United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019 No. 125

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

RECOGNIZING RALPH AND CHRISTINE BROWN

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we all have been privileged to know people in our communities who have led remarkable lives but are unsung heroes. Today, I want to highlight one such couple whom I have come to know and admire.

I rise to recognize Ralph and Christine Brown, a remarkable couple and role models for all the rest of us.

They grew up in families of very modest means. While working full time, Ralph began a one-man security business in 1963. What started as Lake Norman Security Patrol, Inc., expanded into two of the most successful businesses in North Carolina and the country: Security Central and AlarmSouth.

Ralph learned the importance of security while serving as a U.S. Army policeman and turned his knowledge into security and patrol services for homes and commercial entities.

At his side was Christine, his brilliant helpmate. They have a wonderful and philanthropic family that is carrying on the family tradition and business into the third generation.

Ralph and Christine's success has not only become a family legacy but has benefited numerous good causes in the community through their generosity, including the American Heart Association, the United Way, and Grandfather Home for Children.

Having inspiration and determination combined with hard work was their recipe for remarkable success. The Browns are proof that the American Dream is alive and well.

RECOGNIZING DKG IN REGION IX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Region IX of the North Carolina State Organization of the Delta Kappa Gamma Society on their achievements at the State convention in Hickory, North Carolina.

Region IX makes up eight chapters across North Carolina's Fifth District and took home five achievement awards, three communications excellence awards, and two newsletter and website awards.

These recognitions speak to the chapter's success in its mission to promote the professional and personal growth of women educators and excellence in education.

As an educator myself, I know the incredible difference it makes to have opportunities for mentorship, professional development, and scholarships.

The society invites members who are dedicated to education in different fields, both active and retired, to build up future leaders at the local level. As we all know, the local level is where the best practices and policies in education come from.

Knowing that young educators in the Fifth District have such talented and locally engaged women behind them makes me very proud. These women are shining examples of the powerful impact that organizing within our communities has on future generations.

NAACP AGAIN MAKES HISTORY

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, proud to be an American and, today, I would also say, proud to be a member of the Nation's oldest civil rights organization, the NAACP.

I am especially proud to be a member of the NAACP today because, yesterday, the NAACP became the first of the civil rights and human rights organizations to take a stand against bigotry, xenophobia, homophobia, Islamophobia, hatred, and racism by passing a resolution at its national convention calling for the impeachment of the President.

And still I rise, proud, Mr. Speaker, to be associated with this organization. This is not its first time taking a stand on behalf of the American people.

It was the NAACP that filed Shelley v. Kraemer and Barrows v. Jackson, outlawing restrictive covenants that prevented people of color from living in certain neighborhoods.

It was the NAACP that filed and won Brown v. Board of Education, which, literally, took on and eviscerated segregation—lawful segregation, I might add—in this country.

Printed on recycled paper.

It was the NAACP that guided the Supreme Court of the United States of America for almost a quarter of a century under the leadership of Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall. He was the lawyer who took Brown v. Board of Education before the Supreme Court. He was the lawyer who was the chief legal counsel for the NAACP. He sat on the Supreme Court. He guided the Supreme Court.

The NAACP, again, makes history, and I am proud to be associated with this great organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would also add that we are now some 98 days since the Mueller report was called to the attention of the public, 98 days since it was made public, 98 days since the Chief Executive has been above the law.

Mr. Mueller is testifying today. Tomorrow, I will start another acid test wherein I will show the number of days that the President has been above the law since Mr. Mueller himself testified in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in some very challenging times—very challenging times—but Dr. King reminded us that the truest measure of a person in times such as this is not where you stand in those times of comfort and convenience but where you stand in these times of challenge and controversy.

I am proud to know that the NAACP stands for liberty and justice for all, stands for the people of the United States of America, as it has historically. And I shall continue to stand and be a member of the NAACP.

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

KANSANS WANT CONGRESS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the circus is back in town. I can hear the music all the way over here in the Capitol, the music of that merry-go-round going on in the Judiciary Committee right now, as we speak.

Yes, Mr. Mueller is here now for the fifth congressional hearing on this same issue, on this witch hunt. This is a cheap, made-for-TV television movie that is now going back and reviewing everything, allowing Mr. Mueller to sit there and read the report that he submitted days and weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, the frustration is that, back home, we have done over 63 town halls, and I can count on one hand the number of times somebody has ever asked me about the Mueller report or Russiamania.

What Kansans want is for Congress to stand up and solve the problems in front of us.

The USMCA agreement, the NAFTA–2.0 agreement, is sitting on the Speaker of the House's desk. Nothing would do more for Kansas right now, both Kansas agriculture and Kansas manufacturing, than to get that agreement passed. It would mean thousands of jobs for Kansans. It would mean hundreds of millions of dollars more income for Kansans as well.

We are tired of this witch hunt. We want to move on. We want to move on and fix problems. The problem is the Democrats don't want to challenge us on issues and on policy. Instead, they want to attack the President because their policies won't stand the test of the American public or the test of time.

BRING IRAN TO THE TABLE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we don't want war in Iran. We don't want war in the Middle East. We don't want war anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I try to talk to my parents every week—every Sunday, typically. My parents seldom offer me advice, but the last thing my dad recently said to me was, ''Roger, don't send our troops into battle.''

Mr. Speaker, we must, however, make every effort to ensure Tehran does not have access to nuclear weapons. We must stop them from fueling global terror and endangering Americans and our allies around the world.

Like many other Kansans, I have served our country in uniform. None of us want war in Iran. That is not my goal, and it is not the President's goal. We must, however, guarantee Iran never has access to nuclear weapons and that they stop funding and arming terror around the world.

They are very evil actors. They are not a normal country. They seek the destruction of the United States and our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel.

I support any effort to bring Iran to the table for a deal that addresses both of these important goals. The best way to do this is to continue to apply maximum pressure on Iran.

Mr. Speaker, Iran has been responsible for the death of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of American soldiers during the Iraq war through their supply of IEDs. They chant ''death to America,'' and as I said, they threaten our allies. This is an issue of great importance to the safety and security of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if I haven't said it before, we don't want war. We just want Iran to act like a normal country. Normal countries don't take other country's ships hostage. Normal countries don't shoot down American drones. Normal countries don't ship IEDs to terrorists to kill Americans. Normal countries don't fund terrorism.

We cannot sit idly by on our hands as we watch Iran seize ships and continue to hold the Nation hostage. Instead, I believe, like President Reagan and, before him, President Eisenhower, that we best have peace through strength. We need to keep the maximum pressure, keep the faith, work with our allies, and get Iran to the table.

My fellow Americans, please join me in prayer as our Nation's officials make this effort to ensure peace and increase stability in the region.

USDA RULE CHANGE WILL KICK MILLIONS OFF SNAP

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the administration's proposal, its recent attack on some of the most vulnerable Americans, the 38 million people who rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, otherwise known as SNAP.

The USDA, United States Department of Agriculture, announced yesterday a rule change to the eligibility for the program. This change would kick millions of Americans—seniors, children, and their families—off a program that provides critical assistance. It is a safety net.

This change would weaken our ability to provide support for working people who are struggling to get by month to month.

It would have a huge impact in my district. Unfortunately, 25 percent of my constituents depend upon the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program monthly to provide nutrition for themselves and their families.

As a member of the conference committee that negotiated the 2018 farm bill, these suggestions were a part of the discussion. We opposed them. We fought successfully to include expanded SNAP eligibility requirements, and Congress agreed.

