a failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker;

“(B) the term ‘organization’ means any entity that serves children; and

“(C) the term ‘systemic child sexual abuse’ means—

“(i) a pattern of informal or formal policy or de facto policy to not follow State and local requirements to report instances of child sexual abuse in violation of State and local mandatory reporting laws or policy; or

“(ii) a pattern of assisting individual perpetrators in maintaining their careers despite substantiated evidence of child sexual abuse.”.

SEC. 108. REPORTS.

(a) SCALING EVIDENCE-BASED TREATMENT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.—Section 110 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106f) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 110. STUDY AND REPORT RELATING TO SCALING EVIDENCE-BASED TREATMENT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT; STUDY AND REPORT ON MARITAL AGE OF CONSENT; STUDY AND REPORT ON STATE MANDATORY REPORTING LAWS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study that examines challenges to, and best practices for, the scalability of treatments that reduce the trauma resulting

from child abuse and neglect and reduce the risk of revictimization, such as those allowable under sections 105 and 106.

“(b) CONTENT OF STUDY.—The study described in subsection (a) shall be completed in a manner that considers the variability among treatment programs and among populations vulnerable to child abuse and neglect. The study shall include, at minimum:

“(1) A detailed synthesis of the existing research literature examining barriers and challenges to, and best practices for the scalability of child welfare programs and services as well as programs and services for vulnerable children and families in related fields, including healthcare and education.

“(2) Data describing state and local providers’ experiences with scaling treatments that reduce the trauma resulting from child abuse and neglect and reduce the risk of revictimization.

“(3) Consultation with experts in child welfare, healthcare, and education.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations for best practices for scaling treatments that reduce the trauma resulting from child abuse and neglect and reduce the risk of revictimization.

“(d) STUDY AND REPORT ON MARITAL AGE OF CONSENT.—

“(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall study, with respect to each State—

“(A) the State law regarding the minimum marriage age; and

“(B) the prevalence of marriage involving a child who is under the age of such minimum marriage age.

“(2) FACTORS.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include an examination of—

“(A) the extent to which any statutory exceptions to the minimum marriage age in such laws contribute to the prevalence of marriage involving a child described in paragraph (1)(B);

“(B) whether such exceptions allow such a child to be married without the consent of such child; and

“(C) the impact of such exceptions on the safety of such children.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of the study required by this subsection, including any best practices.

“(e) STUDY AND REPORT ON STATE MANDATORY REPORTING LAWS.—

“(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall collect information on and otherwise study State laws for mandatory reporting of incidents of child abuse or neglect. Such study shall examine trends in referrals and investigations of child abuse and neglect due to differences in such State laws with respect to the inclusion, as mandatory reporters, of the following individuals:

“(A) Individuals licensed or certified to practice in any health-related field licensed by the State, employees of health care facilities or providers licensed by the State, who are engaged in the admission, examination, care or treatment of individuals, including mental health and emergency medical service providers.

“(B) Individuals employed by a school who have direct contact with children, including teachers, administrators, and independent contractors.

“(C) Peace officers and law enforcement personnel.

“(D) Clergy, including Christian Science practitioners, except where prohibited on account of clergy-penitent privilege.

“(E) Day care and child care operators and employees.

“(F) Employees of social services agencies who have direct contact with children in the course of employment.

“(G) Foster parents.

“(H) Court appointed special advocates (employees and volunteers).

“(I) Camp and after-school employees.

“(J) An individual, paid or unpaid, who, on the basis of the individual’s role as an integral part of a regularly scheduled program, activity, or service, accepts responsibility for a child.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of the study required by this subsection, including any best practices related to the inclusion, as mandatory reporters, of individuals described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) REPORT ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT IN INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Indian tribes from each of the 12 regions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall study child abuse and neglect in Indian Tribal communities for the purpose of identifying vital information and making recommendations concerning issues relating to child abuse and neglect in such communities, and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on such study, which shall include—

(A) the number of Indian tribes providing primary child abuse and neglect prevention activities;

(B) the number of Indian tribes providing secondary child abuse and neglect prevention activities;

(C) promising practices of Indian tribes with respect to child abuse and neglect prevention that are culturally-based or culturally-adapted;

(D) information and recommendations on how such culturally-based or culturally-adapted child abuse and neglect prevention activities could become evidence-based;

(E) the number of Indian tribes that have accessed Federal child abuse and neglect prevention programs;

(F) child abuse and neglect prevention activities that Indian tribes provide using State funds;

(G) child abuse and neglect prevention activities that Indian tribes provide using Tribal funds;

(H) Tribal access to State children’s trust fund resources, as described in section 202 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116a);

(I) how a children’s trust fund model could be used to support prevention efforts regarding child abuse and neglect of American Indian and Alaska Native children;

(J) Federal agency technical assistance efforts to address child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment of American Indian and Alaska Native children;

(K) Federal agency cross-system collaboration to address child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment of American Indian and Alaska Native children;

(L) Tribal access to child abuse and neglect prevention research and demonstration grants under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.); and

(M) an examination of child abuse and neglect data systems to identify what Tribal data is being submitted, barriers to submitting data, and recommendations on improving the collection of data from Indian Tribes.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “Alaska Native” has the meaning given the term in section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g); and

(B) the terms “child abuse and neglect” and “Indian tribe” have the meaning given the terms in section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 112(a) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106h(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “to carry out” through “fiscal year 2010” and inserting “to carry out this title \$270,000,000 for fiscal year 2020”; and

(B) by striking “2011 through 2015” and inserting “2021 through 2025”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make available 30 percent of such amounts, or \$100,000,000, whichever is less, to fund discretionary activities under this title.”

SEC. 110. MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT.

Section 114(1) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5108(1)) is amended—

(1) in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) include written guidance and technical assistance to support States, which shall include guidance on the requirements of this Act with respect to infants born with and identified as being affected by substance use or withdrawal symptoms, Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome, or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder, as described in clauses (i) and (ii) of section 106(b)(2)(D), including by—

“(i) enhancing States’ understanding of requirements and flexibilities under the law, including by clarifying key terms;

“(ii) addressing State-identified challenges with developing, implementing, and monitoring plans of safe care; and

“(iii) disseminating best practices on implementation of plans of safe care, on such topics as differential response, collaboration and coordination, and identification and delivery of services for different populations, while recognizing needs of different populations and varying community approaches across States; and

“(D) include the submission of a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains a description of the activities taken by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (C); and”.

SEC. 111. ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM.

Title I of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 115. ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM.

“(a) INTERSTATE DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consider the recommendations included in the reports required under paragraph (8)(A) and subsection (b)(2) in developing an electronic interstate data exchange system that allows State entities responsible under State law for maintaining child abuse and neglect registries to communicate information across State lines.

“(2) STANDARDS.—In developing the electronic interstate data exchange system under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) use interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

“(B) develop policies and governance standards that—

“(i) ensure consistency in types of information shared and not shared; and

“(ii) specify circumstances under which data should be shared through the interstate data exchange system; and

“(C) ensure that all standards and policies adhere to the privacy, security, and civil rights laws of each State and Federal law.

“(3) LIMITATION ON USE OF ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM.—The electronic interstate data exchange system may only be used for purposes relating to child safety.

“(4) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall begin implementation of a pilot program to generate recommendations for the full integration of the electronic interstate data exchange system. Such pilot program shall include not less than 10 States and not more than 15 States.

“(B) COMPLETION.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall complete the pilot program described in subparagraph (A).

“(5) INTEGRATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may assist States in the integration of this system into the infrastructure of each State using funds appropriated under this subsection.

“(6) PARTICIPATION.—As a condition on eligibility for receipt of funds under section 106, each State shall—

“(A) participate in the electronic interstate data exchange system to the fullest extent possible in accordance with State law (as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services) not later than December 31, 2027; and

“(B) prior to the participation described in subparagraph (A), provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services an assurance that the child abuse and neglect registry of such State provides procedural due process protections with respect to including individuals on such registry.

“(7) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not access or store data from the electronic interstate data exchange system, unless the State to which such data pertains voluntarily shares such data with the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(8) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to Congress—

“(A) not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this section, a report on

the recommendations from the pilot program described in paragraph (4); and

“(B) not later than January 31, 2025, a report on the progress made in implementing this subsection.

“(9) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the funds appropriated under section 112 for a fiscal year—

“(A) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, \$2,000,000 shall be reserved to carry out this section; and

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, \$1,000,000 shall be reserved to carry out this section.

“(b) WORKING GROUP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall convene a working group to study and make recommendations on the following:

“(A) The feasibility of making publicly available on the website of each State definitions and standards of substantiated child abuse and neglect for the State.

“(B) Whether background check requirements under this Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), and part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) are complementary or if there are discrepancies that need to be addressed.

“(C) How to improve communication between and across States, including through the use of technology and the use of the electronic interstate data exchange system established under subsection (a), to allow for more accurate and efficient exchange of child abuse and neglect records.

“(D) How to reduce barriers and establish best practices for the State to provide timely responses to requests from other States for information contained in the State’s child abuse and neglect registry through the electronic interstate data exchange system established under subsection (a).

“(E) How to ensure due process for any individual included in a State’s child abuse and neglect registry, including the following:

“(i) The level of evidence necessary for inclusion in the State’s child abuse and neglect registry.

“(ii) The process for notifying such individual of inclusion in the State’s child abuse and neglect registry and the implications of such inclusion.

“(iii) The process for providing such individual the opportunity to challenge such inclusion, and the procedures for resolving such challenge.

“(iv) The length of time an individual’s record is to remain in the State’s child abuse and neglect registry, and the process for removing such individual’s record.

“(v) The criteria for when such individual’s child abuse and neglect registry record may be—

“(I) made accessible to the general public;

“(II) made available for purposes of an employment check; and

“(III) be shared for the purposes of participation in the electronic interstate data exchange system described in subsection (a).

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the working group convened under paragraph (1) shall submit a report containing its recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

“(3) CONSTRUCTION.—There shall be no requirement for any State to adopt the recommendations of the working group, nor shall the Secretary of Health and Human

Services incentivize or coerce any State to adopt any such recommendation.”.

SEC. 112. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” each place it appears and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”;

(2) in section 103(c)(1)(F), by striking “abused and neglected children” and inserting “victims of child abuse or neglect”; and

(3) in section 107(f), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 10603a)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 20104)”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SECTION 103.**—Section 103(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5104(b)(5)) is amended by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)”.

(2) **SECTION 105.**—Section 105(a)(11) (42 U.S.C. 5106(a)(11)) as redesignated by section 105(1)(A) of this Act is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i)(II), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(ii) in clause (i)(IV), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)(II)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)(II)”;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 106(b)(2)(B)” and inserting “clauses (i) and (ii) of section 106(b)(2)(D)”;

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i)(I), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)(I)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)(I)”;

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(i)”;

(iii) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)(I)”;

(iv) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(i)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(A)(i)”;

(v) in clause (iii)(IV), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(vi) in clause (v), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(iii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(ii)”;

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking “section 106(b)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “section 106(b)(2)(D)(i)”;

(E) in subparagraph (G)(ii), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 106(b)(2)(B)” and inserting “clauses (i) and (ii) of section 106(b)(2)(D)”.

(3) **SECTION 114.**—Section 114(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 5108(1)(B)) is amended by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 106(b)(2)(B)” and inserting “clauses (i) and (ii) of section 106(b)(2)(D)”.

(4) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act is amended—

(A) by striking the items relating to sections 2 and 102;

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 114 the following:

“Sec. 115. Electronic interstate data exchange system.”; and

(C) by striking the item relating to section 110, and inserting the following:

“Sec. 110. Study and report relating to scaling evidence-based treatment of child abuse and neglect; study and report on marital age of consent; study and report on State mandatory reporting laws.”.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY-BASED GRANTS FOR THE PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

SEC. 201. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116) are amended to read as follows:

“(A) **PURPOSE.**—The purposes of this title are—

“(1) to establish and maintain support for community-based family strengthening services and statewide systems-building approaches to the extent practicable, to ensure the development, operation, expansion, coordination, and evaluation of quality services, initiatives, programs, and activities to prevent child abuse and neglect; and

“(2) to promote improved access for diverse populations with demonstrated need, including low-income families, racial and ethnic minorities, families with children or caregivers with disabilities, underserved communities, and rural communities, to family strengthening services in order to more effectively prevent child abuse and neglect.

“(b) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall make grants under this title on a formula basis to the entity designated by the State as the lead entity (referred to in this title as the ‘lead entity’) under section 202(1) for the following purposes:

“(1) Providing programs, activities, and initiatives to help families build protective factors linked to the prevention of child abuse and neglect, such as knowledge of parenting and child development, parental resilience, social connections, time-limited and need-based concrete support, and social and emotional development of children, that—

“(A) are accessible to diverse populations, effective, and culturally appropriate;

“(B) build upon existing strengths;

“(C) offer assistance to families;

“(D) provide early, comprehensive support for parents;

“(E) promote the development of healthy familial relationships and parenting skills, especially in young parents and parents with very young children;

“(F) increase family stability;

“(G) improve family access to formal and informal community-based resources, including health and mental health services, time-limited and need-based concrete supports, and services and supports to meet the needs of families with children or caregivers with disabilities; and

“(H) support the additional needs of families with children with disabilities, including through respite care.

“(2) Fostering the development of a continuum of preventive services to strengthen families through State- and community-based collaborations and both public and private partnerships.

“(3) Financing the start-up, maintenance, expansion, or redesign of core services described in section 205, where communities have identified gaps and decided to prioritize the establishment of such services, to the extent practicable given funding levels and community priorities.

“(4) Maximizing funding through leveraging Federal, State, local, public, and private funds to carry out the purposes of this title.

“(5) Developing or enhancing statewide and local networks to operate, expand, or enhance community-based family strengthening services, initiatives, and activities that promote child, parent, family, and community health and well-being and prevent child abuse and neglect.

“(6) Promoting the development of, and coordination with, existing community coalitions of networks of family strengthening

services that utilize culturally responsive providers in order to enhance child, family, and community well-being and prevent child abuse and neglect in all families.

“(7) Financing public information activities that focus on parent and child development and child abuse and neglect prevention.

“(8) To the extent practicable—

“(A) promoting the development and implementation of a statewide systems-building strategy to address the unmet needs identified in the inventory described in section 204(3), including the participation of public and private stakeholders, community-based organizations, legislators, parents and other relevant stakeholders, and State agencies, including the child welfare agency, the public health agency, housing agency, and the State education agency, to scale evidence-based, evidence-informed, and promising programs that expand access to family strengthening services and reduce the numbers of children entering the foster care system;

“(B) developing comprehensive outreach strategies to engage families with various risk factors, including families who have experienced trauma or domestic violence, parents with substance use disorder, and families with children or caregivers with disabilities; and

“(C) providing capacity-building supports to local programs to improve desired outcomes for children and families, such as—

“(i) technical assistance, including support for local programs to collect outcome data that helps improve service delivery;

“(ii) professional development; and

“(iii) peer support networks, including through developing a problem-solving forum.”.

SEC. 202. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 202 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) the Governor of the State has designated a lead entity to administer funds under this title for the purposes identified under the authority of this title, including to develop, implement, operate, enhance, or expand community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect;”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) the Governor of the State has given consideration to the capacity and expertise of all entities requesting to be designated under subparagraph (A);”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) has demonstrated ongoing meaningful partnerships with parents in the development, operation, and oversight of State- and community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect;”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families” and inserting “community-based family strengthening services designed”;

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) has the capacity to provide operational support (both financial and programmatic), professional development, technical assistance, and evaluation assistance, to community-based organizations;”;

(D) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) will integrate efforts with individuals and organizations experienced in working in

partnership with low-income families, racial and ethnic minorities, families with children or caregivers with disabilities, sexual and gender minority youth, victims of domestic violence, and with the child abuse and neglect prevention activities in the State, and demonstrate a financial commitment to those activities; and

“(E) will take into consideration access for diverse populations and unmet need when distributing funds to local programs under section 205.”

SEC. 203. AMOUNT OF GRANT.

Section 203 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) RESERVATION.—For the purpose of making allotments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations and migrant programs, the Secretary shall reserve 5 percent of the amount appropriated under section 210(a) for each fiscal year, except that, if making such reservation would cause the total amount allotted to States under this section for a fiscal year to be less than such total for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall reserve 1 percent of the amount appropriated under section 210(a) for the year for such purpose.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) LIMITATION.—For any fiscal year for which the amount allotted to a State under subsection (b) exceeds the amount allotted to the State under such subsection for fiscal year 2019, the State’s lead entity may use not more than 10 percent of such excess amount for administrative expenses.”

SEC. 204. APPLICATION.