That is why I fought to expand the employment and training programs that we do in SNAP in the Fresno Bridge Academy, to equip recipients with the necessary tools to get back on their feet, to make them self-sufficient. That is what we should be doing.

Guess what: The President supported it when he signed the farm bill into law last December. He needs to remain consistent.

I will fight for families, for seniors, and for children. The bottom line is this: SNAP is a helpful program to support people in their time of need with achieving self-sufficiency. It is part of America's safety net.

We must block this egregious attempt to administratively do what Congress did not do last December.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and oppose this attack on some of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

HIGHLIGHTING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE HOUSE IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House of Representatives what we have achieved in the last 6 months, many of these pieces of legislation on a bipartisan basis.

We have passed 10 bills to reduce the price of healthcare; lower prescription drugs costs, which our communities want us to do; and strengthen protections for people with preexisting conditions—reducing the cost of drugs and

strengthening protections for preexisting conditions to protect those individuals.

We passed the Equality Act to ensure that every American enjoys the same rights and is protected equally under the law. The Equality Act is so important.

I fought to improve our water infrastructure, to address the strain on this precious resource brought by drought and climate change to ensure that we have clean, safe drinking water for all of our communities.

In the San Joaquin Valley, sadly, we have many communities that don't enjoy clean, safe drinking water standards.

□ 1015

I have worked hard to implement the farm bill, to lead education and outreach programs for farm programs to help farmers improve not only their water sustainability, but their ability to market their crops.

In immigration, we have passed the funding bills to help alleviate the humanitarian crisis at our border and advanced legislation to secure a pathway to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States; our Dreamers, over 800,000, who came here through no choice of their own, and for them America is the only country they have ever known. They need and deserve legal status.

I am proud that, in the last 6 months of work, this week we will consider H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.

Many of us have been to the borders, and we do have a humanitarian crisis there, and we need to do what is right. We need to ensure that those individuals receive good standards of water, beds, and access to healthcare, and that they are treated humanely. That is the American way. These are basic living standards.

Finally, the budget deal that was agreed to on a bipartisan basis over the weekend is important, not only as it relates to our discretionary and nondiscretionary spending for the next 2 years lifting the budget cap, but in addition to that, to ensuring that we produce a budget on time; that we avoid a government shutdown; that we ensure that our men and women serving in American Armed Forces have the adequate funding that they need; that our veterans get the support and our VA hospitals that we have promised them.

These are the things that are part of an overall budget deal. It avoids the kind of circus that we had over the last year where we had a government shutdown, a government shutdown we should never have. We should never have that impact on our economy; our Federal workers to be expected—whether they be in air traffic control or food safety—to go to work and not to receive a check. That is irresponsible.

So the budget deal is good. It is a bipartisan effort. It, frankly, gives the sort of discretion that Congress needs to make budget decisions to prioritize our needs in America.

So, for that, I thank the Congress.

CONGRATULATING SAINT FRANCIS UNIVERSITY ON THEIR APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION GRANT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Saint Francis University on a well-deserved grant from the Appalachian Regional Commission, otherwise known as ARC.

ARC recently announced Saint Francis University as the recipient of a $150,000 grant to support advanced patient simulation training equipment for the university's new Health Science Experiential Learning Commons that will open this October.

The Commons will include much-needed space for classroom, laboratory, and clinical education, including five state-of-the-art simulation suites where students can practice real life clinical scenarios on computer-controlled mannequins with the assistance of their instructors through two-way audio-video conferencing.

The grant will be used to invest in this cutting-edge technology to provide students with the technology needed to close the skills gap and better prepare them for situations they will likely encounter in their professional careers.

Saint Francis University has committed itself to career and technical education in the health science field, and this grant will help provide hundreds of students with the training necessary to prepare for rewarding careers and, quite frankly, service to their community.

Investments like these are playing a critical role in developing the 21st century American workforce, in developing a workforce full of talented individuals who can help meet today's ever-growing demand for healthcare professionals.

Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, in particular, is in need of healthcare professionals, and Saint Francis students are rising to the occasion. The grant will not only support current Saint Francis students; ARC rightfully noted, ''local employers will have access to a pipeline of highly-skilled healthcare professionals to meet labor demands, help create jobs and expand the local economy, and provide quality healthcare to citizens in Appalachian Pennsylvania.''

Reverend Malachi Van Tassell, President of Saint Francis University, noted the value that this grant adds for the students who are seeking an education in health science. He said, ''This equipment will allow our students to practice hands-on patient care procedures in a simulated environment and to learn how to work in an interprofessional, team-based setting. Beyond the benefit to our students, it will also enable us to provide advanced training opportunities to area emergency medical services personnel and first responders.''

Mr. Speaker, this grant is not just an investment in Saint Francis, it is an investment in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District. It is an investment in the lifeblood of our local communities.

When we empower learners and provide them with the necessary resources for a conducive, innovative learning environment, our students will thrive personally and professionally, and will provide the best possible care to Pennsylvanians in need.

COMMEMORATING ASSYRIAN GENOCIDE MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate August 7, Assyrian Genocide Memorial Day.

Many Americans are already familiar with the horrors of the Armenian genocide. But not nearly as many know about the genocide of innocent Assyrian civilians by the Ottoman Empire; which is why I am leading a resolution to finally recognize the genocide of Assyrians in the Middle East.

Many of my Assyrian friends and neighbors in California's Central Valley still carry the weight of this horrific event.

Beginning in 1914, the Ottoman Empire is estimated to have slaughtered 300,000 innocent Assyrians; but some experts believe the true death toll is much higher. On August 7, Shovah b'tabakh, we remember those who were lost, and we say never again.

My resolution would take simple steps to do both. It would assert that Turkey, the inheritor of the Ottoman tradition, must recognize the genocide; and it would condemn any efforts to associate the U.S. with genocide denial.

My resolution would recognize the resilience of the Assyrian people who endured the genocide, the Simele massacre, and are now threatened once again by holdouts in ISIS. And they have survived all of this without a homeland to call their own.

Today, we remember the Sadih, the martyrs. We think of their families. We recommit ourselves to upholding the rights of all people to live freely and in safety.

AMERICA IS AN AMAZING PLACE

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, America is an amazing place, and we too

often, as Americans, take that for granted. Opportunities exist in this country that simply aren't available in much of the world. And my life is an example of the extraordinary possibilities in the United States of America.

I ask you, where else can a kid, born in poverty, beginning life in a subsidized housing project, become a national legislator? Yet, here I stand as a Member of Congress.

In how many countries can the oldest of seven children with parents that are an hourly auto worker and an office worker for the Salvation Army, become the first in their extended family to graduate from college, build a career, become the CEO of a major workforce development company and, after retiring, be elected to Congress?

America is a truly unique and special place that we must love and respect with all our heart and soul.

My mother raised me to believe that those with talents and resources were expected by God to make a difference in the world. I tried to do that in my career throughout my life.

My mission for 35 years was to assist people in identifying and securing career opportunities. My professional career allowed me to support my family, while assisting adults of all ages and backgrounds to develop the skills to support their families and build careers.

I assisted individuals ranging from laid-off steel workers and auto workers, to long-term public assistant recipients, develop the skills they needed to build a career and support their families.

I worked with individuals requiring literacy education, English as a second language, and adults that had worked their same job their entire lives, and suddenly found their jobs and industries had evaporated, and their lives turned upside down.

I worked, in some way or another, with tens of thousands of people searching for assistance in securing a job and a career path. I believed then, and I continue to believe, that most Americans find value and opportunity in working. Sometimes they just need a hand and assistance to overcome adversity.

I brought that passion and commitment to Washington. My mission was to make a difference in the world. I literally approached being a Member of Congress like my career, full tilt, leaving no stone unturned to have a meaningful impact and to make a difference.

It is an honor to stand on this floor, debate issues, and represent the people of Michigan's 10th District. I am proud to be among the 12,500 or so that have had the privilege to serve in Congress.

But I have also begun to ask myself about making a difference in my family. My children of all ages, the youngest just 9, have accepted their dad traveling the country, working a demanding schedule, frequently interrupted by text messages, emails, and phone calls. My spouse, Sherry, has been so supportive and more patient than probably warranted.

A career in Washington was never my objective. My mission has always been to simply address significant challenges this Nation faces: Trade, healthcare, immigration, and infrastructure, to name just a few.

However, it appears to me that rhetoric overwhelms policy, and politics consumes much of the oxygen in this city.

The time has come to make a difference for my family, to focus my time and energy upon them, their needs, their goals.

George Washington is quoted as saying: ''I would rather be on my farm than emperor of the world.''

As a result, I have decided I will not seek to represent Michigan's 10th Congressional District next term. After serving out the remainder of the 116th Congress, I will return to my family and to our small farm.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF LARRY N. OLINGER

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Larry N. Olinger, Vice Chairman of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, a dedicated, inspiring leader who passed away July 15, 2019, at the age of 80.

Vice Chairman Olinger grew up in Palm Springs and, later, in Orange County, where he spent many years breeding and racing horses.

From a young age, Vice Chairman Olinger was drawn to enacting positive change in his community through public service.

Vice Chairman Olinger was first elected to Tribal Council in 1961, where he began his 60-year career. He went on to serve in every position on Tribal Council, including secretary, treasurer, chairman, and eventually vice chairman in 2012.

As the first chairman of the Agua Caliente Development Authority, Olinger championed gaming as a Tribal business enterprise, stimulating economic growth and strengthening Tribal sovereignty.

His leadership also spanned from the Native American Rights Fund to the State of California and the Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy, where he advocated for the protection of our communities' natural and cultural resources.

Our communities have lost a great man and generational leader in Vice Chairman Olinger's passing. His passion, class, and concern for the well-being of others, including his Tribe and our surrounding communities, was admirable.

I have always admired Chairman Olinger's strong character and lifelong commitment to learning; and I will deeply miss his caring nature and dry sense of humor.

Vice Chairman Olinger often called his ''proudest achievement'' his marriage to his wife, Susan.

Susan, my heart goes out to you and the entire Olinger family.

I also send my heartfelt condolences to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.

We will miss Vice Chairman Olinger deeply; but we can honor his legacy by loving our neighbors, caring for the Earth, and protecting and respecting the rich culture and sovereignty of Tribal communities.

□ 1030

HONORING JESUS RIVERA OSUNA

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jesus Rivera Osuna, a soft-spoken, true family man, who passed away on June 28, 2019, at the age of 74.

Mr. Osuna is the father of my childhood best friend, Oscar Osuna. I spent so much time at the Osuna home that they became my second family, and Mr. Osuna always made me feel welcome and part of the family.

I remember his patience, humility, and loving and calming nature. He was also a kind, stable, and secure male role model in our rough-and-tumble impoverished community.

Mr. Osuna was a hardworking man and ran his own business for 50 years, toiling in the hot desert Sun to repair air-conditioning units in the Coachella Valley community.

He was also a great guitar player. I would listen in amazement to Mr. Osuna play classical guitar alone in his room after a long day at work. He was always so humble. He would stop playing if he noticed anybody nearby, so I would quietly listen from Oscar's room in awe of his talent.

Mr. Osuna married his high school sweetheart, Mary Lou, at 24 years old, and together they raised four children, my second family brothers and sisters—Elvia, Sergio, Oscar, and Lila—three nephews, and supported Mr. Osuna's mother. Mr. and Mrs. Osuna's family has grown to include four grandchildren.

Even in his final days, Mr. Osuna refused to be a burden to his family as he battled the illness that ultimately took his life.

To the Osuna family, I love you, and your dad's story is engraved in my heart and now recorded in our Nation's history.

HONORING SERGEANT MIKE STEPHEN

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our Nation's fallen first responders, Sergeant Mike Stephen, who was killed in the line of duty on July 18.

Sergeant Stephen was a true public servant, having served Arkansas and our Nation as a law enforcement officer, firefighter, and soldier.

Sergeant Stephen began his career as a first responder when he was just 16 years old, following in his father's footsteps by joining the Calico Rock Fire Department.

As a soldier, Mike Stephen rose to the rank of sergeant first class. As a firefighter, Mike Stephen led the Pineville Volunteer Fire Department while he served as a sheriff's deputy. He instilled his values and dedication to public service and his family, all of whom served as volunteer firefighters. Whenever a call came to the Stephen home, the entire family responded.

As a career law enforcement officer, Sergeant Stephen served in the Mountain View Police Department, Arkansas Department of Corrections, and, ultimately, the Stone County Sheriff's Office. Beloved by his colleagues, Sergeant Stephen viewed public service as more than a job. He was always on call 24/7, ready to assist his community in any way. He advocated for first responders by testifying before the Arkansas General Assembly.

On Thursday, July 18, Sergeant Stephen responded to his final call. Early that morning, Sergeant Stephen responded to a domestic welfare call in Leslie, Arkansas. As Stephen performed his duties, shots were fired, and Stephen was struck fatally, as was the suspected shooter.

As Arkansas mourns the loss of Sergeant Mike Stephen, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending my condolences to the Stephen family and honoring the life of a true public servant who gave his life protecting the community he loved.

OUR COUNTRY'S ATTENTION IS FOCUSED ON THE MUELLER REPORT

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today much of our country's attention is focused on the hearing happening across the street from where we stand. For weeks, pundits have been speculating: What else would the special counsel reveal? Where is that smoking gun or the viral moment?

These questions are understandable, but they also obscure a powerful tool already at this body's disposal as we consider whether or not to hold the President accountable: what we already know. And for that, we turn to the special counsel's report.

Volume I details a ''sweeping and systematic'' attack by the Russian Government on our democracy, an attack that our President still refuses to acknowledge. Volume II describes 11 different occasions—11—where the actions of the President may have obstructed justice.

The legal framework is pretty straightforward. In criminal cases, an individual must meet the so-called elements of an offense, essentially, a checklist of actions, which, if each is proven, means that a crime was committed. What follows in the special counsel's report is an exhaustive detailing of facts uncovered and a thorough analysis as to whether the elements of obstruction of justice were met in those 11 instances.

The special counsel instructs, on page 9 of Volume II, that ''three basic elements are common to the most relevant obstruction statutes: one, an obstructive act; two, a nexus between the obstructive act and an official proceeding; and three, a corrupt intent.''

In a few of the occasions investigated, the special counsel indicates that the evidence is not sufficient to reach that standard. In several others, however, his analysis is crystal clear.

On page 84, the report begins to detail how the President directed White House Counsel Don McGahn to remove the special counsel. ''Mueller has to go.''

''Call me back when you do it.''

The special counsel then applies the law:

One, an obstructive act: page 88, ''Substantial evidence supports a conclusion that the President . . . directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the special counsel removed.''

Two, a nexus: page 89, ''Substantial evidence indicates that . . . the President knew his conduct was under investigation by a Federal prosecutor.'' In fact, the President had tweeted about it.

Three, corrupt intent: page 89, ''Substantial evidence indicates that the President's attempts to remove the special counsel were linked . . . most immediately to reports that the President was being investigated for potential obstruction of justice.''