Section 204 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116d) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “specified by the Secretary as essential to carrying out the provisions of section 202, including” and inserting “and assurances required in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 202 and types of information specified by the Secretary as essential in carrying out the provisions of section 201(b), including”;

(2) in paragraphs (1), (2), and (4), by striking “community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families” and inserting “community-based family strengthening services designed”;

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities” and inserting “community-based family strengthening services designed”;

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking “and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families to prevent child abuse and neglect;” and inserting “services and statewide strategies designed to strengthen and support families to promote child, family, and community well-being and prevent child abuse and neglect;”;

(5) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) a description of the State’s capacity and commitment to ensure the meaningful involvement of parents who are or have been consumers of preventative supports, including the involvement of parents of diverse populations, such as low-income families, families with children or caregivers with disabilities, racial and ethnic minorities, and members of other underrepresented or underserved groups, family advocates, and adult victims of child abuse or neglect who can provide leadership in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the programs and policy decisions of the applicant agency in accomplishing the desired outcomes for such efforts;”;

(6) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (15);

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (12), respectively;

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) a description of the process and criteria the lead entity will use to identify and select communities in which to build a continuum of family strengthening services, including an assurance that the process will ensure access for all families, including families in communities with high rates of child abuse and neglect relative to other communities in the State;”;

(9) by striking paragraph (9), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(9) a description of outreach activities that the lead entity and local grantees will undertake to maximize the participation of low-income families, racial and ethnic minorities, families with children or caregivers with disabilities, sexual and gender minority youth, victims of domestic violence, homeless families and those at risk of homelessness, and members of other underserved or underrepresented groups;”

(10) by striking paragraph (10), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(10) a plan for providing operational support, professional development, and technical assistance to grantees, other State and local programs and providers, families, and other entities involved in strengthening families and preventing child abuse and neglect;”;

(11) in paragraph (11), as so redesignated, by striking “and its members (where appropriate)” and inserting “of community-based family strengthening services and statewide initiatives”; and

(12) by striking paragraph (12), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(12) a description of the actions that the applicant entity will take to inform systemic changes in State policies, practices, procedures, and regulations to improve the delivery of community-based family strengthening services designed to promote child, family, and community well-being, and to prevent child abuse and neglect;

“(13) a description of how the lead entity will incorporate research evidence in its process for selecting community-based family strengthening services;

“(14) an assurance that, in issuing regulations to improve the delivery of community-based family strengthening services designed to promote child, family, and community well-being, and to prevent child abuse and neglect, the State will—

“(A) take into account how such regulations will impact activities funded under this Act; and

“(B) where appropriate, attempt to avoid duplication of efforts, minimize costs of compliance with such regulations, and maximize local flexibility with respect to such regulations; and”

SEC. 205. LOCAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 205 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116e) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 205. LOCAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Grants from the lead entity made under this title shall be used to develop, implement, operate, expand, and enhance community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect that—

“(1) assess community assets and needs and develop a strategy to create a comprehensive continuum of effective services that strengthen and support families to prevent child abuse and neglect, through a planning process involving parents, local and

public agencies, local nonprofit organizations and service providers, and private sector representatives in meaningful ways;

“(2) develop or enhance existing place-based family strengthening services, other parenting support services, and connections and coordination among key family services in the community by reaching spaces familiar to such families; and

“(3) help families build protective factors that support child and family well-being and help prevent child abuse and neglect, including knowledge of parenting and child development, parental resilience, social connections, time-limited and need-based concrete support, and social and emotional development of children.

“(b) LOCAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants, the lead entity shall consider, consistent with the needs of the State and community, how the grantee—

“(1) demonstrates the ability to form collaborations across a range of services or initiatives and the commitment to engage in long-term planning and strategic development for community-based family strengthening services as well as provide on-going problem solving support;

“(2) involves parents, including parents of children with disabilities, diverse racial and ethnic groups, and members of other underrepresented or underserved populations, in the development, implementation, oversight, and evaluation of services;

“(3) addresses the need for place-based services and the need to reach families in hard-to-reach areas through approaches that provide core family strengthening services;

“(4) promotes improved access to family strengthening services for diverse populations and ensures that the services address identified needs of all families; and

“(5) demonstrates an understanding of the sources of child and family trauma and the strategies that mitigate the impact of and prevent adverse childhood experiences.

“(c) LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.—Grant funds from the lead entity shall be used for community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect, which may include the following:

“(1) Developing a strategy based on supporting a comprehensive continuum of preventive, family-centered services that strengthen and support families to prevent child abuse and neglect, especially to young parents, to parents with young children, and to parents who are adult victims of domestic violence or child abuse or neglect, through public-private partnerships.

“(2) Addressing the needs of families in hard-to-reach areas by creating access to place-based family strengthening services.

“(3) Performing an assessment of community needs, including by partnering, at the option of the grantee, with an organization that already has performed a needs assessment (such as a Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program under section 511 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711) or a Head Start program under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

“(4) Supporting outreach for services, including by coordinating with existing family strengthening services such as home visiting and other early intervention programs.

“(5) Providing, promoting the development or enhancement of, or connecting families to, core services that include—

“(A) parenting support and parent education programs, including services that help parents and other caregivers support children’s development;

“(B) parent leadership skills development programs that support parents’ personal growth as leaders in their families and communities;

“(C) mutual support groups for parents, children, and parent partners;

“(D) respite and crisis care; and

“(E) referrals to optional community and social services, including—

“(i) domestic violence services;

“(ii) screening and referrals to early intervention;

“(iii) voluntary home visiting programs;

“(iv) health and mental health services, including referrals for information on the State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.);

“(v) early care and learning programs including child care and Head Start programs and Early Head Start programs under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(vi) nutrition programs, including the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) and the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

“(vii) education and workforce development programs, including adult literacy, child development, wellness, and family socioeconomic mobility programs; and

“(viii) services and supports to meet the needs of families with children or caregivers with disabilities, such as early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, as early intervention services are defined in section 632 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1432).

“(6) Providing leadership in mobilizing local public and private resources to support the provision of community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.

“(7) Developing and maintaining meaningful partnerships with parents relating to the development, operation, evaluation, and oversight of the programs and services.

“(8) Coordinating with other community-based family strengthening services designed to prevent child abuse and neglect in the development, operation, and expansion of networks where appropriate.

“(d) PRIORITY.—When awarding grants, a lead entity shall give priority to effective community-based efforts that serve low-income communities and are focused on comprehensive approaches to serving young parents or parents with young children.”

SEC. 206. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

Section 206 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116f) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1), (5), (6), and (8), by striking “community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families” and inserting “community-based family strengthening services designed”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “meets” and inserting “meet”;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “including core and optional services as described in section 202”;

(4) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) shall demonstrate how they have addressed unmet needs identified by the inventory required under section 204.”

(5) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) shall describe the number of families served, including families with children or caregivers with disabilities, and the involvement of a diverse representation of families in the design, operation, and evaluation of both community-based family strengthening services and networks of such services.”;

(6) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) shall describe—

“(A) the number of programs funded disaggregated by urban, suburban, and rural community type;

“(B) the number of children and families served under each such program disaggregated by urban, suburban, and rural community type; and

“(C) the number of programs that partner with outside entities and the services such outside entities provide.”;

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) by striking “leadership of” and insert “partnership with”;

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

(8) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) shall describe the extent to which there is evidence to support the effectiveness of activities conducted under this title for the program’s intended purpose, or, in instances where such evidence is not available, shall describe barriers and challenges to developing evidence of effectiveness.”

SEC. 207. NATIONAL NETWORK FOR COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.

Section 207 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116g) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and inserting “not more than 5 percent”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families” and inserting “community-based family strengthening services designed”.

SEC. 208. DEFINITIONS.

Section 208 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116h) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (1), respectively, and transferring paragraph (1) as redesignated to appear before paragraph (2) as redesignated; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(1) COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY STRENGTHENING SERVICES.—The term ‘community-based family strengthening services’ includes organizations such as family resource programs, family support programs, voluntary home visiting programs, respite care services, parenting education, mutual support groups for parents, children, parent partner programs, and other community programs or networks of such programs that provide activities that are designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.”

SEC. 209. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 209 as section 210; and

(2) by inserting after section 208 the following:

“SEC. 209. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

“Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit grandparents, kinship care providers, foster parents, adoptive parents, or any other individual in a parenting role from receiving or participating in services and programs under this title.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 209 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 209. Rule of construction.

“Sec. 210. Authorization of appropriations.”

SEC. 210. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 210 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.), as

redesignated by section 209 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking “There are” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are”;

(2) by striking “to carry out” through “fiscal year 2010” and inserting “to carry out this title \$270,000,000 for fiscal year 2020”;

(3) by striking “2011 through 2015” and inserting “2021 through 2025”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TREATMENT OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS IN CERTAIN FISCAL YEARS.—For any fiscal year for which the amount appropriated under subsection (a) exceeds the amount appropriated under such subsection for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall consider non-Federal funds and in-kind contributions as part of the State contribution for the activities specified in section 204(4).”

SEC. 211. STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) STUDY RELATING TO NEW PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study, using data reported by States to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 206 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116f), as amended by this Act—

(A) to determine how many families and children in the first 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act are served annually through programs funded under title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.); and

(B) to compare the number of such families and children served annually in the first 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act to the number of such families and children served in fiscal year 2019.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include the following for each of the first 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act:

(A) An examination of how many families received evidence-based programming under title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.).

(B) An examination of the extent to which local programs conduct evaluations using funds provided under such title and the findings of such evaluations.

(C) An examination of whether findings of effectiveness in evaluation studies vary by urban, suburban, or rural community type.

(D) An examination of whether programs partnering with other entities are more effective than those that do not partner with other entities.

(E) An examination of barriers to implement evidence-based programming or to conduct evaluations in instances where such activities do not occur.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

TITLE III—ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.

Section 201 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5111) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE” and inserting “PURPOSE”;

(2) by striking subsection (a); and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) PURPOSE.—”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “sexual and gender minority youth” after “particularly older children, minority children,”; and

(C) in paragraph (1), by inserting “services and,” after “post-legal adoption”.

SEC. 302. REPORT AND GUIDANCE ON UNREGULATED CUSTODY TRANSFERS.

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5111 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 201 the following:

“SEC. 202. REPORT AND GUIDANCE ON UNREGULATED CUSTODY TRANSFERS.

“(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

“(1) Some adopted children may be at risk of experiencing an unregulated custody transfer because the challenges associated with adoptions (including the child’s mental health needs and the difficulties many families face in acquiring support services) may lead families to seek out unregulated custody transfers.

“(2) Some adopted children experience trauma, and the disruption and placement in another home by unregulated custody transfer creates additional trauma and instability for children.

“(3) Children who experience an unregulated custody transfer may be placed with families who have not completed required child welfare or criminal background checks or clearances.

“(4) Social services agencies and courts are often unaware of the placement of children through unregulated custody transfer and therefore do not conduct assessments on the child’s safety and well-being in such placements.

“(5) Such lack of placement oversight places a child at risk for future abuse and increases the chance that the child may experience—

“(A) abuse or neglect;

“(B) contact with unsafe adults or youth; and

“(C) exposure to unsafe or isolated environments.

“(6) The caregivers with whom a child is placed through unregulated custody transfer often have no legal responsibility with respect to such child, placing the child at risk for additional unregulated custody transfers.

“(7) Such caregivers also may not have complete records with respect to such child, including the child’s birth, medical, or immigration records.

“(8) A child adopted through intercountry adoption may be at risk of not acquiring United States citizenship if an unregulated custody transfer occurs before the adoptive parents complete all necessary steps to finalize the adoption of such child.

“(9) Engaging in, or offering to engage in, unregulated custody transfer places children at risk of harm.

“(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate a report on unregulated custody transfers of children, including of adopted children.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) the causes, methods, and characteristics of unregulated custody transfers, including the use of social media and the internet;

“(B) the effects of unregulated custody transfers on children, including the lack of assessment of a child’s safety and well-being by social services agencies and courts due to such unregulated custody transfer;

“(C) the prevalence of unregulated custody transfers within each State and across all States; and

“(D) recommended policies for preventing, identifying, and responding to unregulated custody transfers, including of adopted children, that include—

“(i) amendments to Federal and State law to address unregulated custody transfers;

“(ii) amendments to child protection practices to address unregulated custody transfers; and

“(iii) methods of providing the public information regarding adoption and child protection.

“(c) GUIDANCE TO STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date specified in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall issue guidance and technical assistance to States related to preventing, identifying, and responding to unregulated custody transfers, including of adopted children.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The guidance required under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) education materials related to preventing, identifying, and responding to unregulated custody transfers for employees of State, local, and Tribal agencies that provide child welfare services;

“(B) guidance on appropriate pre-adoption education and post-adoption services for domestic and international adoptive families to promote child permanency; and

“(C) the assistance available through the National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption under section 203(b)(9).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

“(2) UNREGULATED CUSTODY TRANSFER.—The term ‘unregulated custody transfer’ means the abandonment of a child, by the child’s parent, legal guardian, or a person or entity acting on behalf, and with the consent, of such parent or guardian—

“(A) by placing a child with a person who is not—

“(i) the child’s parent, step-parent, grandparent, adult sibling, legal guardian, or other adult relative;

“(ii) a friend of the family who is an adult and with whom the child is familiar; or

“(iii) a member of the Federally recognized Indian tribe of which the child is also a member;

“(B) with the intent of severing the relationship between the child and the parent or guardian of such child; and

“(C) without—

“(i) reasonably ensuring the safety of the child and permanency of the placement of the child, including by conducting an official home study, background check, and supervision; and

“(ii) transferring the legal rights and responsibilities of parenthood or guardianship under applicable Federal and State law to a person described in subparagraph (A).”

SEC. 303. INFORMATION AND SERVICES.

(a) NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—Section 203(b)(9) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113(b)(9)) is amended by inserting “not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, establish and” before “maintain”.

(b) PLACEMENT WITH ADOPTIVE FAMILIES.—Section 203(b)(11)(C) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113(b)(11)(C)) is amended by striking “such children” and inserting “the children and youth described in the

matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 201”.

(c) PRE-ADOPTION SERVICES.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113(c)(1)) is amended by striking “post” and inserting “pre- and post-”.

(d) SERVICES.—Section 203(c)(2) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113(c)(2)) is amended by inserting “and the development of such services,” after “not supplant, services”.

(e) ELIMINATION OF BARRIERS TO ADOPTION ACROSS JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES.—Section 203(e)(1) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “with, States,” and inserting “with States, Indian Tribes.”; and

(2) by inserting “, including through the use of web-based tools such as the electronic interstate case-processing system referred to in section 437(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(g))” before the period at the end.

SEC. 304. STUDY AND REPORT ON SUCCESSFUL ADOPTIONS.

Section 204 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5114) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 204. STUDY AND REPORT ON SUCCESSFUL ADOPTIONS.

“(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study (directly or by grant to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit research agencies or organizations) on adoption outcomes and the factors (including parental substance use disorder) affecting those outcomes.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 36 months after the date of the enactment of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that includes the results of the study required under subsection (a).”

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 205(a) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5115(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “fiscal year 2010” and inserting “fiscal year 2020”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal years 2011 through 2015” and inserting “fiscal years 2021 through 2025”.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 401. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) HEAD START ACT.—Section 658E(c)(2)(L) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)(2)(L)) is amended by striking “will comply with the child abuse reporting requirements of section 106(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(i))” and inserting “will comply with the child abuse reporting requirements of section 106(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(A)(i))”.

(b) VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT OF 1984.—Section 1404A of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20104) is amended by striking “section 109” and inserting “section 107”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am excited that the House of Representatives is considering this bill, Stronger CAPTA, today, a bipartisan bill I urge my colleagues to support.

Stronger CAPTA is a reauthorization of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, CAPTA, that will re-vamp already existing Federal supports for preventing child abuse and neglect.

It has been 9 years since Congress comprehensively reauthorized CAPTA. This Congress, I partnered with several of my Democratic and Republican colleagues to introduce the bipartisan Stronger CAPTA, which would help States and communities address the recent rise in cases of child neglect, abuse, and death, many of which can be linked to an increasing number of parents affected by substance abuse and the opioid crisis.

Stronger CAPTA will overhaul a prevention system that has always been overworked and underresourced. In Washington State, only 11 of about 125 programs that apply receive funding. The support my State gets from the Federal Government is about 50 cents per child per year.

□ 1700

Stronger CAPTA will increase funding so that more programs can ensure families in need receive their services.

It will also create a local system in which families who are seeking services but have not yet been identified as needing those services can receive the help they need.

Currently, a family who knows they need help can't get it unless something bad happens to the child. Parents are the most informed regarding the needs of their children, and we should not punish families who are proactively seeking assistance. Stronger CAPTA will help these families before harm occurs.

I am hopeful that, because of this legislation, Washington State will build on their efforts to support new mothers with parenting, help families teach social-emotional and early literacy skills, expand programs for Tribal families, counsel families and children exposed to violence and homelessness, and expand the countless other programs in place to help families seeking support.

I am also excited that the bill I introduced with my Republican colleague STEVE STIVERS, the Early Detection to Stop Infant Abuse and Prevent Fatalities Act, is included in this legislation. With passage of Stronger CAPTA, States will be able to help medical professionals, early childhood educators,

and others better identify early signs of infant abuse and neglect that might look harmless to the untrained eye.

As a pediatrician, I take care of the children and families we are talking about today. I want every parent to have the support they need to parent well. My bill will go a long way to making sure every family gets the support they need.

I thank my colleagues, Representatives TRAHAN, JOHNSON, STEFANIK, BONAMICI, and COMER; Chairman SCOTT, and Ranking Member FOXX, for co-leading this legislation with me.

The well-being of children and their opportunity to grow up in stable, loving environments will be improved with the passage of Stronger CAPTA.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, as lead Republican for the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services, and as its lead Republican sponsor, I am happy to rise today to celebrate this bipartisan legislation, the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. This legislation will help target, prevent, and treat child abuse and neglect.

The statistics of children in the United States who are abused and/or neglected are staggering. In 2016, child protective services determined approximately 676,000 children to be victims of abuse or neglect. This is simply heartbreaking.

CAPTA was originally enacted in 1974 to support the development of programs aimed at prevention, assessment, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of child abuse and neglect. Stronger CAPTA seeks to continue this important work while putting more emphasis on prevention so that abuse and neglect can be stopped before they happen.

Prevention takes a holistic approach to combating neglect and abuse by focusing on strengthening communities and educating parents and caregivers on how to keep their children safe. In addition to bolstering our prevention efforts, Stronger CAPTA streamlines current assurances and requirements so States can focus on serving and providing treatment to children rather than spending more time filling out paperwork.

State agencies benefit from increased flexibility that allows them to respond more swiftly and effectively to reports of abuse and neglect. We must equip States with the tools and resources needed to address maltreatment and keep kids safe.

I am very proud of the hard work done on both sides of the aisle to champion this bipartisan legislation aimed at protecting some of our most vulnerable citizens.