Substantial evidence to show that all three elements of the offense are met; substantial evidence that the President obstructed justice; substantial evidence that the President of the United States committed a crime.

There are countless other troubling facts which the special counsel indicates may meet the obstruction threshold.

Page 91, just days after pressuring McGahn, President Trump directs his former campaign manager Corey Lewandowski to deliver a message to Attorney General Jeff Sessions to limit the scope of the Mueller investigation to future election interference alone.

Page 92, the President follows up with Lewandowski with the same request a month later.

Page 96, the President writes Chief of Staff Reince Priebus, ''Did you get it?''—referring to Sessions' resignation. ''Are you working on it?''—which leads Mr. Mueller to conclude, on page 97, that ''taken together, the President's directives indicate that Sessions was being instructed to tell the special counsel to end the existing investigation into his campaign.'' And, the same page, that ''substantial evidence indicates that the President's efforts to have Sessions limit the scope of the special counsel's investigation . . . was intended to prevent further investigative scrutiny of the President's and his campaign's conduct.''

These are the findings of the report, the facts as they were uncovered and applied to the relevant statutes of our criminal law. This is the information already in our hands today.

Summed up by Mr. Mueller's devastating conclusion: ''Our investigation found multiple acts by the President that were capable of exerting undue influence over law enforcement investigations, including the Russian interference and obstruction investigations.''

The special counsel has done his job. We must do ours.

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

HONORING BOYD W. SORENSON

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Boyd W. Sorenson of Waite Park for receiving France's highest distinction, the Legion of Honor, for his service during World War II.

As a fighter pilot in the U.S. Army Air Corps, he flew 89 missions in the European theater during World War II, assisting in the liberation of France.

Mr. Sorenson's service didn't end after World War II. In fact, Boyd went on to fly 72 missions during the Korean war.

Mr. Boyd is no stranger to recognition for his bravery. He has already been awarded the European African Middle Eastern Medal with three bronze stars, the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross with two oak leaf clusters, and the Canadian Operational Service Medal with maple leaf cluster.

Boyd is a hero, and his actions helped further the cause of freedom we enjoy today. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Sorenson for his service and congratulate him on another well-deserved award.

CONGRATULATING VIOLET HALVERSON

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Violet Halverson of Sartell, Minnesota. At 94 years old, Violet has just earned herself the silver medal in shuffleboard at the National Senior Games. The National Senior Games were created to promote healthy lifestyles for aging adults through education, fitness, and sport.

Violet began playing shuffleboard in the 1980s. Over the years since, she has participated in recreational leagues and competitions. When she heard about the National Senior Games, she knew she had to compete. Violet won gold her first year, and this year she takes home a silver.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Violet and can't wait to see how she performs next year.

CONGRATULATIONS TO FOREST LAKE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Forest Lake Area High School for being named a Green Ribbon School by the United States Department of Education. This award is given to schools that have recognized the environmental impact of their facility, promote health, and ensure high-quality environmental education programming that prepares students with sustainability skills.

Forest Lake Area High School is among only 35 schools, 14 districts, and 4 postsecondary institutions across the country to receive this award. I look forward to welcoming the honorees to Washington, D.C. in September for a ceremony to recognize their wonderful achievement.

Congratulations to Forest Lake Area High School for the Green Ribbon School award.

THE GROWING RACIAL WEALTH GAP IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the crisis that is the growing racial wealth gap in the United States.

A recent report from the Institute for Policy Studies noted that the median wealth for Black families, adjusted for inflation, declined from $7,323 to $3,557 between the years 1983 and 2013.

Mr. Speaker, if these alarming trends continue, the average Black household is on track to own $0 in wealth by the year 2053.

This stands in sharp contrast to the average wealth of White households, which increased by nearly $14,000 during the same period, to an average of $137,000 by the year 2053.

Zero dollars for the Black families, $137,000 for the White families by the year 2053.

The wealth disparity between Black and White families persists across nearly all levels of income and education.

White middle-class households have almost eight times more wealth than a Black household in the same income bracket.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, even a 4-year degree cannot remedy these disparities. A 2014 census survey found that a Black family whose head of household has obtained a master's degree owns an average $37,600 of wealth, compared to an average of $181,220 in a comparable White household, a difference of nearly $150,000.

Mr. Speaker, the racial gap in our Nation must be addressed, as it is a critical concern for all of our Nation.

The barriers between Black families and White families must be addressed. The barriers preventing Black families from accumulating wealth drive up poverty rates and stifle America's economy.

This is not just a Black issue; this is an American issue.

The inability to secure your future no matter how hard you work runs contrary to our basic American principles. We must do more in this House of Representatives to alleviate this critical issue, this crisis, and we must continue to make our Nation, these United States of America, the land of opportunity for all of its citizens.

BOYS & GIRLS CLUB MISSOURI STATE YOUTH OF THE YEAR

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Boys & Girls Club 2019 Missouri State Youth of the Year, Ms. Jazzmine Jones.

Jazzmine is a member of the Boys & Girls Clubs of West Central Missouri's Cole Camp Site, where she serves as a junior staff member. In her position, she helps run programs and mentors the younger club kids.

Earlier this year, Jazzmine was named the Missouri State Youth of the Year at a 2-day event in Jefferson City, Missouri, marking the first time a student from the Boys & Girls Club of West Central Missouri was awarded this title.

Last week, on July 18, Jazzmine represented Missouri at the Boys & Girls Clubs of America Midwest Regional Youth of the Year competition. She made Missouri proud with her speech highlighting the importance of a healthy lifestyle, education, and the impact of one's actions.

I am so thankful to have such a talented young individual in Missouri's Fourth Congressional District working hard to be the best person that she can be and sharing her knowledge with younger kids as a mentor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Jazzmine for her hard work and dedication in using her actions to inspire others. I also want to wish her well in her future endeavors as she begins her freshman year at the University of Missouri.

Go, Tigers.

FAYETTE OPTIMIST CLUB

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Optimist Club of Fayette, Missouri. This club, founded on December 13, 1968, celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. For half a century, they have helped to support youth, and cultivate an overall stronger community in Fayette.

The Optimist Club relies on their dedicated volunteers to raise funds and complete projects that impact the lives of kids in their community.

The Optimists promote youth involvement in Fayette by hosting a summer recreation program, a youth appreciation banquet, and a fishing derby every year, as well as numerous other activities that promote local programming for young people throughout the community.

It is organizations like the Optimist Club that create the backbone of our small towns and help preserve their treasured culture.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Optimist Club of Fayette, Missouri, for their hard work and dedication to the youth of the community for the last 50 years.

COMO FIRE CHIEF RANDY WHITE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Columbia, Missouri, Fire Chief Randy White on his retirement.

Since joining the department in 1998 as a firefighter, Chief White has dedicated his life to the safety of mid-Missouri families. He has saved countless lives and led his department to new heights.

During his time as fire chief, Randy's department became one of only 258 in the world to achieve accreditation through the Commission on Fire Accreditation International. His hard work and leadership have been a blessing to the Columbia Fire Department and a true role model for other departments to follow.

I join with many Missourians, families, and friends to wish Chief White a fulfilling retirement. I hope Randy enjoys the days he has worked so hard to earn and wish him continued health and happiness in this new phase of life.

WE ARE A COUNTRY OF BRAVE AND BEAUTIFUL CITIZENS AND IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, let me set the record straight. The way President Trump talks about women, minorities, immigrants, and pretty much every American who does not look like him is fueling hate in our great country.