Keeping America's children safe from the detrimental harm of abuse and neglect is something we can all agree is paramount, and I am glad that we could work together on such an important initiative.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2480, the bipartisan Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

Child maltreatment is a public health crisis and a threat to our country. Although we have made progress toward reducing cases of child maltreatment since passage of the original CAPTA, in recent years, the rates at which children are abused and neglected have steadily increased. Evidence suggests that the opioid crisis is responsible for new challenges in protecting vulnerable children.

Stronger CAPTA is an important step toward making sure that all children grow up in safe and healthy environments that allow them to reach their full potential.

The bill will strengthen Federal investments in community-based prevention services so families across the country can receive help before children suffer.

It will build networks of wraparound services that lower the risk of child maltreatment by helping families navigate complex health, education, and financial hardships.

It will seek to reduce rates of child maltreatment exacerbated by the opioid crisis by supporting the development of best practices and strategies.

Importantly, the bill will streamline communication between and among States so child protection agencies across the country can work together and prevent cases of maltreatment from slipping through the cracks, no matter where they occur.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Ranking Member FOXX but also especially Ranking Member COMER of the subcommittee and Representatives SCHRIER, TRAHAN, JOHNSON, and STEFANIK for their leadership.

I strongly urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the work that they have done on this bill, and I rise today in strong support of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

Not only will this bill strengthen our laws to help keep children safe, but this legislation also makes needed investments to help ensure children impacted by the opioid epidemic do not face abuse, maltreatment, and neglect.

Every one of our communities, sadly, has been impacted by the opioid epidemic. Sadly, our children are suffering the consequences.

This bill includes a bipartisan amendment that I was pleased to offer in committee with Representative UNDERWOOD to study and learn more about how parental substance abuse affects the outcomes on adoption. This study is necessary to help States better serve children in need, and I was proud to see it unanimously adopted.

Last Congress, I introduced legislation that was passed to reduce known barriers for foster placement, which was signed into law. This amendment builds on that important work to help States detect additional barriers to better serve children caught up by the opioid epidemic.

Madam Speaker, child abuse is not a partisan issue, and I am proud of the strong bipartisan work my colleagues have done on the Committee on Education and Labor to strengthen prevention efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my colleague Representative SCHRIER's Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, which increases funding for under-resourced child protection agencies.

I am particularly proud that we could reach bipartisan agreement on a top priority of mine in this bill, which is ensuring that State plans of safe care for infants exposed to substances in utero do not unfairly target pregnant women who need to remain on medication in order to stay healthy.

Prior to 2016, States only developed plans of safe care for infants exposed to illegal substances in utero. It became clear during the opioid crisis that we needed to look at the abuse of legal drugs during pregnancy.

In 2016, Congress updated the law to ensure that all infants and families impacted by substance abuse could get the care they need. Unfortunately, as an unintended consequence, some States are now referring all infants exposed to substances in utero to child protective services and opening CPS investigations even if the mom was using the substance in a treatment plan that was prescribed by a doctor.

In some States, new mothers using antidepressants during pregnancy are being referred automatically to CPS for investigation. This is not only unjust but also a waste of limited resources.

Untreated depression during pregnancy is linked to premature birth, low birth weight, and developmental problems, not to mention increased risk of postpartum depression and poor health for pregnant mothers.

There is already incredible stigma that prevents people from seeking treatment for mental illness, with

communities of color facing greater barriers to that treatment.

What is more, mothers who made a safe choice to transition to medication-assisted treatment for opioid withdrawal shouldn't automatically be investigated by CPS.

I am so grateful to Representative GUTHRIE on the other side of the aisle, the chair and ranking member, and experts in pediatric medicine for finding a solution. This bill clarifies that CPS will only undertake an investigation when the findings of a family assessment warrant it, not when moms are simply following their doctors' advice to stay healthy.

Stronger CAPTA will prevent unnecessary trauma to families.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2480, the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, which includes my provision asking for a study of forced child marriages in the United States.

It is shocking to think that the Tahirih Justice Center estimates that, between 2000 and 2015, more than 207,000 children were married in this country. In Texas alone, 40,000 minors were married between 2000 and 2014.

I hope we can all agree that marriage should be between consenting individuals and that children should not be married without their consent.

I was proud, on a bipartisan basis in Texas, to end forced child marriages in Texas. I know that States, red and blue, have addressed this problem and solved it. But we need to work harder here in the United States Congress.

I am grateful to my colleague from Washington for accepting this amendment to work on studying forced child marriage in the 43 States that have not adjusted their laws to end what I would consider to be a barbaric practice.

I look forward to supporting this bill.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise today in support of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

Children are our future teachers, doctors, police officers, and Members of Congress. It is our responsibility to ensure that they are able to live, learn, and grow in a safe environment.

My home State of Georgia ranked fifth in the Nation for the highest number of child abuse-related deaths in 2017 and third for calls to hotlines to report abuse.

I was proud to introduce an amendment in the Education and Labor Committee with my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), that would establish a national child abuse hotline.

Stronger CAPTA is bipartisan legislation that will provide critical protections and resources to families and

children across our Nation to prevent and end child abuse. Together, we can and we should ensure the safety of our Nation's children.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2480. I thank all of those who had any part in drafting this important legislation.

The Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act takes an important step in improving the lives of children in every State.

This bill authorizes important programs that will provide essential support for child protective service systems and communities fighting against child abuse and neglect.

This legislation before us comes at a time when State child protective services around the country are seeing resources increasingly strained due to the opioid crisis. H.R. 2480 provides the resources and reforms needed for States to combat this crisis and ensure that abused or neglected children are getting the help they deserve.

Under this bill, States and local providers can focus on serving children and families by streamlining duplicative and burdensome paperwork requirements. It also ensures community and parent involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of prevention services.

I am pleased that the bill before us today includes an amendment that I introduced with my colleague from Maryland (Mr. TRONE). The amendment ensures those working in the child welfare system are of the highest professional quality.

As has been said before, this work is critical. We want to ensure these people are ready to tackle this challenging work, and States need to know how to recruit the right people for the job.

The child welfare system contains some of the most vulnerable citizens in our society, which makes it so important that those working in the field get the education and professional development that is needed.

H.R. 2480 will allow State and local providers to better serve the almost 700,000 children who are victims of abuse and neglect every year.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1715

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan bill. I thank Representative SCHRIER, an amazing woman, pediatrician, and fellow member of our freshman class, for leading this bipartisan effort.

Preventing child abuse is an issue that is front-of-mind for our community in Illinois' 14th District, with the recent death of AJ Freund, a 5-year-old

boy from Crystal Lake, who was tragically killed.

AJ's heartbreaking death was a result of a system that failed him. I am committed to honoring his life with action.

Child abuse prevention is an issue that calls for big policy solutions, and this bill offers those, as my colleagues have outlined.

Rates of child abuse have recently been rising as the opioid epidemic has devastated communities across the country; and children who are adopted after being removed from homes with substance abuse issues have special kinds of trauma.

My bipartisan amendment, with Representative SMUCKER, looks out for those kids. It would allow us to track their outcomes and ensure we have the information we need to make informed policy decisions to best serve them and set them up for success.

With my amendment, a Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act will help keep kids safe and make sure families get the services they need. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

In 2016, there were 4.1 million referrals to child protective services. Far too many children experience some form of abuse or neglect in their lifetime, a sad reality that deserves our utmost attention.

The Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act strengthens the original law in order to further protect our children. The bill provides for evidence-based support for the victims of abuse, establishes national reporting requirements to more accurately track child abuse trends, expands research into child welfare, and improves the grant funding process.

As Representatives in Congress, protecting our children and most vulnerable members of society is an obligation we each take very seriously. This issue rises above party lines and, as an original cosponsor of the bill, I am grateful for my colleagues coming together to support this important legislation.

I am also proud that this bill includes an amendment that I introduced with my colleague across the aisle, Mrs. MCBATH, to establish a National Abuse Hotline. This amendment offers grant funding to nonprofit entities to establish and maintain a 24-hour, national, toll-free, abuse hotline that gives at risk individuals the opportunity to report instances of abuse and receive immediate assistance without fear of retribution.

I thank my colleagues for the unanimous support of this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues today to support this lifesaving bill.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to show my support for a Stronger CAPTA.

The opioid crisis is devastating communities across the country, and we are seeing rising rates of child abuse and neglect as a result of this crisis. In order to reverse these trends, we must invest in smart primary prevention efforts like those included in this bill.

Passing Stronger CAPTA will mean stronger networks of prevention services that will benefit children and communities for decades to come.

It will also mean a stronger child welfare workforce. Some States see a 40 percent annual turnover rate among the child welfare workforce. We must do more to equip our workers to better serve our most vulnerable children and families.

That is why I am pleased this bill includes a provision I authored with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), my colleague, that will help develop and retain a high-quality workforce in the child welfare system.

I urge a "yes" vote from my colleagues on this commonsense bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Kentucky for yielding, and for handling this bill today. I also commend my friend, Representative COMER, for his outstanding leadership of the Republicans on the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, and for his leadership on this bill.

I have served on the committee under its different names for a long time. It was a great honor to serve as the Committee's chairwoman during the last Congress, and as Republican leader during this Congress because, from this perspective, I have seen just how much we are able to get done together that doesn't always capture the attention of the rest of this body or the public.

It should be a great encouragement to all of us that when it comes to serving the most vulnerable Americans, children and youth, Republicans and Democrats on the Education and Labor Committee have been able to come together on numerous occasions and produce bipartisan legislation that is forward-looking and aims at prevention first.

We did this last Congress with the Juvenile Justice Reform Act and with the reauthorization of the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

In a perfect world, we would not need laws addressing child abuse. We certainly would not need stronger laws addressing child abuse. But this world is far from perfect.

Today, members of the Education and Labor Committee have brought before the House an update to the Child

Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act which, since 1974, has helped States combat child abuse and neglect. This bill, aptly named Stronger CAPTA, looks to those who spend their professional and personal lives fulfilling what can only be described as a deep calling to stand between children and abuse, to lead us forward in our efforts to serve families.

Last year, we saw a House-wide effort to address the scourge of opioid abuse in communities across the country. As our committee met for hearings and worked to determine our own contributions to that effort, the impact opioid abuse and addiction is having on innocent children came in to sharper focus. In many ways, today's legislation has its roots in those informative proceedings.

This bill recognizes the power of community in supporting at-risk families. Leaders in Washington and in State capitals, more than anything, want to protect children in danger. But it is friends, neighbors, fellow church members, and community volunteers who can spot real trouble, hopefully, before it will start.

This legislation strengthens and expands coordination among local agencies to help ensure families have access to physical and mental health services, domestic violence prevention programs, disability supports, and substance abuse treatment, when necessary.

As opioid addiction continues its hold in communities in every single congressional district represented here, we must look at Stronger CAPTA as another way we can fight back.

This bill puts families and children before bureaucracies and paperwork. I am proud of the members of the Education and Labor Committee on both sides of the aisle who worked together to bring this bill to the floor.

I urge all Members to support the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Ranking Member FOXX for their work in bringing this bipartisan Stronger CAPTA to the floor; as well as Representative WATKINS, for drafting our bipartisan amendment that ensures that poverty alone cannot be used as evidence of abuse and neglect.

The fight against intergenerational poverty has many fronts, but one of the most important things we can do is preserve family stability for as many children as possible. Families struggling with poverty need supports to preserve stability, not additional toxic stress that can alter child development.

Let me be clear: Abuse and neglect know no socioeconomic barriers. Poverty alone is neither abuse nor neglect. I am proud that our amendment will ensure that no child is removed from

their family solely because that family is living in poverty.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I am so happy that H.R. 2480 includes several noteworthy improvements to the CAPTA Act. One is a bill that I introduced last Congress called Family Poverty is Not Child Neglect Act. It recognizes that 75 percent of child abuse referrals are not because of malicious abuse, but because of symptoms of poverty that officials categorize as neglect.

It would mandate States to treat those conditions of poverty with service-based remedies that will reduce the parental separation risk disproportionately affecting low-income children and families.

I am so pleased that federally-supported distinctions between poverty-based lack and parental maltreatment unrelated to poverty has been added to our Stronger CAPTA bill.

Poverty-related conditions should be met with poverty-alleviating solutions, not child separation.

Madam Speaker, I just want to share my own personal story. My own experience, at age 18, was that I was separated from my child, who was placed in foster care, because my scholarship money would not cover living expenses. And while she was placed in a loving foster home, this was traumatic for me, and constituted an adverse childhood experience for my daughter.

So I am so pleased to stand here today to say, as a witness, that we should do everything we can to avoid child separations, and this bill addresses it.

Madam Speaker, I thank all of the authors on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in proud support of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, a bill that will help protect children from abuse and neglect.

Across our country, more than 670,000 children were reported to be victims of child abuse or neglect. In 2016, almost 1,500 children in the United States died as a result of abuse or neglect.

It is past time for us to act to prevent child abuse and neglect. That is why, earlier this month, I introduced the Speak Up to Protect Every Abused Kid Act. I am proud that portions of the Speak Up Act are included in the Stronger CAPTA Act.

The Speak Up Act would take commonsense steps to increase reporting of child abuse or neglect by requiring States to implement a consistent

standard for reporting suspected child abuse or neglect.

The Speak Up Act would require individuals with professional responsibilities over children to report suspected child abuse and neglect directly to State authorities. We have heard too many stories of children being abused or neglected and not getting the help they need because adults do not report it to the proper authorities.

I was proud to support the Stronger CAPTA Act in the Education and Labor Committee, and I am proud to vote for it on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this important bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

□ 1730

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Stronger CAPTA, which includes provisions from the Safe Home Act, which is bipartisan legislation I introduced with Representative DON BACON.

These provisions address unregulated custody transfers. This is the frightening practice of transferring a child, usually an adopted child, to a stranger outside the safeguards of the child welfare system.

Known as rehomeing, this phenomenon occurs when parents lack the supports to meet their children's needs and, instead, place them with individuals who haven't undergone background checks, home studies or supervision, where they are at risk of further abuse.

Unregulated custody transfers are a form of child abuse and neglect, and Stronger CAPTA removes any ambiguity that might prevent child welfare agencies from being able to investigate these cases. So it will give States the tools to prevent, identify, and respond to such dangers so that they can safeguard our most vulnerable youth.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SCHRIER for her leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support Stronger CAPTA.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my colleague and the chair of our committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. SCHRIER and Mr. COMER for sponsoring this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or Stronger CAPTA.

Congress has a vital role in helping States protect children from physical injury and emotional trauma associated with child abuse and neglect.

Stronger CAPTA will fulfill that role by increasing investment in both treat-

ment of child abuse and neglect, and programs designed to prevent maltreatment from happening in the first place.

Specifically, this bill would provide States with resources to strengthen prevention programs, invest in child protective service agencies, and streamline communication between those agencies across this country. It would also build upon the bipartisan commitment to keep families together when it is in the best interests of the child.

Last Saturday, May 18, was the 1-year anniversary of the tragic death of Heaven Watkins, an 11-year-old girl in my community who lost her life because of child abuse. Had the reforms in this bill been in place, Heaven's death could have been prevented.

Specifically, investing in prevention strategies and improving the collection and sharing of vital information can help children like Heaven from slipping through the cracks.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank, again, Dr. SCHRIER and Mr. COMER for their leadership, as well as Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. STEFANIK, and, of course, the ranking member, Dr. FOXX, for their work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Stronger CAPTA.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to conclude by again thanking everyone for working together in a bipartisan way on this bill. This is very important. This is something that we can do to prove Congress can work together, can come together on issues of the utmost importance, and preventing child abuse and neglect is an issue that is bipartisan and of the utmost importance.

This bill streamlines the process. It does just exactly the things that the States have asked us to do with the bill.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following: first, a letter from the National Child Abuse Coalition supporting H.R. 2480, which praises the legislation's improvements to interstate data sharing and increases to authorization levels; second, a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics endorsing H.R. 2480, which praises the legislation's public health focus; and third, a letter from the American Psychological Association supporting H.R. 2480, which praises this legislation's improvement to research on helping families experiencing substance use disorders.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE COALITION,
May 7, 2019.

Chairman BOBBY SCOTT,
House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.
Representative KIM SCHRIER,
Washington, DC.
Ranking Member VIRGINIA FOXX,
House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.
Representative JAMES COMER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT, RANKING MEMBER FOXX, REPRESENTATIVE SCHRIER, and REPRESENTATIVE COMER: On behalf of the National Child Abuse Coalition, thank you for your outstanding leadership on the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. The reforms and funding levels you have proposed in this legislation are extremely important, and we strongly encourage all members of the House Committee on Education and Labor to support its passage. If appropriately funded, this legislation will reduce child abuse and neglect, strengthen families through community-driven solutions, improve local responses to child trauma, increase states' child safety tools, and bring much improved data and transparency around abuse and neglect fatalities so that states can make tailored reforms to prevent future fatalities. Though some changes to the bill are still needed, we look forward to continuing to work with you as the legislation moves forward.

In particular, we strongly support the following elements of the proposal:

Authorization levels. Meaningful increases to CAPTA funding are essential to ensure this bill's important reforms will make children safer and families stronger. For too long, Congress has sought key improvements to this law but has failed to appropriate the funds that would allow states to successfully implement them. The Coalition believes at least \$500 million for each title is critical, but we recognize the authorization levels in this legislation reflect your strong commitment to keeping children from being harmed. We were very disappointed to learn that the House Labor-H bill released today does not reflect the important investments you have included in the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. We look forward to working with you to ensure the funding levels included in this legislation are executed in the appropriations process. The reforms this Committee envisions for CAPTA will not be realized without robust increases to funding.

Emphasis on family strengthening. We also applaud the bill's focus on family strengthening, a clear reflection of what we know to be true: that healthy and strong families are key to ensuring children are healthy and can achieve their full potential. The Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act reflects the entire continuum of supports to families, starting with primary prevention at the heart of Title II and extending into the identification and treatment of abuse and neglect in Title I. All are essential to creating systems of support that both prevent child abuse and neglect and keep families together whenever possible, and also ensure timely and appropriate action when child abuse or neglect does occur.

Improvements to child protection systems to reduce child fatalities and near fatalities from abuse and neglect. Experts estimate nearly 3,000 children die every year from child abuse and neglect. Without proper data and disclosure, efforts to reduce these fatalities will not succeed. The legislation's reforms in Section 103 to develop uniform standards for tracking and reporting of child fatalities resulting from maltreatment are absolutely essential to making sure federal,

state, and local governments have the information they need to keep more vulnerable children alive. The bill's reforms to clarify and strengthen disclosure about fatalities and near fatalities in Section 106 are also very important to these efforts. Both of these reforms were proposed by the Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities, a bipartisan Commission devised by Congress to put an end to these tragic child deaths. We also commend you for taking steps to improve interstate data exchange.

Thoughtful attention to children and families impacted by substance use disorders. As the national rise in substance use disorders continues to drive more children and families into the child welfare system, we appreciate the thoughtful attention paid by the Committee to these issues. In particular, the bill incorporates new language reflecting the intersection between child abuse and neglect and substance use disorders, the needs of children and families with substance use disorders, and how critical collaboration across multiple public and community partners is to effectively connect families to needed treatment services.

Improved transparency, accountability, and focus on key priorities. We greatly appreciate the legislation's much-needed streamlining and updating of CAPTA in ways that will prioritize key needs from the experts working in states and communities, and that will improve transparency and accountability to ensure better implementation of the law. The revisions to Sections 104 and 105 reflect a more focused approach to key priorities in child welfare. The use of funds in Section 106 presents a much more cohesive and coordinated vision to help states in their efforts to prevent, treat, and intervene in child abuse and neglect. The bill's revisions specifying the state mandates in Section 106 will bring much-needed improvements to CAPTA's transparency and accountability.

Finally, as the bill advances, we look forward to working with you so that the following provisions in Title II strike the right balance to ensure effective use of taxpayer dollars, reduce bureaucratic requirements for states, and reflect the importance of a universal, or public health, approach to primary prevention:

Administrative cap. Thank you for working with the Coalition and its members on this provision in between introduction and mark-up. We appreciate your willingness to respond to deep concerns from the states that the initial proposed cap would hinder states' ability to carry out the provisions of the legislation. CBCAP lead agencies are committed to running their programs efficiently, and most of them operate as part of larger agencies and do not always control what shared expenses are charged to them. We heard from numerous CBCAP lead agencies that a four percent cap would greatly limit their ability to provide adequate oversight and support in implementing the bold vision that is proposed in the underlying legislation. As the legislation advances, we hope to work with you to ensure that the administrative cap is consistent with guidance from Office of Management and Budget related to federally negotiated indirect cost rates for federal funding, in a manner that does not undermine state flexibility to effectively implement the law.

70/30 funding formula. The Coalition urges Congress to simplify the Title II formula to be entirely population based. Currently, thirty percent of the funding formula is determined by a very complicated set of rules that burdens states with onerous bureaucracy, reduces state flexibility, produces accounting incentives that do not necessarily

reflect state investments, and creates a situation where states that might benefit the most are the least able to leverage funds. As a result, just three states receive nearly one-third of the funding from this portion of the formula. We hope that you will continue to work with us to create a more appropriate formula for this Title.

Public health approach. As the Committee repeatedly heard from the witnesses at its March 26th hearing, a universal approach to primary prevention services is essential to the success of Title II. Primary prevention of child abuse is most effective when it takes a universal approach to building protective factors and reducing risks in families and communities. It is important that CAPTA strike the right balance between emphasizing building a universal—or public health—approach and targeting higher risk communities. We look forward to working with you to make sure the final law addresses this in the best manner possible.

Thank you for your commitment to the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect, and to improving the lives of children and families in the United States. The National Child Abuse Coalition and its twenty-five organizational members stand ready to continue to help support your efforts as the critical bill moves through Congress.

Sincerely,

RUTH J. FRIEDMAN, Ph.D.,
Executive Director, National Child
Abuse Coalition.

—
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
May 8, 2019.

Hon. KIM SCHRIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES SCHRIER AND COMER: On behalf of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), a non-profit professional organization of 67,000 primary care pediatricians, pediatric medical sub-specialists, and pediatric surgical specialists dedicated to the health, safety and well-being of infants, children, adolescents, and young adults, I am writing to share our endorsement of the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 2019 (H.R. 2480).

As many as 25 percent of children in the United States have experienced some form of maltreatment. Pediatricians have long supported the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) because it is an essential federal policy tool for preventing and responding to child maltreatment. CAPTA provides critical support to states and non-profit community-based organizations for services to prevent and treat child abuse and neglect. While CAPTA is critically important, limited federal funding has historically impeded its ability to create meaningful change for vulnerable children and families. This bipartisan legislation would create major progress and support efforts to apply a public health approach to preventing and addressing child maltreatment.

The Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act would reauthorize and strengthen CAPTA to better promote child health and well-being. Crucially, the bill authorizes \$270 million for Title I state grants and \$270 million for Title II community-based prevention and state system improvement in FY2020. The AAP strongly supports this critical funding increase, which would improve CAPTA's ability to create meaningful change for vulnerable children and families. In addition, the AAP supports the bill's restructuring of CAPTA to shift away from lists of state assurances to intentional strategic planning. This will improve the quality

and accountability of CAPTA-financed activities.

H.R. 2480 also shifts CAPTA toward a public health focus on prevention of child abuse. The bill streamlines CAPTA research topics to focus on understudied areas such as how to best address trauma, promote racial equity, and serve families with substance use disorders in child welfare systems. The Academy strongly supports the inclusion of a provision to allow funds for research into “sentinel” injuries. This will help develop practices for improving early detection and management of injuries indicative of potential abuse, preventing further maltreatment and fatalities.

The AAP also supports the bill’s requirement for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to create standardized definitions for fatalities and near-fatalities related to maltreatment, and to require data tracking on those incidents. These data will be essential to applying a public health approach to child maltreatment, enabling researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to learn how to better prevent maltreatment from studying the most tragic outcomes.

The AAP also supports the bill’s creation of a new interstate maltreatment registry system. This policy would support essential information sharing to ensure that information about maltreatment a child has experienced can cross state lines. Currently, states do not readily share this information, which can lead to missed opportunities to intervene and protect children from further harm. This is vital to protecting children and preventing child fatalities.

Child maltreatment is a preventable but pervasive public health problem. This bipartisan legislation offers critically needed innovative approaches to improving child welfare systems. The Academy supports this legislation and looks forward to working with you to advance these important policies.

Sincerely,

KYLE E. YASUDA, MD, FAAP,
President.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION SERVICES, INC.,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2019.

Chairman BOBBY SCOTT,
*House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.*

Representative KIM SCHRIER,
Washington, DC.

Ranking Member VIRGINIA FOXX,
*House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.*

Representative JAMES COMER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT, RANKING MEMBER FOXX, REPRESENTATIVE SCHRIER, and REPRESENTATIVE COMER: On behalf of the nearly 118,400 members and affiliates of the American Psychological Association (APA), thank you for your extraordinary leadership on H.R. 2480, the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Stronger CAPTA). The reforms in this legislation, in concert with the increased funding authorization, are powerful steps toward preventing child abuse and neglect and improving access to treatment and essential services for children and families, especially those recovering from trauma.

APA is a scientific and professional organization representing psychology, comprised of clinicians, researchers, educators, consultants and students across the United States and around the world. APA works to advance the creation, communication and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people’s lives. Many psychologists are specialized in child development and work across research and practice

to serve children and families, including children who have experienced abuse and neglect.

The Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act takes a streamlined and family-oriented approach to addressing key priorities in child welfare. The bill thoroughly emphasizes the importance of strengthening families through a continuum of services and supports including treating traumatic stress, connecting parents and children to mental and physical health services, programs to develop parenting skills, and other core services. Building on the Family First Prevention Services Act, the new Stronger CAPTA includes a greater focus on the prevention of child abuse and neglect. APA is particularly pleased to see trauma and adverse childhood experiences highlighted across the bill’s, research and technical assistance components, as well as the state grants in both Titles I and II. While there is much to be commended in the proposal, APA strongly supports the following elements:

IMPROVEMENTS IN RESEARCH AND DATA COLLECTION

The priorities set in section 104 focus on key areas of research to identify evidence-based approaches that improve primary prevention efforts, service delivery to children and families, and the wellbeing of victims of child abuse and neglect. The bill emphasizes scalability with an eye toward better serving more children and families, particularly those who have experienced trauma or have complex needs. APA strongly supports the promotion of racial equity within the child welfare system and the development of evidence-based approaches that consider the unique needs of rural, urban, and suburban families. In addition to streamlining research priorities, Stronger CAPTA enables much needed improvements in transparency and state data reporting through an update to the state plan mandates in section 106.

REDUCING FINDINGS OF NEGLECT DUE TO POVERTY

Consistent with APA’s Presidential Initiative on Deep Poverty, APA applauds the new provisions aimed at preventing and reducing findings of child neglect that result from a family’s economic insecurity. Keeping families together, whenever possible, is critically important for healthy development and children should not be separated from loving families due to poverty. As the section 106 grants suggest, families in financial need are better served by connecting them to services, such as nutrition assistance benefits.

ADDRESSING COMPLEX FAMILY NEEDS

GI Stronger CAPTA recognizes the challenges of adequately supporting and improving outcomes for families with complex needs. Some of America’s most vulnerable families are those with multiple risk factors for child abuse and neglect, such as parents with substance use disorders, parents who have experienced domestic violence, caregivers and children with disabilities, and young parents. Across both Titles, the bill encourages comprehensive outreach and treatment strategies to identify and support families with complex needs.

SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS

The national epidemic of opioid use disorders has driven a substantial increase in findings of child abuse and neglect that has resulted in more children in the child welfare system. This bill acknowledges the intersection of substance use disorders and child maltreatment and incorporates new provisions to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration across community and public partners, with the goal of ensuring families are connected to the mental health services and additional supports that they need.

These reforms reflect a responsiveness to current needs identified by state and local agencies and service providers.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION LEVELS

Congress has long sought myriad improvements to CAPTA but has historically failed to appropriate adequate funds for proper implementation. Additional funding is vital to ensure that the meaningful reforms of this legislation are fully realized, to the benefit of vulnerable children and families. The significant increases to authorization levels in H.R. 2480 illustrate a renewed commitment protecting children from harm. The importance of the increases proposed cannot be overstated, and the changes must be incorporated into the Fiscal Year 2020 appropriations legislation accordingly, so as to not risk delays in implementation.

The Stronger Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act represents an encouraging federal commitment to preventing child abuse and neglect before it occurs and proving the best possible continuum of services to support to children and families who have experienced child abuse and neglect. We welcome opportunities to work together to strengthen and advance this legislation.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE MCGUIRE,
Chief Advocacy Officer.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2480. I am so pleased that we worked together in a bipartisan fashion.

Parenting is the hardest job we have, and yet we have no training for it. This bill ensures that parents will have the support they need. It will save lives and prevent child mistreatment, maltreatment, abuse, and neglect.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2480, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-36)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2019.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 20, 2019.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- Motions to suspend the rules and:
 - Pass H.R. 1952; and
 - Agree to H. Res. 106.

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

INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION INFORMATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1952) to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]
YEAS—397

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

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

NOT VOTING—34

- | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Meng | Shimkus |
| Cartwright | Meuser | Smith (WA) |
| Castor (FL) | Pallone | Swalwell (CA) |
| Crawford | Perry | Thompson (PA) |
| DeLauro | Pocan | Tlaib |
| Doggett | Porter | Walden |
| Grijalva | Rice (NY) | Walorski |
| Herrera Beutler | Rooney (FL) | Wilson (FL) |
| Huffman | Rouzer | Wilson (SC) |
| Huizenga | Rush | Young |
| Kaptur | Ryan | |
| Marshall | Schrader | |

□ 1904

Mr. LEWIS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 218.

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS ANNUAL CLAY COMPETITION

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I am here today to talk about the Annual Clay Competition held by the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. I would like to take the time now to congratulate my good friend, AUSTIN SCOTT,

who was the captain of the Republican team.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), and encourage those of you who are sportsmen who have not had the opportunity to join the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus to join. It is a wonderful organization. It is the largest bipartisan caucus in the House. We even allow Senators to participate in the skeet shoot.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize RICHARD HUDSON, who was our team captain this year. I sent the B team captain, and I look forward to being there next year.

I want to congratulate JOHN RUTHERFORD, Sheriff Rutherford, who was top gun over all, with a score of 63; JODY HICE, who was the top Republican from Georgia; and MARK MEADOWS, from North Carolina was top trap. "GT", GLENN THOMPSON, from Pennsylvania, was top sporting clays.

It is a wonderful event every year. I hope that if Members weren't able to join us this year, that they will be able to join us next.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I really appreciate Representative SCOTT, Representative HUDSON, and just everybody that makes this competition very special.

I would like to announce the Democratic nominees: from Northern California, the top gun on the Democratic side, with 53 shots, was MIKE THOMPSON; and also on the Democratic side, top skeet, from Minnesota, was COLLIN PETERSON.

Madam Speaker, I would like to maybe step it up a little bit for next year's competition and use this time to maybe encourage my Republican colleagues, because we didn't have any women at all participate on the Republican or the Democratic side this year. So I am going to encourage Mr. SCOTT, and I am going to encourage them to recruit some women shooters. I am going to do the same thing; and I think that that is going to be the key to us winning next year; so good luck.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I just wanted Mr. VEASEY to get a good look at the trophy. We will certainly be recruiting women next year, but we intend to keep the trophy in good safekeeping for a long time.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, 2020 is right around the corner.

DENOUNCING FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION/CUTTING AS VIOLATING HUMAN RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND GIRLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 106) denouncing

female genital mutilation/cutting as a violation of the human rights of women and girls and urging the international community and the Federal Government to increase efforts to eliminate the harmful practice, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—393

Adams	Cook	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Cooper	Green (TN)
Aguilar	Correa	Green (TX)
Allen	Costa	Griffith
Allred	Courtney	Grothman
Amash	Cox (CA)	Guest
Amodei	Craig	Guthrie
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Haaland
Arrington	Crist	Hagedorn
Axne	Crow	Harder (CA)
Babin	Cuellar	Harris
Bacon	Cummings	Hartzler
Balderson	Cunningham	Hastings
Banks	Curtis	Hayes
Barr	Dauids (KS)	Heck
Barragán	Davidson (OH)	Hern, Kevin
Bass	Davis (CA)	Hice (GA)
Beatty	Davis, Danny K.	Higgins (LA)
Bera	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (NY)
Bergman	Dean	Hill (AR)
Beyer	DeGette	Hill (CA)
Biggs	DelBene	Himes
Bilirakis	Delgado	Holding
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Hollingsworth
Bishop (UT)	DeSaulnier	Horn, Kendra S.
Blumenauer	DesJarlais	Horsford
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Houlahan
Bonamici	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Bost	Dingell	Hudson
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Hunter
F.	Doyle, Michael	Hurd (TX)
Brady	F.	Jackson Lee
Brindisi	Duffy	Jayapal
Brooks (AL)	Duncan	Jeffries
Brooks (IN)	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Brown (MD)	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Buck	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)
Bucshon	Espallat	Jordan
Budd	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Burchett	Evans	Joyce (PA)
Burgess	Ferguson	Katko
Bustos	Finkenauer	Keating
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (IL)
Calvert	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Carbajal	Fletcher	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Flores	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Khanha
Carter (GA)	Foster	Kildee
Carter (TX)	Foxx (NC)	Kilmer
Case	Frankel	Kim
Casten (IL)	Fudge	Kind
Castro (TX)	Fulcher	King (IA)
Chabot	Gabbard	King (NY)
Cheney	Gaetz	Kinzinger
Chu, Judy	Gallagher	Kirkpatrick
Cicilline	Gallego	Krishnamoorthi
Cisneros	Garamendi	Kuster (NH)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (IL)	Kustoff (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (TX)	LaHood
Clay	Gianforte	LaMalfa
Cleaver	Gibbs	Lamb
Cline	Gohmert	Lamborn
Cloud	Golden	Langevin
Clyburn	Gomez	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Gonzalez (OH)	Larson (CT)
Cole	Gonzalez (TX)	Latta
Collins (GA)	Gooden	Lawrence
Collins (NY)	Gosar	Lawson (FL)
Comer	Granger	Lee (CA)
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Lee (NV)
Connolly	Graves (LA)	Lesko

Levin (CA)	Panetta	Spanberger
Levin (MI)	Pappas	Spano
Lewis	Pascarell	Speier
Lieu, Ted	Payne	Stanton
Lipinski	Pence	Staubert
Loebsock	Perlmutter	Stefanik
Lofgren	Peters	Steil
Long	Peterson	Steube
Loudermilk	Phillips	Stevens
Lowenthal	Pingree	Stewart
Lowe	Posey	Stivers
Lucas	Pressley	Suozzi
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Takano
Luján	Quigley	Taylor
Luria	Raskin	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Ratcliffe	Thompson (MS)
Malinowski	Reed	Timmons
Maloney,	Reschenthaler	Tipton
Carolyn B.	Rice (SC)	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Tlaib
Marchant	Rigglesman	Tonko
Massie	Roby	Torres (CA)
Mast	Rodgers (WA)	Torres Small
Matsui	Roe, David P.	(NM)
McAdams	Rogers (AL)	Trahan
McBath	Rogers (KY)	Trone
McCarthy	Rose (NY)	Turner
McCaul	Rose, John W.	Underwood
McClintock	Rouda	Upton
McCollum	Roy	Van Drew
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
McGovern	Ruiz	Veasey
Cox (CA)	Ruppersberger	Vela
McHenry	Rutherford	Velázquez
McKinley	Sánchez	Visclosky
McNerney	Sanbans	Wagner
Meeks	Scalise	Walberg
Miller	Scanlon	Walker
Mitchell	Schakowsky	Waltz
Moolenaar	Schiff	Wasserman
Mooney (WV)	Schneider	Schultz
Moore	Schrier	Waters
Morelle	Schweikert	Watkins
Moulton	Schwartz	Watson Coleman
Mucarsel-Powell	Scott (VA)	Weber (TX)
Mullin	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Murphy	Scott, David	Welch
Nadler	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Napolitano	Serrano	Westerman
Neal	Sewell (AL)	Wexton
Neguse	Shalala	Wild
Newhouse	Sherman	Williams
Norcross	Sherrill	Wittman
Norman	Simpson	Womack
Nunes	Sires	Woodall
O'Halleran	Slotkin	Wright
Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (MO)	Yarmuth
Olson	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Omar	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
Palazzo	Smucker	
Palmer	Soto	

NOT VOTING—38

Abraham	Kaptur	Ryan
Baird	Marshall	Schrader
Butterfield	Meadows	Shimkus
Cartwright	Meng	Smith (WA)
Castor (FL)	Meuser	Swalwell (CA)
Crawford	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
DeFazio	Perry	Thornberry
DeLauro	Pocan	Walden
Gottheimer	Porter	Walorski
Grijalva	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Huffman	Rouzer	Young
Huizenga	Rush	

□ 1920

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2839, DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Mrs. LOWEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-78) on the bill

(H.R. 2839) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. 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. 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. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the Majority Leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

HONORING REVEREND JOSEPH L. JONES, SR.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Joseph L. Jones of Monumental Baptist Church in Jersey City, New Jersey, on the occasion of his retirement.