Last week, in a series of tweets, President Trump attacked four Congresswomen, all of whom are American citizens and women of color. The President doubled down on his attacks and singled out one of my colleagues from Minnesota in a rally, during which the crowd chanted, ''Send her back,'' which he seemed to relish.

Mr. Speaker, watching that clip made me sick to my stomach, and I am concerned about the direction President Trump is leading our country.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump appears to be encouraging Americans to assume patriotism by the color of one's skin and not the content of one's character. This is, in fact, the opposite of what American heroes like Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Dolores Huerta, Cesar Chavez, and Dr. King fought and bled for.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake: our President is stoking the flames of hate and division in our great country.

President Trump, his America is an America where Congress does not include Native Americans, Latinos, African Americans, Asian Americans, or LGBTQ Americans. His vision for America is one where people like my parents and grandparents are not welcome.

What I find ironic about Donald Trump's anti-immigrant vision for this country is it contradicts his own family's history. Donald Trump's grandfather, Friedrich Trump, moved to the United States in 1885 for many reasons, including to escape poverty. Today, President Trump is hurting our reputation by denying entry to asylum seekers who are fleeing many of the hardships his very own grandfather was escaping.

In 1905, after making his fortune in the United States running a brothel, Grandfather Trump attempted to go back to Germany, only to be denied entry for failing to complete military service in his own country of Germany, something that apparently runs in the family.

After attempting to appeal the denial in a flattering letter to the Prince of Germany, addressing him as the much-loved, noble, wise, and righteous sovereign and sublime ruler, Friedrich Trump's request to return to Germany was denied for a second time.

My father and mother moved to the United States in 1946 seeking a better life for their family because they heard of the promise of the United States of America, that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can succeed and your children can have a better life.

I stand before you today an American-born citizen and a Member of the United States Congress because my parents worked hard and played by the rules. I wasn't handed a fortune like President Trump. I was taught the values of keeping my word, being kind to others, and working for what I earn.

Mr. Speaker, this President would like us to believe that he is more patriotic than the Congresswomen he has repeatedly attacked, not because of anything he has done for this country, but because he believes that this country's rights and protections only apply to the privileged, like himself.

Honor and patriotism exist in some more than others. My brother-in-law, Hector, who was born in Mexico and is now a citizen of the United States of America, answered the call to serve our great country, when Donald Trump avoided service time and time again.

While Donald Trump was dodging the draft five times, my brother-in-law, Hector, was serving the United States of America in Vietnam.

While Donald Trump was ripping off small businesses right here at home, Hector was shot while serving his country in Vietnam.

My Mexican-born brother-in-law has served this country honorably, and if Donald Trump had his way, Hector would never have had the chance to serve our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, does the word ''patriot'' come to mind when you think of a man who dodged the draft time and time again, or does the word ''patriot'' come to mind when you think of a man who answered the call of duty and bled for our great country?

Mr. Speaker, I tell these truths to remind us all why the United States of America is great: We are a country of brave and beautiful American citizens and brave and beautiful immigrants from all over the world who contribute to the greatness of our great Nation every single day.

May God bless the diverse and beautiful people of the United States of America, and God bless the United States of America.

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

REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the medical device tax.

Utah has earned a reputation as a thriving hub for innovation in life sciences, leading the Nation in technology breakthroughs. Each year, medical device manufacturers in Utah pioneer new, exciting medical technologies that help patients live longer and more productive lives.

Unfortunately, the culture of collaboration and innovation has been threatened by the medical device tax, a tax on device manufacturers that has stalled medical technology investment across the country.

Although Congress has come together on a bipartisan basis time and time again to delay its implementation, the continuous threat of heavy, onerous taxation has stifled job growth among medical technology innovators and has delayed cutting-edge research that could potentially lead to breakthroughs in patient care and treatment.

As it stands today, this tax will come into effect January 1, 2020. The impact would be devastating in Utah, where the med tech industry employs thousands of Utahns and contributes approximately $5 billion to the local economy. One local company estimated the tax would cost them over $7 million, money that would otherwise be reinvested into workforce and technology development.

As we approach this January deadline, I call upon my colleagues to come together and finally repeal the tax on innovation once and for all.

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH ISRAEL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight our critical relationship with Israel, an alliance not only important to our two countries, but to the tectonic plates of global geopolitics.

I was pleased to both cosponsor and vote in favor of the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act and the resolution opposing the efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Disinvestment, and Sanctions movement targeting Israel, two important legislative priorities, because I believe Israel's safety and security is critical to our own safety and security. More importantly, it is the right thing to do.

I have shared with my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee that Israel holds a special place in my heart. As a college student 40 years ago, I had the opportunity to spend a semester in Jerusalem and get to know the people and cultures. I developed a unique appreciation and understanding for the struggles they face on a daily basis.

As many of us know, the BDS movement exists solely to delegitimize Israel's very existence, and I am proud of the House of Representatives coming together on a bipartisan basis with a unified voice that we will not stand idly by while one of our closest allies is targeted and vilified. The path to peace between Israel and Palestine will not be hindered by that kind of blind hatred.

Although this BDS resolution sends a critical message, it falls short of what is ultimately needed to address the long-term challenges. I am hopeful that the House will consider stronger legislation with actual binding policy provisions to help the United States stand with Israel against BDS.

I am prepared to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address these issues and those facing our allies.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING APOLLO ENGINEER MARION JOHNSON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Marion Johnson for her contribution to landing a man on the Moon 50 years ago this month.

A product of the First Congressional District of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON used her love of math to break barriers throughout her life not only in math and science but also for women and people of color.

With a math degree from Talladega College, Ms. JOHNSON took a risk and applied to become one of the first female and/or minority engineers at Boeing. She was accepted. By chance, it happened to be around the same time that President Kennedy announced the national mission of sending a man to the Moon.

At Boeing, she worked on a team of engineers with the specific mission of putting a man on the Moon.

In her own words, she said, ''We worked hard. We worked Saturdays. We worked afternoons and evenings until we got it right.''

The rest is history. Now, Ms. JOHNSON's name is enshrined in the Apollo Saturn V Roll of Honor at the Smithsonian and Library of Congress.

I could not have been prouder to have someone like Ms. JOHNSON from the First Congressional District of Georgia contributing to this engineering marvel that changed world history.

RECOGNIZING BLACKSHEAR TIMES' ROBERT AND CHERYL WILLIAMS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Robert and Cheryl Williams, who are retiring after nearly 50 years of running the Blackshear Times in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

The oldest business in the area, the newspaper is 150 years old this year. Under Mr. and Mrs. Williams' leadership, the Blackshear Times has become one of the top papers in Georgia, receiving over 400 awards. Nearly everyone in Pierce County gets their news from the newspaper, exemplified in the Blackshear Times tag line, ''Liked by Many, Cussed by Some, Read by Them All.''

Mr. WILLIAMS edited and published, his dream job since he was a young child. Mrs. Williams continually kept the paper's financials in check.

''To be a good paper, first, you have to be a good business,'' Mr. WILLIAMS said in praise of his wife's work.

I am proud to have the Blackshear Times in my district, and I am thankful that Mr. and Mrs. Williams dedicated 50 years to the paper and keeping the Blackshear community informed.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Williams on their retirement. They both will be missed.

RECOGNIZING HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR SAM WEINREICH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Sam Weinreich, who is celebrating not only his 100th birthday in August but also his 73rd wedding anniversary with his wife, Frieda.

Referred to as Zadie, from Yiddish, Mr. Weinreich is a Holocaust survivor who spent time in both the Auschwitz and Dachau concentration camps. He was the only survivor from his family, which included nine of his siblings. His hometown, Lodz, Poland, once contained over 200,000 Jews and the second largest Jewish community in Europe.

After the Nazi occupation ended, Mr. Weinreich was one of only 6,000 to survive. Mr. Weinreich survived in part because he was a Jewish doctor and received more privileges than other prisoners, but he also had a beautiful voice and would sing songs in front of the guards for food.

Now living in Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. Weinreich has dedicated his life to sharing his story and ensuring that a tragedy of this magnitude will never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, happy birthday and anniversary, Zadie.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS SHARE CONCERNS ABOUT NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Herbert Hoover once stated, ''Blessed are the young, for they will inherit the national debt.''

Four young interns in my office—Nathan Olsen, Jill Oxley, Austin Snell, and Tyler Wiley—recently shared their concerns about the debt burden they will inherit from debt-addicted Washington politicians. These remarks reflect their concerns.

Ironically, their concerns coincide with a massive $2 trillion deficit bill Congress will soon vote on that bequeaths at least $24 trillion in debt to America's future generations. Bequeathing this dangerous debt is the greatest disservice ever done by one American generation to another.

My interns itemize three ways in which excessive debt endangers America.

First, excessive government debt and borrowing compete with and crowd out private borrower investment opportunities by decreasing available credit, thereby costing American jobs and better incomes. According to the Congressional Budget Office, when the government borrows, it borrows from people in businesses, which limits American business and citizen opportunity, which, in turn, drives them to be less productive, cuts their compensation, and makes them less inclined to work. In sum, excessive government debt stunts future growth and hurts the American economy and people.

Second, excessive debt hurts Congress' ability to respond to challenges and emergencies. The Peter G. Peterson Foundation warns that high levels of debt reduce our government's flexibility concerning ''future emergencies, unanticipated challenges, wars, or recessions.''

The Peterson Foundation adds that one reason ''the United States was able to recover from the Great Recession more quickly than other countries was because our debt was fairly low, at 35 percent of GDP.''

As recent history proves, America can better respond to a financial crisis if we are not drowning in excessive debt. Unfortunately, by year's end, America's debt will explode to roughly 78 percent of GDP, more than double that of a mere decade ago. That trend is dangerous.

Third, as America's debt becomes more unmanageable, our creditors become increasingly concerned about government default and national bankruptcy and insolvency. The Congressional Budget Office warns that with the debt-to-GDP ratio projected to grow to ''unprecedented levels, it is increasingly likely that . . . investors will become concerned about the risk of default.''

America has clearly entered dangerous, uncharted financial waters. The greater the debt, the greater the risk.

How do we safely navigate these dangerous waters? Washington must learn from history and heed the advice of President John F. Kennedy, who said we do not choose to cut spending because it is easy, but because it is hard. Unfortunately, today's Washington politicians reject President Kennedy's wisdom because they are as hopelessly addicted to debt as a junkie is to heroin.

As a result, America faces a mountainous $22 trillion debt and a bipartisan debt agreement that adds yet another $2 trillion in debt in just 2 years.

If America is to soar to new heights rather than crash and burn on a mountain of debt, Washington politicians must act like adults. Our choice is clear.

Washington can rack up obscene deficits, accumulated debt, and pay hundreds of billions of dollars each year in debt service costs, with the ultimate catastrophe being debilitating national insolvency and bankruptcy. Or Washington can protect America's future, stop unnecessary spending, and bequeath future generations economic freedom and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I choose the path of economic freedom and prosperity for future American generations. That is why I vote against so many unnecessary and excessive spending bills that we don't have the money to pay for. And that is why I will vote against the proposed spending deal that creates a short-term debt junkie high while badly risking America's future and health.

HONORING WAR HERO TOM ''PINKY'' FUNDERBURK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a man who is part of the Greatest Generation, Tom ''Pinky'' Funderburk of Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Mr. Funderburk has been awarded the French Legion of Honor. Pinky flew B–17 bombers, known as the Flying Fortress, with the Mighty 8th United States Air Force during World War II.

The Legion of Honor was established by Napoleon in 1802 as the highest French order of merit for military and civil merits.

The first dangerous missions for which Pinky was awarded the Legion of Honor took place on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of April 1945 over Royan, France. His crew's mission was to bomb the 30,000 encamped German troops concentrated around Royan on the coast of France.

One day, they approached their target from an altitude of 25,000 feet and noticed an absence of antiaircraft activity in the skies, so they dropped down to 17,000 feet. The formation circled three times to drop their bombs more accurately when a small flare used to follow bombs to their targets ignited in their bomb bay, filling the aircraft with thick, sooty smoke that covered all the windows.

Fearing they were hit by ground fire, the crew grabbed their parachutes and prepared to abandon their plane over enemy territory. Before jumping out, the crew made one last check to see if the pilots were able to make it out safely. They yelled through the intercom to see if they were coming but received no reply. Just as they were ready to bail out, copilot Funderburk yelled out, ''Wait.''

The smoke was so thick that the pilots were worried about crashing into the other planes in the formation and were too busy flying the plane and clearing the smoke to worry about bailing out. The pilots were able to clear the smoke and fly the airplane and crew safely back to their home base.

The final mission took Pinky deep into enemy territory into Horsching, Austria, where French prisoners of war had recently been liberated from a POW camp. Pinky's crew reconfigured their B–17 bomber to carry 31 prisoners of war back to Paris and their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, for these heroic duties and his selfless service, Pinky Funderburk honors all South Carolinians, and I am proud to recognize him today for receiving the prestigious French Legion of Honor.

CAHOKIA MOUNDS

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, southern Illinois is home to one of America's great civilizations in history, many years before this was the United States of America. Its center was at Cahokia, and it was once the largest civilization in today's United States. By 1200 A.D., the community numbered 10,000 to 20,000 strong.

What remains today are the Cahokia Mounds, a 2,200-acre site with more than 70 earth mounds, upon which many of their buildings once stood. This treasure is visited by schools, families, and history buffs, everyone who wants to see this wonderful part of history. It is a critical part of history.

That is why I introduced a bill to make Cahokia Mounds a national park. My bill would help preserve this amazing piece of history for generations to come.

I thank Congressmen CLAY, SHIMKUS, and DAVIS for cosponsoring this bill. This legislation preserves the mounds in their districts, as well.

I also thank the State and local leaders who support our efforts in Illinois, and I thank the HeartLands Conservancy for its hard work and for being guardians of our history.

I thank my staff for working so hard with other issues that are going on but understanding how important this issue is to future generations, to the opportunity for our children and grandchildren to understand the history of this area in the world. I am proud to be part of these efforts to preserve our past well into the future.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Mark Getman, Temple Emanu-El of Canarsie, Brooklyn, New York, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly One, our protector and redeemer, guardian of life and liberty, we ask for Your continued blessings as we open this session of the House of Representatives.

May our Nation and its leaders be blessed with Your protection as they continue their work for their constituents across these United States.

God, continue to send Your light to all elected officials across this land, guiding them with Your good counsel and providing them with wisdom and forbearance.

May our Nation and its citizens always work towards world peace and harmony as part and party representing this great Nation.

God of peace and prosperity, bless this House of Representatives and all those who lead, serve, and defend our Nation as they continue to serve with honor, and remember those who have died in defense of our ideals and values.

May the One who makes peace in the universe make peace for all of us, for all the United States, for all the world.

God bless America.

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 Florida (Mr. DUNN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNN 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.