Reverend Jones has been a part of the Monumental Baptist Church family for 54 years. He spent the last 23 years as its pastor.

Reverend Jones helped grow the church's Sunday school, Bible school, and prayer service programs, but he also helped grow educational opportunities in the community at large.

Under Reverend Jones' leadership, Monumental Baptist Church has gone out into the community to expand career and educational opportunities for everyone. That is something to be proud of.

As Reverend Jones says, he has always lived by the motto: "Do something good for someone else."

I am proud to represent Monumental Baptist Church, and I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the retirement of Reverend Joseph L. Jones.

AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thus far, I have released several transcripts of interviews from the Judiciary Committee's investigation into the apparent wrongdoing at the FBI and Justice Department. Today, I am releasing a final collection of those transcripts.

The American people deserve transparency. They deserve to know what transpired at the highest levels of the FBI at the origin of the probe of President Trump's campaign.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the link www.dougcollins.house.gov/transparency so the American people can review the transcripts of these interviews.

Out of an abundance of caution, these transcripts have a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions relating only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing investigations, and nonmaterial personal information.

I have worked to release as many transcripts as possible because the American people deserve the truth.

D.C. STATEHOOD

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, women who celebrate 100 years of suffrage this year have in common with the residents of the Nation's Capital this: denial of equal rights in their democracy, requiring decades of fighting.

It took 132 years since the Nation's founding for women to get the vote.

It has taken 218 years, and still counting, for D.C. residents to achieve statehood, which includes voting rights and all the rights that come with equal citizenship.

We are grateful that as we move forward to a formal vote on statehood, the House has already endorsed D.C. statehood in H.R. 1.

Today, women set the pace in our democracy, outvoting men in national elections. D.C. residents yearn to join them in showing that those who are denied their rights know how to use them after fighting to achieve them.

DEMANDING CONGRESS ACT TO SECURE OUR BORDER

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis on our southern border, even if Democrat leaders try desperately to deny it. Nearly 100,000 peo-

ple were detained last month trying to illegally cross our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, imagine if the population of Billings, Montana, was caught crossing the border in just 1 month. That is the crisis our country faces.

Last week, a U.S. district court judge in Billings sentenced a Mexican citizen to prison for possession of 34 pounds of meth with the intent to distribute. That is nearly 125,000 doses. With Montana facing a meth epidemic, we must secure our border and stop the flow of Mexican meth into our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I saw firsthand the crisis on our southern border. Congress has an obligation to act. I have stood with President Trump to secure it. Let's build the wall where feasible. The safety and security of our country and our communities depend on it.

HONORING MUHLAYSIA BOOKER

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Muhlaysia Booker, a courageous 23-year-old Black transgender woman in Dallas who was found fatally shot this weekend.

Muhlaysia's name has been in the news a lot. Recently, she suffered a brutal beating by a group of men who screamed transphobic slurs at her as they assaulted her. The attack was captured on video, and it made you sick to your stomach to see the level of transgender hate that is so strong and prevalent in this country.

Muhlaysia's death is devastating for the Black transgender community in Dallas, but it is also part of a much larger trend that shows the violence, discrimination, and fear that the transgender and LGBTQ communities face on a daily basis.

Deaths in the trans community are underreported, and the adversity they face is on clear display.

The unemployment rate for the Black transgender community is 20 percent, close to four times the national average; 38 percent have lived in poverty, and 42 percent have experienced homelessness.

Even with all the odds stacked against them, Black transgender women like Muhlaysia choose to live their life in truth. They show courage, strength, and great personal sacrifice in the fight for equality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join the House by passing the Equality Act. We must do everything in our power to stop the discrimination and violence in our neighborhoods.

Our brothers and sisters are dying out there. We need the inaction to stop.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ZION LUTHERAN CHURCH IN GROVELAND, FLORIDA

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Zion Lutheran Church in Groveland, Florida, for celebrating 100 years of service to the community.

For the past 100 years, Zion has stood as a shining example to the people of Groveland of what it means to be a Christian. Under Reverend Werley's leadership, the congregation has actively shown God's love through service.

The church regularly provides backpacks and school supplies to four schools in the area, which are then given to students who need them most.

Additionally, many women in the church also operate a knitting ministry, where they knit prayer shawls and blankets for people who are spending time in hospitals and nursing homes. Many of these gifts come with a prayer so that the recipient knows that they are not alone in their time of need.

Beyond these and many other acts of kindness, Zion has consistently spread the good news to the people of Florida. The church has led by example and shown what it means to live like Christ for generations of Floridians.

You may be small in numbers, but you are, indeed, large in spirit.

100 YEARS CELEBRATING WOMEN GETTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, today, over 68 million women participate in elections. This would not be possible without the brave and brilliant suffragettes who never gave up the fight for equal rights.

Tomorrow, we celebrate the 100th anniversary of House passage of an Amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteeing women the right to vote. This historic centennial offers an unparalleled opportunity to commemorate this victorious milestone of the women's suffrage movement.

A vibrant democracy requires that all voices are heard, and when all voices are heard, we have a stronger and better America.

These women fought to be heard and to make our Nation a better place, and, for that, we are forever grateful.

□ 1930

BUDGET DEADLINE MISSED

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it has been 35 days since the deadline for Congress to pass a budget, but the majority party has

done nothing. The American people's government has no plan to rein in spending, while Members of this body are proposing trillions of dollars in new spending.

Families in Missouri live within their means and balance their books every day, and they expect their government to do the same, which is why it is troubling that Members are advocating for the Green New Deal and a government takeover of healthcare without any way to pay for it.

To pay for just these two items alone, we would have to take every penny from every American household, and we would still come up \$20 trillion short. This is why the majority has failed to put forth a budget, because there is simply no way to pay for these wild ideas.

Mr. Speaker, a budget is the primary responsibility of governing, which is why I serve on the Budget Committee.

The Speaker of the House likes to say that a budget is a statement of your values, so what does it say about their party?

MARKING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the passage of the 19th Amendment out of this very Chamber 100 years ago.

As I join with my colleagues to celebrate this historic vote on May 21, I will wear a yellow rose on my lapel. This is reminiscent of a scene in the Tennessee State House.

At that time, one more State was needed to ratify the 19th Amendment. All eyes were on Tennessee.

State Representative Harry T. Burn of Tennessee's Third District donned a red rose signaling his opposition to the pro-suffrage movement. However, after reading a letter from his mother, Ms. Phoebe Ensminger Burn, Representative Burn cast the tie-breaking vote, joining with his colleagues in yellow roses to vote in support of women's suffrage.

The resolution passed. Tennessee became the final State needed to ratify the 19th Amendment.

I will wear a yellow rose in honor of women like Ms. Burn, who demanded to be heard, to honor Members of the 66th Congress who championed change and for the enfranchisement of all American women. Without their voices, our Nation would not be what it is today.

REMEMBERING PIONEERING EFFORTS OF WOMEN 100 YEARS AGO

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anni-

versary of the House passage of the 19th Amendment of the United States Constitution, prohibiting the government from denying the right to vote to citizens on the basis of sex.

In the year 1893, the first attempt to organize the women's suffrage movement in the State of Texas took place in Dallas with the formation of the Texas Equal Rights Association. Twenty-six years later, Texas became the first State in the South to ratify the 19th Amendment.

From raising families to organizing political movements to fighting overseas, our country could not thrive without the influence of so many strong and determined women. It is with great admiration that I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the pioneering efforts of women 100 years ago that are still shaping our Nation today.

RECOGNIZING MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of May as Mental Health Month for the 70th consecutive year.

Unfortunately, throughout our history in the United States, many mental health conditions have been overlooked and often met with rejection, shame, and more. But mental health conditions truly touch us all. Between family members and friends, we all are either affected ourselves or we know someone with a mental health condition.

Currently, 46.6 million adults in the U.S. have a mental health condition. Suicide is the 10th leading cause of death in the U.S., and 90 percent of those who die by suicide have an underlying mental illness revealed by psychological autopsy.

Less than half of adults in the U.S. are receiving adequate treatment for mental health.

During the month of May, I encourage everyone to get a mental health checkup and to remember that your mental health is as important as your physical health.

Please know, you are not alone, and it is okay to open up and share what you are going through.

STRONGER CAPTA TO HELP PROTECT ABUSED, NEGLECTED CHILDREN

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the importance of H.R. 2480, the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, which we just passed in the House with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Although we are facing challenging times and political divide in our Nation, one thing we can absolutely agree on is this: Child abuse and neglect are heartbreaking, immoral, and simply inexcusable.

As many of you know, the opioid epidemic has devastated families and communities across our country, which has been a major factor in the recent uptick in child abuse and neglect cases.

H.R. 2480 assists States in addressing this recent increase in child neglect by improving data collaboration between States, strengthening accountability, supporting evidence-based services, and developing best practices for reducing child neglect linked to parental substance abuse.

Most importantly, it provides parents with parental education and leadership skills developed to help keep them and their families safe and together.

We have a duty to ensure that American children are protected from maltreatment and neglect, and the Stronger Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act sets us on the right path to do so.

CELEBRATING CENTENNIAL OF SECURING WOMEN'S RIGHT TO VOTE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate the centennial of the House passing an amendment granting women the right to vote in all States in this country.

One hundred years ago, the unrelenting efforts of women suffragists over the course of a 72-year campaign paid off in the passage of the 19th Amendment.

For example, the first woman to hold Federal office, Republican Representative Jeannette Rankin of Montana, was actually elected 3 years before women were allowed to vote at the Federal level in all the States at the time. She went on to introduce legislation similar to what would eventually become the 19th Amendment.

My home State Republican Senator, Aaron Sargent from California, introduced the first legislation to amend the Constitution and grant women the right to vote. It failed on the Senate floor, but it represented the beginning of an unstoppable movement that culminated in the ratification of the 19th Amendment in August 1920.

This Chamber is where it all began. I am proud to be standing here today and joining my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to celebrate the 100th anniversary of this great victory for women and the values of our Republic.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: HONORING JUDGE DAMON J. KEITH, DISCUSSING ROLLBACK OF SAFETY NET PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to co-anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents we represent, and all Americans.

Tonight, we will discuss and honor the legacy of Judge Damon J. Keith from Detroit, Michigan, and discuss, as well, this administration's, President Trump's, recent attempts to roll back safety net programs.

Damon Keith, a Federal judge in the Midwest whose rulings championed equality and civil rights, notably in a landmark Supreme Court decision striking down Nixon administration wiretapping in domestic security cases without a court order, died April 28 of this year in Detroit, Michigan. He was 96 years old.

In one of the Federal judiciary's longest and most prolific careers, Judge Keith was a fountainhead of regional rulings with national implications. He attacked racial segregation in education, housing, and employment; conservative efforts to limit African American voting; and after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, secret hearings to deport hundreds of immigrants deemed suspicious.

Judge Keith's tenure spanned more than a half century, first as President Lyndon B. Johnson's choice for a district court judgeship in Detroit, with jurisdiction in eastern Michigan, and then as President Jimmy Carter's selection for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, presiding in Cincinnati over cases arising in Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, and Tennessee.

In a blistering 2016 dissent in an Ohio case that restricted early and absentee voting, Judge Keith, even in the later years, worked tirelessly and accused two circuit court colleagues of scorning African American voters and the memory of Black people slain in the struggle for voting rights.

In a, frankly, emotional rebuke, he incorporated into his opinion photo-

graphs and biographies of 36 such victims, including the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. "By denying the most vulnerable the right to vote, the majority shuts minorities out of our political process. . . . The unfettered right to vote is the bedrock of a free and democratic society. Without it, such a society cannot stand."

One of America's oldest Federal jurists, Mr. Keith served in the segregated Army in World War II, cleaned bathrooms at the Detroit News, attended historically Black undergraduate and law schools, and witnessed deadly riots in Detroit in 1967.

□ 1945

My colleagues are here with me today to discuss his legacy and the work of Judge Keith, not just for African Americans, but for the American people.

I am happy to be coanchored in the CBC Special Order by my friend and colleague from Nevada, STEVEN HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, Congresswoman PLASKETT, and I am very honored to be able to join with her as one of the coanchors for the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour.

Tonight, as my colleague indicated, we are here to honor the life and legacy of a civil rights icon, the honorable Judge Damon Keith, who was also a member of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated.

Judge Keith was born on July 4, 1922, the grandson of slaves, who went on to become an internationally revered champion of justice. Judge Keith has vigorously enforced the Nation's civil rights laws, most notably in the areas of employment and education.

In *Stamps v. Detroit Edison Company*, Judge Keith ruled the Detroit Edison Company had practiced systemic racial discrimination, resulting in fines against the company of \$4 million and against the employee union of \$250,000. He ordered the company to institute an aggressive affirmative action program.

In 2016, Judge Keith wrote a searing dissent when an appeals panel ruled that Ohio's voting rights laws did not discriminate against minorities by restricting early and absentee ballots. He said in that dissent: "The birth of this Nation was founded upon the radical principle that we, as a people, would govern ourselves. And voting is the ultimate expression of self-government. Instead of making it easier for all persons, unrestrained and unfettered, to exercise this fundamental right to vote, legislators are making it harder."

He concluded by saying: "With every gain in equality, there is often an equally robust and reactive retrenchment. We must never forget that constant dialectical tension. For every action, there is a reaction. The majority's decision is a fateful reminder that we can never fool ourselves into believing that we have arrived as a nation."

That is a statement that is ever so true even today.

Judge Keith recalled many of the civil rights activists and innocent children who were slain to make sure minorities had access to the voting polls.

They include: Emmett Till, Herbert Lee, Medgar Evers, Jimmie Lee Jackson, Benjamin Brown, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the four little girls who were, sadly, killed in the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing in Birmingham, Alabama.

Judge Keith fought on their behalf during his tenure on this Federal court.

Some of his other rulings had a profound impact on American life as well, the biggest being his decision that prohibited the Nixon administration from warrantless wiretapping in domestic security cases.

He ordered the Nixon Justice Department to end all wiretapping that was not approved by the courts. This was in the midst of the Nixon administration's attempt to go after radicals accused of conspiring to bomb a CIA office in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He stated it violated the Constitution's Fourth Amendment rights from "unreasonable searches and seizures."

The Nixon administration appealed his ruling, and the Supreme Court, with a vote of 8-0, rejected the administration's claim of constitutional authority to protect the Nation from internal subversion by wiretapping dangerous radicals without court warrants.

Along with this case, he ruled in favor of integration of the Detroit Police Department and made the decision that deportation hearings could not be held in secret after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

He has left an indelible mark on the judiciary. Judge Keith has received over 40 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across the country and is the recipient of numerous awards. He was awarded the Spingarn Medal from the NAACP, and the Edward J. Devitt Distinguished Service to Justice Award, the highest award that can be bestowed on a member of the Federal judiciary.

Judge Keith fought on all of our behalf to make this country more just, fair, and less discriminatory.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), my colleague.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring Judge Damon J. Keith, who passed away last month.

The grandson of slaves, Judge Keith served more than 50 years on the Federal bench, where he consistently ruled to uphold civil rights and civil liberties.

Judge Keith leaves behind a legacy of fostering equal opportunity and fighting for the little guy. Unfortunately, this legacy is under threat.

The Trump administration is proposing yet another idea that will hurt

working families. The administration wants to change the way poverty is measured to artificially reduce the number of people who are considered poor. That means fewer people will be eligible for programs like SNAP and WIC and Medicaid.

I am disappointed, but I am not surprised. The latest attempt to gut the social safety net just goes to show how out of touch this administration is with the needs of everyday Americans.

This administration has proposed cutting nutrition benefits for an estimated 755,000 people just because they cannot find jobs. They have threatened to take money away from the Pell Grant Program that provides a pathway to higher education for millions of low-income students.

The President has consistently tried to cut funding for essential programs like Medicaid, public housing, Head Start, and more. And while passing a tax cut to benefit corporations and millionaires, the little people have been left out.

We need serious solutions to combat income inequality. Pretending that poor people don't exist is not the solution at all. Instead of changing the way we measure poverty, we need to strengthen programs that help people who are struggling.

We need to raise the minimum wage. We need a living wage. Working hard is not enough if you don't make enough.

We need to expand access to quality nutrition and housing, and we need to make sure that students have equal access to higher education.

I am proud to stand tonight with my colleagues against the administration's ongoing attacks on working people and families and so proud to praise and honor Judge Damon J. Keith, who worked so hard to preserve our rights.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing our efforts to make sure that working families and low-income Americans have access to all of the services that they need.