WELCOMING RABBI MARK GETMAN

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

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Rabbi Mark Getman of Temple Emanu-El of Canarsie, Brooklyn, and thank him for leading us in prayer this morning on the House floor.

I was proud to invite Rabbi Getman to give the opening prayer today, and I am even more proud to call him a constituent of New York's Fourth Congressional District.

Rabbi Getman is a military veteran, a cancer survivor, a community leader, and a man of deep faith. He embodies the strength, leadership, and patriotism that we look for in every American.

I can't express how grateful I am to Rabbi Getman for making the trip down to Washington today to represent our community and to deliver a message of harmony and compassion. I believe that is a message that our country needs to hear, perhaps now more than ever.

Rabbi Getman graciously reminded us today that we are a country united under God, in our pursuit of prosperity and peace for all people, and he reminded us that this shared purpose is more powerful, more important than any political division we may have, and I couldn't agree more.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am beyond appreciative that Rabbi Getman paid such a touching tribute to the brave men and women who wear our uniform today and to those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our great Nation. As a veteran himself, I know that Rabbi Getman understands that sacrifice better than most.

I want to thank Rabbi Getman once more for his service to our community and to our country and, above all, for taking the time to be here with us today and delivering a much-needed message of unity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JACOB CHESTNUT AND JOHN GIBSON

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the history of the House. Some 21 years ago, a deranged individual came through the door that we now call the Memorial Door and took the lives of two of our officers.

I rise to pay tribute to my constituent Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson from the State of Virginia. Both of them were shot and killed defending this Capitol 21 years ago today, July 24, 1998.

A lone gunman burst through what we now call the Memorial Door and attacked this sacred home of American democracy. These brave officers, whom we remember today, placed themselves in the line of fire and gave their lives to protect Members, staff, and visitors in the building that morning.

Memorial Door, Mr. Speaker, is right outside my office. I go through it almost every day. Every time I pass through it, I look at the memorial plaque and remember these two extraordinary and brave men whose sacrifice will not be forgotten by those who serve in and work in this House, by their brothers and sisters in the Capitol Police force who still stand sentry and watch over it, and by their grateful fellow Americans.

Today, America, let us pay tribute to Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson and give our thanks to all the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police and, indeed, to all law enforcement officers who, every morning, get up and put a badge perhaps on their chest or on their belt or in their wallet and go out to protect us, their neighbors, their friends.

Let us thank all law enforcement officers in communities across this country for their service, their dedication, and their sacrifices, which make the exercise of democracy possible.

HONORING MELINDA WALKER UPON HER RETIREMENT AS CHIEF REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I just spoke about two who served our Capitol and our country. Unhappily, they lost their lives.

I now speak about one who has served our House of Representatives as an institution much more happily, because she has served so well and so faithfully and so long and is now retiring, hopefully, to a very happy retirement.

We could not do our job representing the American people without the tireless and sometimes thankless labors of the men and women who make this House function behind the scenes.

They sit at the desk behind us. They sit at the upper rostrum. They make a difference. And they record what we have to say.

From the Clerk's Office to the Parliamentarian staff, from the C–SPAN crew to the stenographers, the nonpartisan, professional staff who enable the work of the House and its Members are central to the success of our constitutional mission.

The House has relied on the services of shorthand reporters of debates for almost 200 years, and the verbatim proceedings of House business have been published as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since 1873.

We have a young woman who is now taking down my remarks, which may or may not be profound, but somebody will be able to say: ''What did Hoyer say?'' ''What did my Representative say?''

A division of the Office of the Clerk, the Office of Official Reporters is charged with providing nonpartisan, professional stenographic services for the House floor, committees, and leadership.

It has grown from a 5-person shop in the 19th century to a diverse 43-person operation today. They work extraordinarily long hours; they work very hard; and they are extraordinarily competent.

Today, I join all my colleagues in thanking one of those outstanding, wonderful individuals who is retiring as the Chief Reporter of Debates, Melinda Walker.

Melinda is with us on the floor today.

Melinda, thank you very much.

And I know, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't out of order, I would mention that her family is in the gallery, but because that is not in order, I won't do that.

Melinda will step down in August, after more than 20 years of service to the House of Representatives.

A proud native of Texas, Melinda came to the House in 1999, after serving as a court reporter for the U.N. International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in Arusha, Tanzania.

Her career began after graduating from the Stenograph Institute of Texas in 1989, and her work took her around the country and across the world, with positions in the United Kingdom, the Caribbean, and South Africa.

Melinda has reported both House committee hearings and floor proceedings. She has taken down committee testimony from two Chief Justices of the Supreme Court and three Secretaries of State, among many others.

On the floor, Melinda has reported the State of the Union messages for three Presidents, as well as the remarks of numerous foreign dignitaries during joint meetings of Congress.

Upon Melinda's promotion to Chief Reporter in 2015, she led the team of reporters and staff in charge of the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under her watch, the office has been successful in meeting its daily production deadlines, while capturing the intricate parliamentary nuances of House proceedings.

Melinda has contributed a fully revised and updated style and formatting manual, more than 200 pages long, for the Office of Official Reporters. Americans will be advantaged by that work for decades to come.

She has been recognized by the National Court Reporters Association as a Registered Professional Reporter and a Certified Manager of Reporting Services, and she remains a certified shorthand reporter in her native Texas.

Melinda plans to return to her hometown of San Saba, Texas, and spend more time with her family and faithful dog, Bleu.

Lucky dog to have Melinda back.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking Melinda Walker for her many years of distinguished and dedicated service to the House and in wishing her the very best in retirement.

Melinda, we owe you and your colleagues a debt of gratitude. You silently serve and sit and listen to verb after noun after adjective after word after word after word—and you stay awake. It is amazing. And you do it so well, to the advantage of all of us who serve here, but, much more importantly, to the advantage of the people of the United States, who will know what their Representatives say on their behalf and will be, therefore, able, in a democracy, to make a sound judgment as to whether those words are the words they want intoned on this floor on their behalf.

So, Melinda, to you and to all of your colleagues, we say thank you. Godspeed. Be well.

RECOGNIZING EDD SORENSON OF JACKSON COUNTY, FLORIDA

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a local hero from Jackson County, Florida.

Mr. Edd Sorenson is known internationally for his courageous and skillful ability to rescue and retrieve cave divers. Just this past March, he was called upon in the Dominican Republic to retrieve two bodies that were on the brink of never being recovered due to the dangerous conditions.

His most recent courageous rescue took place in Tennessee, where he was called upon, in the middle of the night, to save the life of a professional cave diver, Josh Bratchley, widely known as the man who saved the Thai soccer team last year from their cave incident.

When Edd is not answering a call for the next cave rescue, you will find him managing his cave diving business in Marianna, Florida, where he is a cave dive instructor.

Edd is a truly remarkable individual. Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Mr. Edd Sorenson for his heroic and selfless actions that have saved the lives of many and brought closure to families that, otherwise, would never have been possible.

□ 1215

THE PLIGHT OF ETHIOPIAN ISRAELIS IN ISRAEL

(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 highlight the suffering of Ethiopian Israelis. A couple of weeks ago, a young Ethiopian Israeli man was killed by an Israeli police officer.

After this tragedy, there have been massive protests against police brutality. Unfortunately, these protests have turned violent. While I do not condone violence, I believe people have the right to protest systemic racism.

The Ethiopian community in Israel has been treated like second-class citizens for decades. In the 1990s, Ethiopian Israelis had their donated blood secretly disposed of by Israeli officials because they believed it may contain the HIV virus.