Ms. PLASKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ADAMS for her leadership on these issues and her understanding of the dire impacts that the Trump administration's proposed rule change would mean on working families and the poor.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), the Congressman and my good friend, whom I have the honor to serve with on the Ways and Means Committee. He is fighting for the people of his district in Philadelphia.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their leadership and vision for leading this effort, under the leadership of Congresswoman BASS.

I think, as the gentleman from Nevada has demonstrated along with my other colleague from the great Virgin Islands, they both have shown the kind of leadership that is extremely essential.

The passing of a civil rights icon like Judge Damon Keith is also a time to focus on one of his priorities: helping future generations to succeed. This is also a priority of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Unfortunately, it has not been a priority of the occupant of the White House.

In August 2016, he asked African Americans: What the hell do you have to lose? It has been crystal clear in the last few years that African Americans of all ages have a lot to lose as long as Donald Trump is in the White House. The latest example of this is the Trump administration's plan to strip Medicare, food assistance, and other basics away from hundreds of thousands of working-class Americans.

They are trying to change how the Census measures poverty so they can count fewer people as poor. As costs go up each year, the fake Trump poverty line will take basic benefits away: SNAP, WIC, Head Start, school lunches, legal services, and even tax credits under the Affordable Care Act that help working people to get healthcare.

It is basically a backdoor tax increase for those who can afford it least. It is an outrageous sequel to the tax cut that Trump and the Republicans gave to millionaires and big corporations. It is classic Trump: Don't actually solve the problem; just pretend that it doesn't exist anymore.

I stand with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in opposing the Trump poverty line change. I stand with all of those who did not inherit millions of dollars from a parent like the President did.

Let us honor the work of Judge Keith and others like him by renewing our commitment to help lift our future generations. We can do this by making college affordable again, raising the minimum wage, and preserving the safety net. Each of these proposals will go a long way toward repairing the ladders of opportunity and making this a more just society.

This dedication today to Justice Damon Keith is our commitment as the Congressional Black Caucus to raise him up in his legacy that he has done for all of us in this country.

It is a real honor as one member of this body, the Congressional Black Caucus, that I stand here today to join my colleagues and show the kind of support for what Justice Keith demonstrated to all of us.

So I am here to lend my voice, to make it clear that this is not acceptable, retreating on the people, particularly African Americans.

Since the President made that statement in August of 2016—and he made it in the city of Philadelphia—it is clear to me that this is not acceptable. Mr. Speaker, we, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, will not stand for this.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from Philadelphia who always stands

up for the rights of the working class of those in cities and elsewhere who are struggling, the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him so much for the work he is doing and for trying to maintain working neighborhoods in our many cities that are, through so much of these rule changes, so much of these executive orders, the ones who are being most affected.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is from the city of Newark, New Jersey, our good friend, my good friend, and champion as well, of those in the urban areas, as well as to others. He has recently taken on issues related to healthcare.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleagues, Delegate Plaskett and Congressman HORSFORD for hosting tonight's Special Order hour on Judge Keith's legacy and the Trump administration's recent attempts to roll back the social safety nets in our country.

Judge Keith's legacy cannot be overstated. He was an icon for African Americans and, indeed, all Americans. He was a Black pioneer in the legal field whose rulings took on Presidents from Richard Nixon to George W. Bush. For 60 years he sat on the Federal bench and consistently ruled in favor of expansive civil rights in this country. It is because of Judge Keith and others like him that thousands of young Black people have entered the legal profession and rose to the top.

He was a judge who always extended a hand down to help lift others up. That is the American way, and it is worth fighting for. Sadly, we live in a time when people in power don't always help uplift others. We have a President who is doing his best to beat down everyone who doesn't think, look, or vote like him.

Now we see that the President has set his sights on America's neediest people. He and his cronies are peddling a myth that the vulnerable people who rely on our social safety net are lazy folks who just want a government handout.

But we know that is not true. Some people just need a hand up every once in a while. The Trump administration's attempts to roll back the social safety net is a life-and-death matter for thousands of Americans who struggle to make ends meet. We live in an unpredictable world. One day you can be on top, but the next day you might be knocked down. The social safety net is our country's promise that we will help people get back up again.

Sometimes people need a little help buying food, or getting healthcare, or just scraping by. There is nothing wrong with that. We all know someone who has had hard times, and when we are having a good time, we need to look out for each other. That is the American way.

I have said this before but let me say it again: I have never met a person who

wakes up in the morning and says: "I want to be poor today." That is just not reality. And let me add this: I have never met a person who wakes up at 5 a.m. to go to her first job; comes home at 1 p.m. to take a nap; and heads out to her second job at 4 p.m., yet still lives paycheck to paycheck.

I never knew anyone that said: "I like the struggle. I like the difficulty. I like being poor." That person does not exist. That is just not how the world works.

Social safety net programs like SNAP, Medicaid, and housing assistance are supplements that help people struggle just a little bit less. Yet, my colleagues across the aisle and their friends in the White House keep pushing a false narrative that people who rely on government assistance to make ends meet are freeloaders or take government handouts and buy drugs. The 45th President keeps pushing his callous, immoral narrative in order to tear apart our social safety net.

In my district, 17.9 percent of the households rely on SNAP to feed their families. They aren't lazy. They aren't addicts. They are hardworking people; some of them with two or three jobs just trying to make ends meet.

And now the President is trying to define them out of existence. According to reports, his administration wants to change how inflation is calculated in the official poverty measure in order to define poverty out of existence and deny people access to our social safety net.

Well, Mr. President, that is not going to work for the American people. The United States Government should be making it easier for Americans to maintain a decent standard of living. The fact of the matter is that 70 percent of Americans rely on at least one Federal program at some point in time in their lives. The President's focus on ripping apart our social safety net with heartless cuts is wrong, it is immoral, and it is shameful.

It isn't about cleaning up waste, fraud, or abuse. It is about pulling the rug out from under people. Programs like SNAP are not just some unlimited handout for people who are sitting at home doing nothing.

Currently, 44 percent of the people who use SNAP have at least one person in the family working. But even though they are working, they might make minimum wage and are still below the poverty line.

When it comes to families with children who are on SNAP, more than half of them bring home wages. But the problem is, their income isn't enough to actually live on. So when the self-proclaimed billionaire in the White House talks about making people who receive SNAP benefits work or defining poverty out of existence, he is just repeating the same old fake news that the Republican Party has peddled for decades.

This is unacceptable, and as a Member of Congress, I am here to serve the

people in my communities, and that means all the people. We have to protect our most vulnerable and those in need. Let us end the administration's war on the working poor and help make their lives better for all of our constituents.

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has 33 minutes remaining.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, you can see we have had a lively discussion in recognition of Federal Judge Damon Keith. I would like include in the RECORD an article on his obituary from The New York Times dated April 28 of 2019.

[From the New York Times, April 28, 2019]

DAMON KEITH, FEDERAL JUDGE WHO CHAMPIONED CIVIL RIGHTS, DIES AT 96

(By Robert D. McFadden)

Damon Keith, a federal judge in the Midwest whose rulings championed equality and civil rights, notably in a landmark Supreme Court decision striking down Nixon administration wiretapping in domestic security cases without a court order, died on Sunday in Detroit. He was 96.

His death was confirmed by his daughter, Debbie Keith.

In one of the federal judiciary's longest and most prolific careers, Judge Keith, a Democrat, was a fountainhead of regional rulings with national implications. He attacked racial segregation in education, housing and employment; conservative efforts to limit African-American voting; and, after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, secret hearings to deport hundreds of immigrants deemed suspicious.

Judge Keith's tenure spanned more than a half-century, first as President Lyndon B. Johnson's choice for a district court judgeship in Detroit, with jurisdiction in Eastern Michigan (1967-1977), then as President Jimmy Carter's selection for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, presiding in Cincinnati over cases arising in Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan and Tennessee.

In a blistering 2016 dissent in an Ohio case that restricted early and absentee voting, Judge Keith accused two Circuit Court colleagues of scorning African-American voters and the memory of black people slain in the struggle for voting rights. In a frankly emotional rebuke, he incorporated into his opinion photographs and biographies of 36 such victims, including the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

"By denying the most vulnerable the right to vote, the majority shuts minorities out of our political process," he wrote. "The unfettered right to vote is the bedrock of a free and democratic society. Without it, such a society cannot stand."

One of America's oldest federal jurists, Mr. Keith served in the segregated Army in World War II, cleaned bathrooms at The Detroit News, attended historically black undergraduate and law schools and witnessed deadly riots in Detroit in 1967.

In the most prominent case of his tenure, Judge Keith ordered the Nixon Justice Department in 1971 to halt wiretapping without court orders in its zeal to prosecute radicals accused of conspiring to bomb a Central Intelligence Agency office in Ann Arbor, Mich.

As grounds, he cited the Constitution's Fourth Amendment freedoms from "unreasonable searches and seizures."

After the Sixth Circuit Court upheld Judge Keith's decision, the Nixon administration appealed to the Supreme Court. At stake, potentially, were warrantless wiretaps in many prosecutions that Attorney General John N. Mitchell had brought against antiwar activists and other opponents of administration policies.

The high court, by 8-0, rejected the government's claim of constitutional authority to protect the nation from internal subversion by wiretapping "dangerous" radicals without court warrants. Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., who wrote the opinion, leaned heavily on the threat to free speech that he saw in the unbridled government wiretapping of dissenters.

The American Civil Liberties Union said: "If this claim had been upheld, there would have been virtually no limits to the range of governmental intrusion on the liberty that would have been implicitly authorized once the government invoked the talisman of 'national security.'"

In another case, the Supreme Court declined to review Judge Keith's order to bus 8,700 of 23,000 students to desegregate public schools in Pontiac, Mich. His 1971 order, one of the first of its kind in the North, led to extensive busing, attacks on school buses, death threats against the judge and the convictions of Ku Klux Klansmen for dynamiting 10 school buses.

But five years after Pontiac's busing began, The New York Times reported that bitter feelings that had all but paralyzed the school district had faded, and that busing had become a fact of life. "Both blacks and whites are learning to understand each other better, to fear and distrust each other less, and to see individuals as individuals," the report said.

In 1973, a year before Nixon resigned in the Watergate scandal, Judge Keith ordered the government to disclose whether it had used sabotage, agents provocateurs and "other espionage activities," including a burglary at a law office, to make its case against militants known as the Weathermen. They were accused of plotting a campaign of bombing and terrorism.

Later, government lawyers appeared in Judge Keith's court and withdrew their case against the Weathermen rather than undergo a hearing on how their evidence had been obtained. Defense lawyers said the Nixon administration had plotted its own campaign of domestic intelligence-gathering operations, including breaking and entering and wiretapping to foster a "malicious prosecution."

In 1979, Judge Keith and the Sixth Circuit upheld the Detroit Police Department's affirmative action program. A lieutenants and sergeants group had sued to overturn the five-year-old program, saying that white officers had been unjustly passed over for promotion. But Judge Keith wrote that promotion tests had been slanted against blacks, and that affirmative action "undoes years of discrimination."

And in 2002, the Sixth Circuit Court held that the Bush administration had violated the First Amendment freedoms of speech and the press by conducting hundreds of secret hearings to deport immigrants suspected of ties to terrorism. Other courts issued contradictory rulings, and the secret hearings went on for some time. But the case yielded one of Judge Keith's more memorable opinions.

"Democracy dies behind closed doors," he wrote.

Damon Jerome Keith was born in Detroit on July 4, 1922, the youngest of six children

of Perry and Annie (Williams) Keith, who had migrated from Georgia. Mr. Keith worked at the Ford Motor Company's River Rouge plant for \$5 a day. Damon and his siblings, Luther, Perry, Napoleon, Marie and Annie, grew up in poverty. For a time during the Depression, the family received welfare assistance.

Mr. Keith graduated from Northwestern High School in 1939. At West Virginia State College, he waited on tables and cleaned a chapel and the college president's house to pay his way. He earned a bachelor's degree in 1943. Drafted into the wartime Army, he served in Europe in a black unit largely assigned to kitchen duties. He was discharged as a sergeant in 1946.

He received his juris doctor in 1949 at the Howard University Law School, where his mentors included Thurgood Marshall, the future first black justice of the Supreme Court, and William Hastie, the nation's first black federal judge. Mr. Keith received a master of laws degree at Wayne State University in 1956.

In 1953, he married Rachel Boone, a prominent doctor in Detroit. She died in 2007. Besides his daughter Debbie, survivors include two other daughters, Cecile Keith Brown and Gilda Keith, and two granddaughters.

In 1964, Mr. Keith helped founded one of Detroit's first African-American law firms and was named co-chairman of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Three years later, he became a federal judge. He was chief judge for Eastern Michigan from 1975 to 1977, when he joined the Sixth Circuit Court. In 1995, he assumed senior status on the appellate court, with a reduced caseload.

A lifelong Detroit resident, Mr. Keith received some 40 honorary doctorates and was showered with honors, including the Spingarn Medal of the N.A.A.C.P. and the federal judiciary's Edward J. Devitt Award.

He was the subject of a 2016 Jesse Nesser documentary, "Walk with Me: The Trials of Damon J. Keith." One highlight: When he was 69, one of the nation's most distinguished jurists and national chairman of a Williamsburg, Va., judicial conference on the Constitution's Bicentennial, he stepped outside the hotel during a break—and was taken for a parking attendant.

"A white man drove up," he told a crowd screening the film at Howard University, "and said, 'Boy, park my car.'"

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, in looking at those things that this Federal judge fought for while he was alive, I think it is a great segue into the other discussion that the Congressional Black Caucus has been engaged in in this hour, and that is poverty. Many of the communities that this judge was fighting for were poor communities.

Unfortunately, at this day and age, it is still primarily people of color who disproportionately are affected by poverty. But the Trump administration is on the verge of making an end run around Congress now, attempting to slash the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by fiat.

The latest effort was a proposed rule that would open for public comments until April 10. This rule would restrict SNAP eligibility by limiting States' flexibility to help the jobless or underemployed workers in struggling regions. By the administration's own estimate, enacting this rule would substantially increase hunger and hardship, stripping at least 755,000 Ameri-

cans of food assistance, though other estimates suggest it could be as much as 1 million individuals and cut SNAP by \$15 billion, slashing more than 178,000 jobs over the coming decade.

In the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats had a long, protracted conference on the farm bill, much of it related to SNAP. Much of it was because of discussions about ensuring that there is a safety net for those who regularly without it would go hungry.

We see that this administration did not want to take what Congress ruled on—what the President even signed—and is now, through his own executive order, attempting to change the law. The administration's most recent attempt to cut SNAP comes on the heels of President Donald Trump's failed attempt to achieve similar SNAP cuts in that farm bill; cuts that Congress rejected on a bipartisan basis.

This proposed rule is not just cruel. It is also bad policy. Making people hungrier will not help them find work any faster. It will only kick underemployment and unemployment workers when they are down.

Most working-age SNAP participants who are not receiving disability benefits are working, but they are often in unstable jobs with volatile schedules, low wages, making them especially likely to be affected by the rule.

I want to talk about how this is going to affect rural communities. In 2010, the U.S. Census found that 22 percent of the population in the Virgin Islands lives in poverty. Fifty percent of those living under the poverty level were families led by single mothers. The Congressional Research Service discovered that on average, children living in female-headed families were more likely to live in poverty than children living in two-parent households.

Given that 76 percent of rural adults report that good jobs are scarce in their area, it is not as if they are not looking. The jobs are simply not there. Rural communities like mine in the Virgin Islands will be among the hardest hit by the President's proposed rule, as it will tie States' hands and remove the flexibility they need to help residents of high unemployment areas put food on the table.

Indeed, while the urban areas experienced a net gain of 3.6 million jobs from 2007 to 2015, rural areas lost 400,000 jobs during that same time, meaning that many rural areas have struggled to recover still from the Great Recession.

Moreover, rural populations already face additional barriers to work. For example, lack of access to broadband is impeding the growth of rural economies, hampering total employment growth, and the opening of new businesses. Additionally, rural economies have less industrial diversity than urban areas and, in some communities, in particular, the departure of a central employer has led to tremendous job loss.

In the Virgin Islands, one of the world's largest refineries based in the Virgin Islands on St. Croix shut down in 2012, driving a decrease in jobs. At the time of the shutdown, the unemployment skyrocketed to 18 percent. In the same year, refined petroleum exports for the U.S. plummeted by 90 percent.

Given these challenges, States need more flexibility, not less, in order to decide how best to protect and invest in rural areas, as the administration's economic policies have not decreased the widening urban and rural divide. I believe that my coanchor, as well, has examples how poverty is affecting Americans; not just African Americans.

□ 2015

The purpose of the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour is not solely to talk about African Americans but to really champion the issues of those Americans who do not often have a voice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) to discuss this further.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for yielding.

This is a very serious and important issue that we are talking about tonight. I really want to provide the context to what got us to this point where the Trump administration is now trying to balance the budget on the backs of working people: the poor, seniors, children, and needy families.

The President and Republicans in Congress during the last Congress passed the so-called Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. What that Tax Cuts and Jobs Act actually did was add \$1.5 trillion to our deficit. The tax cuts that were so-called were supposed to help the working poor. Eighty-three percent of the benefit from those tax cuts went to 1 percent of the wealthiest, the well-connected, and the powerful. Now, to balance the budget, they are proposing these draconian measures—cuts and revisions—on our budget, and they are targeting the poor, those who are relying, as my colleague said, on important programs such as SNAP, Head Start funding, the Children's Health Insurance Program, the National School Lunch Program, and other anti-poverty programs.

Let me talk to you for a moment, Mr. Speaker, about what these cuts mean to the people in my home State of Nevada. Nearly 434,000 Nevadans would be at risk of losing their SNAP benefits. SNAP benefits help families put food on the table and also help contribute to our local economy because they are buying those groceries at our local grocery stores. They are ensuring that we keep workers working at our local grocery stores.

The proposed rule would impact Nevadans, by putting 633,000 Nevadans at risk of being kicked off of Medicaid.

Since we have adopted the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansion in my home State of Nevada in 2008, we have cut the rate of uninsured in half. Prior to the Affordable Care Act and the Medicaid expansion, our uninsured rate among children was over 30 percent. Now it is below 14 percent and continuing to decline. This administration wants to take us backward. We won't go backward.

Over 3,000 young toddlers in Nevada would be at risk of being removed from the Early Head Start and Head Start programs. That is unconscionable to me because the Acelero program that helps administer Head Start in my district already has a waiting list. There are already families who can't get into the program because there is not adequate funding based on this administration's lack of priorities around the poor.

So while this rule may seem mundane to some, the impact on families is real. So we are bringing attention to this issue so the voters and constituents across the United States can have a voice in this process. The rule that the President is proposing to make has a 45-day window for the American public to comment on just how harmful this rule would be. The deadline to submit comments is June 21 of this year, and I would encourage all of the public to make sure that their voices are being heard.

So just to underline again, the Trump administration has proposed a rule that would recalculate how we measure poverty, a move that would more than likely kick people off of certain Federal programs that are meant to assist poor and low-income families.

So why would they do that?

Because they have targeted the working poor in order to balance the budget to pay for the tax cuts that they gave to big corporations, the wealthy, and the well-connected.

The administration is considering switching to a different inflation measure that rises more slowly, a change that over time would make it harder to qualify for assistance. It is already hard enough for many constituents in my district to receive aid.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to you about the waiting list of families at Acelero Head Start program. It is right there on the corner of Martin Luther King and Carey in my district. I have talked to the parents at that program, and those families that are in it depend on the Head Start program in order to give their children a good head start and be able to prepare them for school. But without it, they would be left without adequate childcare and without adequate support for their families.

The Children's Health Insurance Program is something that I had worked on when I was in the State senate. This is not a partisan issue. In fact, many of my colleagues on the other side have supported funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, but the proposed Trump administration rule

that would recalculate how we measure poverty would actually impact 633,000 Nevadans who would be kicked off of Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program.

So I would ask my colleagues on the other side why they would support the administration impacting their constituents in this way?

It is not just the constituents in my district. It is not just the constituents in Delegate PLASKETT's district. Every Member of this body has constituents who would be negatively impacted if this rule by the Trump administration is enacted.

By allowing for these additional substitutions, chained CPI, which is the measurement by which the administration is looking to measure poverty, shows a slower rate of inflation. But for many families who are already choosing between paying the rent and buying food, they are already living as frugally as possible.

Time and time again, the Trump administration has attacked programs that help struggling American families put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads. But they ran and passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. They did it in 51 days without one hearing, and now there are all these unintended consequences from that measure that was passed in the previous Congress, and they want to come back here and balance the budget on the backs of the poor. We say, No.

The Department of Education has said that more than 1 million schoolchildren were homeless in the 2016–2017 school year. One million schoolchildren in America are homeless, and this administration wants to deny them health insurance coverage under Medicaid and a school lunch during the school day?

The Department of Agriculture said that 15 million households faced food insecurity in 2017, meaning that they experienced difficulty affording food, and this administration—the Trump administration—wants to pass a rule that would recalculate how we measure poverty in order to deny more children and families receiving this care. Despite that, 70 percent of voters indicated that they had experienced at least one form of economic hardship last year—70 percent. But we can find ways to give tax cuts to big corporations, to the wealthy, and to the well-connected.

The President's proposed rule would be harmful. It is misguided and unfair to so many Nevada families and families all across the country. Again, I would urge the public to write their Member of Congress and ask them what they are doing to protect the public on this issue. After the public has written their Member, they should submit their comment before the June 21 date to the administration so that we can rescind this proposed rule and protect working families and the poor.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the gentleman that his remarks

were very enlightening and thoughtful. The logic of this administration and what they are thinking just does not make sense. In the end, it is going to cost us more. As you said, how is denying 1 million children lunch benefiting us as a country?

Mr. HORSFORD. I am at a loss for words how we choose to balance the budget on 1 million homeless children, but find a way to give tax cuts to the wealthy. We added \$1.5 trillion to our Federal deficit, but now we have 1 million homeless children in last year's school year whom we are struggling to make sure they get adequate support in their schools and a nutritious meal. And this administration wants to deny them that by this rule change.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, if you want to be calculating about it, how is it helpful to us in the long run?

If you don't want to do it out of Christian goodness, out of the depths of humanity, then think about the long-term ramifications. Think about what it does to us to have 1 million children not being fed properly, not being able to think in a classroom, to be able to function, and to be able to do their work.

What will that do to us 10 years from now?

How many dropouts will there be?

How many young people will be unable to function, to be able to read and write, and to be able to find a job?

That will cost us, I am sure, entirely more money.

Mr. HORSFORD. We have to have a more balanced discussion in this body. I believe that we need to be competitive, and we need to make sure that we are doing things to help incentivize our private sector. There is a way to do that, but, unfortunately, our colleagues took the approach to ram this measure through in 51 days with not one hearing. They didn't discuss the impacts, and none of the issues that we are now bringing forward on how the working poor, the middle class, and those who are struggling and aspiring to be part of the middle class are being negatively impacted by these policies.

So there is a direct correlation. We can't just talk about the budget or the cuts to the budget that this administration is making without talking about what this administration and Republicans in Congress did last Congress by adding \$1.5 trillion to our Federal deficit. It is not just these Federal programs that we are talking about tonight. It is Medicare, it is Social Security, and it is the Affordable Care Act. I am sure we will have a Special Order on those topics as well, but we wanted to bring attention to this tonight, because we only have 45 days for the public to get their comments in to, hopefully, reverse this rule so that it won't go into effect.

Ms. PLASKETT. In the last Congress, and again in this one, I am a member of the Agriculture Committee. I recall that when that farm bill initially was presented, the ranking member at that

time and now the chair, COLLIN PETERSON, and many of the Democrats were aghast that we weren't going to have hearings, that there wasn't going to be a markup, and that there wasn't going to be discussion on the farm bill which contains essential nutrition programs in there. It wasn't until it got to the Senate that we were able to have in conference a discussion about SNAP because the Republicans over here decided that that was not important. They didn't want to fund it, they didn't want to take care of children, and they didn't want to take care of families of those with disabilities and of veterans who rely on SNAP programs, on supplemental nutrition programs. It wasn't until we got to conference that that happened.

The President signed the farm bill, and lo and behold, here comes the boomerang where he is trying to ram this through by executive order and by proposed rule changes to the law.

People in this law it doesn't just affect, and if you are not interested in families that are single-parent families, female-run families, African American families, what about those veterans who are affected?

What about those with disabilities?

The proposed rule purports to apply only to able-bodied adults without dependents. But what people are unaware of is that under the rule, 11 million people with disabilities who receive SNAP assistance could lose that assistance under the rule as people who face limited work capacity due to disability or poor health are regularly misclassified as able-bodied for the purpose of SNAP.

□ 2030

That means those individuals between the ages of 18 and 59 who have at least one physical, functional, or working limitation and are not counted as disabled under SNAP may, in fact, be affected. So this is cutting across so many individuals.

Mr. HORSFORD. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. There was a recent article that showed many of the workers of large employers who don't pay a livable wage are on SNAP benefits. These are people who are working, but because they are not being paid an adequate wage, they are eligible for SNAP benefits.

On top of that, based on the rule change and the discussion the gentleman just outlined, 11 million could lose their benefits. These are people, some of whom are working but because employers aren't willing to pay them a living wage, they are on benefits, Federal benefits, being subsidized by the Federal Government.

Either we need these employers to step up and give America a raise so they don't have to be on SNAP benefits or we need this administration to un-

derstand that balancing the budget on the working poor isn't the solution.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman talks about the working poor, I think about those individuals in the Virgin Islands where we have limited jobs. Many of these individuals have jobs in government.

You have an individual who is the head of a house, a husband-and-wife house, making \$20,000—three children, a wife—trying to make ends meet off that kind of salary. They qualify, as we now have it functioning, for assistance for their family—for Medicaid, in some instances. But this administration is trying to take that away.

Are they going to take it away from those people who are doing what they say they are supposed to do? They are out there working as best they can. They are trying to take care of their families. This Congress has provided a safety net to them, and now we are going to strip that away.

This is untenable, and this has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of Mr. HORSFORD the timeframe that individuals have to send a letter to their Member of Congress, to send a letter to this administration to let them know what their thoughts are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, the comment period for the American public for this proposed rule by the administration ends on June 21.

The Trump administration floated this proposal through what is called a request for comment, essentially a request for the public to provide information and views to the Federal Government on this potential change. They are expecting them not to know that this is happening.

This administration presented no research on how low-income families' costs for basic necessities has changed over time, nor did they provide information on the implications of changing the poverty line for individuals' and families' access to needed assistance.

That is why tonight's Special Order was so important and timely, for us to bring awareness to this. I don't know how many Members of this body know that the administration is doing this.

Again, I would ask my colleagues on the other side, who have constituents just like we do who will be impacted, whether they support this administration in this proposed rule change that will take away fundamental benefits from their constituents, just like it will ours.

This is not a handout. This is a hand up. It is a hand up in order to help individuals bridge, if you will, while they are going through difficult times.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I think people don't understand that SNAP benefits represent \$1.40 per person, per meal—\$1.40. I can't get a cup of coffee in Washington, D.C., with \$1.40, but that is the benefit we are giving per person, per meal, for SNAP benefits.

We should not be talking about cuts to SNAP. We should be talking about how to increase this benefit to the American people, to American children, to our elders, to veterans who are relying on this.

Something must be done. As the Congressional Black Caucus, we are here to raise the alarm.

Raising the Federal minimum wage would save, even if we raised it to \$12 an hour, \$53 billion over the next 10 years, nearly four times as much as the proposed rule, by ensuring that workers earn more so that they are better able to afford food, instead of punishing labor market struggles with hunger, as the gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for any additional thoughts he may have as we close out this Special Order hour, and I thank the American people for listening.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD information from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities titled “Trump Administration Floating Changes to Poverty Measure That Would Reduce or Eliminate Assistance to Millions of Low-Income Americans.”

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Tuesday, May 7, 2019]

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION FLOATING CHANGES TO POVERTY MEASURE THAT WOULD REDUCE OR ELIMINATE ASSISTANCE TO MILLIONS OF LOWER-INCOME AMERICANS

(Statement by Sharon Parrott, Senior Fellow and Senior Counselor)

The Trump Administration yesterday floated a proposal to use a lower measure of inflation when adjusting the poverty line each year. Consistent with other policies the Administration has pursued, this policy would over time cut or take away entirely food assistance, health, and other forms of basic assistance from millions of people who struggle to put food on the table, keep a roof over their heads, and see a doctor when they need to. The reductions in assistance that this proposal would produce stand in stark contrast to the Administration’s 2017 tax law, which conferred large new benefits on the highest-income households.

If the poverty line is altered in this fashion, fewer individuals and families will qualify over time for various forms of assistance, including many who work hard but are paid low wages. That’s because using a lower measure of inflation like the chained CPI to adjust the poverty line each year would make the eligibility thresholds for various programs that serve people in need lower and lower over time, compared with what the thresholds otherwise would be. This, in turn, would lower the income eligibility limits for programs like SNAP (formerly known as food stamps) and Medicaid, which are tied to the federal poverty line. It also would reduce the Affordable Care Act’s (ACA) premium tax credits—and thereby increase the out-of-pocket premium charges faced by millions of people who purchase health insurance through the ACA marketplaces.

The notion that the nation does too much to help struggling families stands in contrast to a broad set of data. For example, even with our current poverty line and set of supports, the Department of Education says that more 1 million school children were

homeless in the 2016-2017 school year, and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) says that 15 million households faced food insecurity in 2017, meaning that they experienced difficulty affording food.

This proposal is entirely discretionary on the part of the Administration. No statute or regulation requires it to alter the methodology for updating the poverty line. Rather, the Administration is choosing to consider a policy that would weaken basic assistance programs and thereby increase hardship.

The Administration is considering using a lower inflation measure to adjust the poverty line while wholly ignoring other questions about the adequacy of the poverty line as a measure of whether households can meet basic needs. And, it has failed to put forward evidence about whether the chained CPI itself accurately captures changes in the cost of living for low-income households.

Indeed, the issue of what measure to use in adjusting the poverty line for inflation is only one of a number of questions about the poverty line and the official poverty measure. Considerable research over the years—including a major report by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS)—has identified a number of ways in which the poverty line appears to be inadequate. For example, the poverty line doesn’t fully include certain costs that many low-income families face like child care. In accordance with the guidance of the NAS panel, federal analysts worked carefully with researchers over a number of years to develop the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM), which more fully measures the cost of current basic living expenses. With this more careful accounting, the SPM’s poverty line is higher than the official poverty line for most types of households, and its poverty rate is slightly higher than the official poverty rate.

Another indication that the poverty line is too low is the high rate of hardship among families with incomes just above that marker. Near-poor families, using today’s poverty line, face high rates of food insecurity, difficulty paying rent and utilities, and high rates of uninsurance.

The Administration’s announcement, however, ignores all other issues regarding poverty measurement that the NAS and other analysts have raised and cherry-picks just one issue—the measure used to adjust for inflation—to focus on in isolation. Simply switching to a lower inflation measure would likely make the poverty line less rather than more accurate as a measure of what families need to get by.

Moreover, it is not at all clear that the chained CPI is a better measure of inflation for low-income households’ basic living expenses, even if we had a poverty measure that measured those living expenses more adequately. Research on different inflation measures generally focuses on the best way to measure inflation for the economy and consumers overall. But the consumption patterns of low-income households—and their ability to change their consumption in response to changes in prices—may be different from those of typical consumers. A recent study indicates that inflation tends to rise faster for low-income households than for the population as a whole. As just one example, housing costs comprise a significantly larger share of low-income households’ budgets, on average, than they do for middle- and upper-income households. And Labor Department data show that costs for rental housing, which low-income people rely on disproportionately, have been rising faster than the overall CPI.

The Administration has floated this proposal through a “Request for Comment”—essentially a request for the public to provide information and views to the federal govern-

ment on this potential change. But the Administration presented no research on how low-income families’ costs for basic necessities has changed over time, the adequacy of the poverty line itself as compared to the cost of basic necessities, or the implications of changing the poverty line for individuals’ and families’ access to needed assistance. Asking for public comment in apparent preparation for a policy change that could harm millions of struggling Americans over time, without providing the public with research and data on these basic questions, suggests this is not a serious effort to explore the important substantive issues that poverty measurement presents.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization and policy institute that conducts research and analysis on a range of government policies and programs. It is supported primarily by foundation grants.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the co-anchor for this hour. This has been a very enlightening topic for us to bring attention to.

Each one of us has constituents who are impacted, to whom we speak on a regular basis. We cannot allow this administration to make this type of an executive order and not have the consequences explained to the American people.

That is what tonight was all about.

Sometimes the other side questioned President Obama making executive orders. Well, this executive order that President Trump is proposing directly impacts the working poor in this country. We cannot allow that to happen.

We cannot allow children who are homeless, families who are struggling, and the working poor who are trying to do everything they can to keep it together to be impacted by this misguided, reckless, and totally unnecessary rule change being proposed by the Trump administration.

Again, we urge the American public to have their voice heard and submit their comments by June 21 or contact their Member of Congress.

We are fighting on their behalf, but we need to make sure that every Member in this body understands the implications of this proposed rule change.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1500, CONSUMERS FIRST ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1994, SETTING EVERY COMMUNITY UP FOR RETIREMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 24, 2019, THROUGH MAY 31, 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PERLMUTTER (during the Special Order of Ms. PLASKETT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-79) on the resolution (H. Res. 389) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1500) to require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to meet its statutory

purpose, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage retirement savings, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from May 24, 2019, through May 31, 2019; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING RACQUEL ASA IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Racquel Asa.

Racquel Asa is an anchor and reporter for WFTV Eyewitness News in Orlando, Florida.

Racquel's parents both came from the Philippines in pursuit of careers in the medical profession. She is a wife and mother to two young children, and she is proud to call central Florida her home.

She has been a journalist for nearly 15 years in New York and Florida. During her time in Orlando, she covers all things transportation in central Florida, from I-4 to SunRail to the growing need to make roads safer. She has been tapped by the Central Florida Expressway Authority and DriveSmartFlorida.org to create a regional campaign to make our roads safer.

She was recently recognized, in May, by the Federal Highway Administration for her efforts to raise awareness for both drivers and construction workers in work zones.

She is also an Emmy-nominated journalist who has been recognized for her investigations into red light cameras and breaking news traffic reports.

She is active in the community and participates in events every year to help organize and raise money for good organizations, causes, and missions. She has helped Second Harvest Food Bank, Embrace Families, and the local chapters of the Muscular Dystrophy Association and American Diabetes Association raise hundreds of thousands of dollars by emceeding their events. Most recently, she helped Tour de Cure Lake Nona break national records, raising more than \$1 million to help fund diabetes research.

For that, we recognize Ms. Racquel Asa.

RECOGNIZING COCO JOHNSTON IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Coco Johnston.

Coco Johnston moved from Honolulu, Hawaii, to southern California and has called Clermont, Florida, her home for the past 12 years.

She currently works in marketing for Metro Title Group, located in Metro West, where she facilitates real estate closings. She has been in the title closing and home warranty industry for over 40 years.

Her activities include being the current president of the Asian American Chamber of Commerce in central Florida. The organization's vision is to help its members prosper, grow, and serve as a bridge between many Asian American communities. They provide leadership, support, and encouragement to the Asian American business community of the greater Orlando region.

She is also a member of the Asian Real Estate Association of America, where she is dedicated to promoting sustainable homeownership opportunities in Asian American communities by creating a powerful national voice for housing and real estate professionals who serve the market.

Ms. Johnston and her husband, John, have been married for 33 years. They have a blended family with their daughter, Amber, and their two granddaughters, Bailey and Charlie.

For that, we honor Ms. Coco Johnston.

RECOGNIZING DR. YALCIN AKIN IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Dr. Yalcin Akin.

Dr. Yalcin Akin is the founder and executive director of Orlando, Seminole, and Osceola science charter schools, a group of tuition-free public charter schools that focus on science, technology, engineering, and math education.

Dr. Akin earned his master's of science and Ph.D. from the University of Florida in materials science and engineering.

Prior to founding Orlando Science Schools, Dr. Akin worked with the National Science Foundation and Department of Energy, supporting numerous projects at the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory in Tallahassee.

The Orlando Science Schools serve a diverse K-12 population of more than 2,500 students at four campuses in Orange, Seminole, and Osceola Counties.

Since opening in 2008, Orlando Science Schools has been consistently ranked as one of the best schools in the State of Florida and is also ranked among the top 100 most challenging high schools by The Washington Post. It currently stands in the top 15 percent of all schools in the State of Florida. It also has been ranked in the top 500 by U.S. News & World Report.

Dr. Akin is an active member of the Florida Consortium of Public Charter Schools. He is a frequent speaker on the topic of high-quality charter school education and regularly participates in the annual Florida charter school conferences.

For that, we honor Dr. Akin.

RECOGNIZING NUREN DURRE HAIDER IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Nuren Durre Haider.

Nuren Durre Haider, Esq., is a proud American-born Muslim Bangladeshi woman. She is a wife, the mother of three beautiful children, and an attorney.

She received her bachelor's degree in political science with a minor in business administration and education from the University of Florida and her juris doctorate degree from Florida A&M University College of Law.

Nuren Durre Haider is a believer in empowerment and representation for all. She is focused on getting her community involved in the electoral and political process and was the first Bangladeshi and Muslim to run for Orange County Commission in her district.

She is an advocate for equality, the environment, a living wage, affordable healthcare, banning assault weapons, raising awareness for mental health issues, raising teacher salaries, and other issues that affect the day-to-day lives of Americans. Along with this, Nuren dedicates her time to various interfaith and cultural events.

□ 2045

Currently, Nuren practices transactional law and is serving her second term as vice chairwoman of the Orange County Democratic Party. She is appointed to the Judiciary Committee of the Florida Democratic Party, the central Florida regional director for the American Muslim Democratic Caucus, an active member of the Democratic Women's Club of West Orange, and holds many other memberships and board positions.

And for that, Ms. Nuren Durre Haider, Esq., we honor you.

RECOGNIZING AKM HOSSAIN IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Akm Hossain. Akm Hossain was born in Bangladesh in September of 1961. He went to school and college in Bangladesh. He came to the United States as a foreign student at Daytona Beach Community College, where he finished his AA degree in business management.

He is a business professional, currently living in Osceola County with his wife, Rokhsana Hossain, and their children. He has been involved with different kinds of social and cultural activities since day one in America. He was elected president of the largest Bangladeshi American social organization in central Florida.

Akm Hossain is the first Bangladeshi American ever to run for public office in the city of Kissimmee, and he is he an active member the Osceola Democratic Party. He has also organized the Asian Food Music and Cultural Festival, the largest multicultural event in central Florida.

He has been awarded Best Community Leader by the Central Florida Bangladeshi American Community five times in a row, and Great Community Leader for his social service and contributions toward the community by the North American Bangladeshi union.

Akm Hossain has dedicated his whole life to uplift the Asian American community and the welfare of its people, and he serves to promote peace, unity, and life throughout the community.

And for that, Mr. Akm Hossain, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING JAN GAUTAM IN HONOR OF ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month, I want to recognize Jan Gautam. Mr. Gautam is identified best as a hands-on executive known for strategic approaches in achieving favorable results for hotel owners, business colleagues, and numerous foundations to which he belongs.

After completing his master's degree in hospitality management, he pursued employment as a hotel director for Carnival and Hawaii Luxury Cruise Lines, before moving to the hotel industry.

As founder of GI Hotels Group in 2004, Mr. Gautam tailored a modern approach to hospitality management. After he founded GI Hotels, Mr. Gautam merged this company with Interessant Hotels & Resort Management, where he currently serves as president and CEO. Interessant has become a leading hotel management company within the United States, Latin America, the Caribbean, and India.

Additionally, Mr. Gautam has overseen more than \$300 million in renovations and \$450 million in new development of hospitality projects over the past 5 years. He has achieved recognition and served on committees such as the Asian American Hotel Owners Association as a regional ambassador, Board of Directors with Visit Florida, the Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association, Rollins College International Advisory Board, and numerous local chapters to support tourism and governmental interaction.

And for that, Mr. Jan Gautam, we honor you.

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

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 744. An act to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 820. An act to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 21, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-184, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to Germany, February 14-17, 2019 with CODEL Graham											
Hon. William M. "Mac" Thornberry	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. James Langevin	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. Michael R. Turner	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. Mike Gallagher	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. Jim Banks	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. Elissa Slotkin	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Hon. Elise Stepanik	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,719.00						1,719.00
Travel to Belgium, February 17-21, 2019 with CODEL Connelly											
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/17	2/21	Belgium		1,289.15						1,289.15
Travel to Germany, Kosovo, Israel, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Burundi, Rwanda, Algeria, Spain, February 14-25, 2019 with CODEL Inhofe											
Hon. Trent Kelly	2/15	2/16	Germany		515.35						515.35
	2/16	2/18	Kosovo		366.17						366.17
	2/18	2/20	Israel		1,039.02						1,039.02
	2/20	2/20	Djibouti								
	2/20	2/22	Ethiopia		791.50						791.50
	2/22	2/22	Burundi								
	2/22	2/23	Rwanda		362.78						362.78
	2/23	2/24	Algeria		283.08						283.08
	2/24	2/25	Spain		215.68						215.68
Travel to Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, February 15-19, 2019 with CODEL Carper											
Hon. Donald Norcross	2/15	2/17	Guatemala		322.70						322.70
	2/17	2/17	Honduras								
	2/17	2/19	El Salvador		280.93						280.93
							1,933.25				1,933.25
Commercial Transportation											
Travel to Cameroon, February 18-22, 2019											
Chidi Blyden	2/20	2/21	Cameroon		645.38						645.38
							18,262.93				18,262.93
Mark Morehouse	2/20	2/21	Cameroon		645.38						645.38
							17,933.93				17,933.93
Travel to Belgium, Germany, February 17-23, 2019											
Hon. Filemon Vela	2/17	2/20	Belgium		920.63						920.63
	2/20	2/23	Germany		1,587.82						1,587.82
							1,351.88				1,351.88
Brian Garrett	2/19	2/20	Belgium		659.47						659.47
	2/20	2/23	Germany		1,587.82						1,587.82
							2,332.98				2,332.98
Commercial airfare											
Travel to Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait, March 14-25, 2019											
Hon. John Garamendi	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,202.37						1,202.37
	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	3/19	3/21	Kuwait		847.56						847.56
							10,857.53				10,857.53
	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,202.37						1,202.37
	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	3/19	3/21	Kuwait		847.56						847.56
Hon. Veronica Escobar	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,090.54		10,857.53				10,857.53
Commercial airfare	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00
Brian Garrett	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,202.37		10,436.03				10,436.03
Commercial airfare	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00
Commercial airfare	3/19	3/21	Kuwait		847.56						847.56
Thomas Hawley	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,202.37		10,857.53				10,857.53
Commercial airfare	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00
Commercial airfare	3/19	3/21	Kuwait		847.56						847.56
Hon. Jonathan Lord	3/15	3/18	Jordan		1,202.37		10,857.53				10,857.53
Commercial airfare	3/18	3/19	Iraq		11.00						11.00
Commercial airfare	3/19	3/21	Kuwait		847.56						847.56
Travel to Germany, March 13–22, 2019 with STAFFDEL Barker							10,857.53				10,857.53
Chidi Blyden	3/18	3/20	Germany		867.98						867.98
Commercial airfare							2,231.63				2,231.63
Mark Morehouse	3/18	3/20	Germany		867.98						867.98
Commercial airfare							2,231.63				2,231.63
Committee total					36,688.01		111,001.91				147,689.92

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

HON. ADAM SMITH, May 6, 2019.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Karen Bass**	2/8	2/11	Ethiopia		**		**		**		**
Hon. Brad Sherman**	2/8	2/11	Ethiopia		**		**		**		**
Hon. Ilhan Omar**	2/8	2/11	Ethiopia		**		**		**		**
Hon. Janette Yearwood**	2/8	2/11	Ethiopia		**		**		**		**
Hon. Karen Bass*	3/1	3/3	Ethiopia		788.96		8,442.03		734.28		9,965.27
Delegation expenses*	3/2	3/3	Eritrea		221.64				5,226.04		5,447.68
Janette Yearwood	3/1	3/3	Ethiopia		788.96		8,442.03				9,230.99
	3/2	3/3	Eritrea		221.63						221.63
Hon. Ilhan Omar	3/1	3/1	Ethiopia		618.96		12,660.03				13,278.99
	3/2	3/3	Eritrea		113.64						113.64
Hon. Tom Malinowski	2/14	2/17	Germany		760.59		(9)				760.59
Hon. Lee Zeldin	2/15	2/17	Germany		826.06		(9)				826.06
	2/17	2/18	France		793.33		(9)				793.33
	2/18	2/20	Cyprus		515.22		(9)				515.22
	2/20	2/23	Austria		1,686.16		(9)				1,686.16
Mira Resnick	2/17	2/20	UAE		1,111.94		11,858.79				12,970.73
	2/20	2/22	Saudi Arabia		968.57		(9)				968.57
Hon. Eliot Engel	3/28	2/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)		13,974.00		14,333.00
Delegation expenses*	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		533.00		(9)		2,310.28		2,843.28
Delegation expenses*	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)		3,224.00		3,468.00
Hon. Michael McCaul	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		415.00		(9)				415.00
Hon. Adriano Espaillat	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		533.00		(9)				533.00
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Hon. John Curtis	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		533.00		(9)				533.00
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Eric Jacobstein	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		509.90		(9)				509.90
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Janice Kaguyutan	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		509.90		(9)				509.90
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Rachel Levitan	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		509.90		(9)				509.90
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Samantha Stiles	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		509.90		(9)				509.90
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Carlos Monje	3/28	3/29	Colombia		359.00		(9)				359.00
	3/29	3/31	El Salvador		509.90		(9)				509.90
	3/31	4/1	Mexico		244.00		(9)				244.00
Tim Mulvey*	3/16	3/18	UAE		828.76		4,716.53		167.73		5,713.02
Delegation expenses*	3/18	3/20	Kuwait		762.62				70.00		832.62
	3/20	3/22	Czech Republic		721.00						721.00
Peter Billerbeck	3/16	3/18	UAE		828.76*		3,183.83				4,012.59
	3/18	3/20	Kuwait		762.82						762.82
	3/20	3/22	Czech Republic		721.00						721.00
Ryan Doherty	3/16	3/18	UAE		828.85		4,716.53				5,545.38
	3/18	3/20	Kuwait		762.54						762.54
	3/20	3/22	Czech Republic		724.34						724.34
Lesley Warner	3/15	3/16	Switzerland		469.32		11,656.83				12,126.15
Delegation expenses*	3/16	3/17	Kenya		267.00				1,050.00		1,317.00
	3/17	3/19	Somalia		132.00						132.00
	3/19	3/20	Kenya		266.00						266.00
Delegation expenses*	3/20	3/22	Sudan		773.68				104.55		878.23
Committee total					28,010.85		65,676.60		26,860.88		120,548.33

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

³ Military air transportation.

* Indicates Delegation costs

**Indicates a cancelled mission

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL, May 2, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019

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

HOUSE COMMITTEES

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

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

HON. MARK TAKANO, May 6, 2019.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2326. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, to amend the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012, and to direct the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, Labor, and Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to take certain actions to improve transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces who separate, retire, or are discharged from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-73, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2480. A bill to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1812. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish Vet Center readjustment counseling and related mental health services to certain individuals; with an amendment (Rept. 116-75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1947. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt transfers of funds from Federal agencies to the Department of Veterans Affairs for nonprofit corporations established under subchapter IV of chapter 73 of such title from certain provisions of the Economy Act; with amendments (Rept. 116-76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2340. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide to Congress notice of any suicide or attempted suicide of a veteran in a Department of Veterans Affairs facility, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. LOWEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2839. A bill making appropriations for Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 389. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1500) to require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to meet its statutory purpose, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage retirement savings, and for other purposes; pro-

viding for proceedings during the period from May 24, 2019, through May 31, 2019; and for other purposes (Rept. 116-79). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. LOWEY: Committee on Appropriations. Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2020 (Rept. 116-80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Armed Services and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2326 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to sentencing of armed career criminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2838. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program for projects to strengthen and protect vulnerable infrastructure used during mass evacuations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain first responder survivors benefits as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to actions for patent infringement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CROW (for himself, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2842. A bill to prohibit any limitation on the entry of a Member of Congress to any facility for the detention of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr.

ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CRIST, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 2843. A bill to decriminalize marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Small Business, 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. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding, on a competitive basis, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees, and to extend empowerment zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KIND, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2846. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit Members of Congress to use facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs for the purposes of meeting with constituents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2847. A bill to waive the fee for the issuance of a passport for a family member of a member of the Armed Forces who is in a hospital or medical facility abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2849. A bill to permit law enforcement officers of the Department of the Treasury to carry service weapons to their place of residence while off duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that healthy research dogs and cats are adopted into suitable homes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2851. A bill to provide safeguards with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal background checks prepared for employment purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize State-licensed appraisers to conduct appraisals in connection with mortgages insured by the FHA and to require compliance with the existing appraiser education requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require corporations to report disbursements made by foreign nationals for purposes of disseminating campaign-related public communications and to inquire whether persons providing such disbursements are foreign nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HAALAND, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to prohibit the use of neonicotinoids in a National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GAETZ):

H. Res. 390. A resolution opposing the lifting of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran without addressing Iran's nuclear program, ballistic missile development, support for terrorism, and other destabilizing activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

54. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 466, commending the 75th anniversary of the WWII Merrill's Marauders mission and urging the United States Congress to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Merrill's Marauders; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

55. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 276, urging Congress to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS); which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

56. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 114, urging Congress to pass funding legislation that will secure the southern border of the United States; which was referred jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of IOWA introduced a bill (H.R. 2855) to deem the application submitted by Jaci Hermsstad to the Food and Drug Administration for compassionate use of the gene therapy antisense oligonucleotides to be approved; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 & Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 95: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 120: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 200: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 216: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 218: Mr. NUNES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 275: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 336: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 400: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 436: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 500: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 535: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 553: Mr. CORREA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 555: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 585: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 586: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROUZER, and Ms. FOX of North Carolina.
 H.R. 598: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. GUEST.
 H.R. 621: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 647: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 649: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 651: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 655: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 661: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 683: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 692: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.R. 693: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 724: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 748: Mr. REED, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 753: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 763: Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 803: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.
 H.R. 864: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 913: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 919: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 929: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 935: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 945: Mrs. HARTZLER and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 948: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 961: Mr. STEWART and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 963: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 985: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 997: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 1042: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 1049: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1055: Mrs. MCBATH.
 H.R. 1058: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1139: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 1154: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ADAMS, and Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 1155: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1163: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 1175: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GIBBS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GUEST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STANTON, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 1217: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. WILLIAMS and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1230: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1236: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1305: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1334: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1335: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 1342: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1349: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1374: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 1376: Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 1380: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 1407: Mr. ROUDA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1412: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. STANTON and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1424: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 1456: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1458: Ms. FINKENAUER.
 H.R. 1551: Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 1554: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1605: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 1607: Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. GUEST.
 H.R. 1695: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1709: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1717: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. GUEST, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. GOODEN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 1749: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1753: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ROUZER, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1778: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 1781: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. CRAIG, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 1812: Mr. DUNN.
 H.R. 1830: Mr. WALBERG, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1850: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1863: Ms. HAALAND and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1903: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 1911: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1923: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MENG, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BLUNT

ROCHESTER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1928: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 1943: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1959: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 1962: Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 1970: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1979: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1989: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. POSEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BACON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 2006: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2010: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 2015: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2046: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 2051: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
 H.R. 2056: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2060: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2069: Ms. SLOTKIN and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2074: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2086: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASE, and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 2140: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2148: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2151: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2161: Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2169: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 2218: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 2266: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 2314: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2326: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2336: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2340: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2343: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 2349: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 2354: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2381: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 2382: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 2388: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 2408: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.R. 2424: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2430: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2433: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 2435: Mr. WELCH, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 2441: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 2442: Ms. SHALALA.
 H.R. 2443: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 2445: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 2473: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. PANNETTA.
 H.R. 2480: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. FINKENAUER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2481: Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. BUSTOS,

Mr. ESTES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. BASS, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2482: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WILD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KIM, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2489: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 2493: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2508: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2509: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2513: Mr. BEYER and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2517: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2557: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 2576: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2577: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2585: Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 2602: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. TLAIb, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2635: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2646: Ms. OMAR, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2662: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 2679: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2720: Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2729: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 2741: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2742: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 2765: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2771: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2775: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. OMAR, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 2776: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2777: Ms. MOORE and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2785: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2803: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2806: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2809: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRIST, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. WALTZ.

H. Res. 60: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Res. 106: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 114: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 134: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 163: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 189: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. YOUNG.

H. Res. 231: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 255: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H. Res. 285: Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MAST, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CASE, Mr. BUCK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H. Res. 325: Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. CRAIG, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 337: Mr. TRONE.

H. Res. 338: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H. Res. 373: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 383: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H. Res. 384: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to urging Congress to refrain from enacting any legislation which would repeal existing Federal law that presently requires persons from outside of the United States, and who are not American citizens, to undergo formal procedures to be lawfully present in the United States for purposes of temporary employment, to attend an educational institution, to become a legal permanent resident, or to become a naturalized U.S. citizen; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.