Just 4 years ago, an Ethiopian Israeli IDF soldier was brutally beaten by an Israeli police officer, setting off another wave of massive demonstrations.

Now, there are reports that the protests against police brutality are being cast as anti-Israeli. This is nothing more than an attempt to delegitimize their suffering. I will not tolerate it, and neither should any Member of this body.

NEW SNAP PROGRAM RULING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced and published a new rule that would address ''broad-based categorical eligibility'' through the SNAP program, formerly known as food stamps.

Under current law, SNAP recipients in dozens of States have been automatically enrolled into the program, despite not really demonstrating financial need; simply by receiving other minimal welfare services, even just receiving a pamphlet in the mail.

Now, let me be clear that these changes—anyone who truly is economically distressed and eligible will continue to receive SNAP benefits. But through the loophole that has been in existence, some recipients were enrolled in the program without meeting its asset and income tests. The asset and income tests are critical metrics to ensure program integrity and prevent benefits from going to those who would not normally qualify or truly need the assistance.

This new regulation attempts to fix this problem by limiting categorical eligibility for SNAP recipients only to those recipients who receive substantial welfare benefits, rather than nominal ones.

As the former chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of this proposal. Enacting this rule will help address waste and abuse within SNAP, while encouraging the continued availability of the program for our friends in need who truly find themselves food insecure.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF PAUL HANEY

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Paul Haney, a longtime leader in Rochester and Monroe County, and my very dear friend, who passed away on Sunday.

As a former county legislator and city councilman, Paul was a fixture in our community; a man who truly embodied the high ideals of public service.

Paul was kind, honest, smart as a whip, and deeply passionate about improving the community he loved. He devoted his life in service to his neighbors and was always the first to lend a hand to those in need.

Paul Haney's contributions have left a profound and lasting impact on his beloved city. His legacy will never be forgotten.

I join all of Rochester County and Monroe County in mourning his loss, and extend my thoughts, prayers, and deepest sympathies to the Haney family.

CONGRATULATING CHANDLER WASHBURN AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY MIXED CREW TEAM

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Midshipman Chandler Washburn and the entire United States Naval Academy mixed crew team for their victory at the historic, now historic, King's Cup this past July.

The King's Cup is a prestigious race between eight allied military forces, and has only been held twice, once in 1919, and this year on the 100th anniversary. The U.S. Naval Academy defeated countries like Canada, France, and Germany on their way to winning the cup.

The Northeast Florida community is incredibly proud of Chandler and his fellow midshipmen on this extraordinary accomplishment.

Chandler graduated from the Episcopal School in Jacksonville and is now a sophomore at the Naval Academy. Like all those representing us at service academies across the country, his commitment to both academics and military service inspire us all.

On behalf of the Fourth District of Florida, congratulations to Chandler and the Naval Academy mixed crew team for a victory they will remember for the rest of their lives.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 397, REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3239, HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 29, 2019, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 509

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-24 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the

purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-26 modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 507 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 25, 2019, or July 26, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 8. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 509, providing for consideration of H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule makes in order one amendment. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act, under a structured rule.

The rule self-executes Chairman NADLER's manager's amendment and makes in order two further amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Upon passage of the rule, House Resolution 507 will be considered as adopted.

Finally, the rule provides suspension authority for this Thursday and Friday, and standard floor recess instructions for the August district work period.

Mr. Speaker, in a few days, we will be celebrating 200 days since Democrats took back the majority in the U.S. House of Representatives. We have spent the past 8 months fighting for American families, American values.

While Republicans spent 8 years in charge, what did they get done?

Their crowning achievement was a massive tax giveaway to corporations to line the pockets of the superwealthy, while exploding the Federal deficit by $1.5 trillion. Clearly, a tax scam was a result of special interests having too much power in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to give back that power to the people, to the American people that sent us here.

Democrats passed the For the People Act, which puts elections back in the hands of the people and gets special interest out of the government.

And instead of giving tax cuts to billionaires, Democrats, last week, passed legislation to increase the minimum wage to $15 an hour.

□ 1230

And as a result, 33 million Americans will finally get a raise and no more singling out to our young Puerto Ricans.

The Raise the Wage Act repealed a shortsighted Republican measure that allowed employers to pay Puerto Ricans under the age of 25 a measly $4.25 an hour for up to 4 years. I don't know about my colleagues' backgrounds, but at 20 years old, I was raising a family, and I could not have done that on $4.25 an hour.

And we proclaim to all the American women, whether you are a supervisor at a fast-food restaurant, a nurse at a hospital, or a World Cup-winning soccer player, women deserve equal pay for equal work.

And for Dreamers without permanent legal status who came here as children and just want to contribute to the greatness that makes America, Democrats passed the Dream Act so that they can have a pathway to citizenship. My Republican colleagues refused to bring up the Dream Act when they were in charge, even when, clearly, we had enough votes to pass the bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of progress Americans wanted to see. That is why elections matter.

Today, we are also voting on the Butch Lewis Act, to protect the pensions of hardworking Americans.

I come from a proud union household. For 17½ years, I worked as a 911 dispatcher, and my husband was a member of the building and construction trades for 20 years. We taught our children, our sons, to work hard and save for their future, and we showed them the honor of public service.

Mr. Speaker, in December of 2014, this body passed the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014, a misguided bill that reneged on the promise that we make to retirees that they will get the benefits they worked and negotiated for. And here we sit, almost 5 years later, and the multiemployer pension system is still on the brink of a real and disastrous crisis.

While these plans have historically been a safe and secure retirement option, many plans now face financial shortfalls because of the Great Recession and other structural challenges, like a lack of new workers, an increase in the number of retirees, and employees abandoning the commitments that they made to their employees.

Around 130 of these plans covering over a million Americans are rapidly running out of money to pay benefits that were promised to these employees. Truck drivers, electricians, ironworkers, steelworkers, coal miners, and many, many others participate in multiemployer pension plans. More than 5,000 of my constituents, alone, participate in multiemployer pension plans. These hardworking individuals are staring down the possibility of losing their retirement through no fault of their own.

I know that some of my colleagues are going to tar and feather this bill. They are going to call it a bailout. They are going to say that it is fiscally irresponsible. But this bill only authorizes loans, loans for multiemployer

pension plans, if it is clear that those loans can be repaid with interest.

This is not a bailout; this is a loan. And I am happy to have my staff provide a dictionary if any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are still confused about the difference and the meaning of each.

Hardworking American workers and retirees are counting on us to protect the benefits that they have earned and keep them on a solid financial footing. H.R. 397 does that exactly, and all without forcing workers and retirees to pay a single cent more for the benefits that they have earned.

Now, I would like to turn our attention to H.R. 3239, Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.

I have had the opportunity to witness the horrendous conditions at our southern border, children jailed in freezing cold cages, toddlers going without nutritious food. They need to grow up and be healthy and strong. Six-year-olds who are not allowed to shower. Border Patrol agents parading asylees around with degrading messages hanging from their necks.

This is the greatest country in the world, and no child—no child—should die in our custody and in the greatest custody in the world. Jakelin Caal should not have died. Felipe Gomez should not have died. And Carlos Hernandez should not have died.

We cannot bring these children back from the dead, but we can try to prevent the next child from dying. And we must. We must because we have a moral responsibility to these children.

Today we have the opportunity to act. The Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Act would protect the health and safety of children in CBP care. It will bring medical expertise to the border so that children receive the care that they need, and it will ensure that children have access to the basics: nutritious food, a shower, toothpaste, and clean clothes.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation. Vote ''yes'' on the rule for the children. Vote ''yes'' on the bill for the children.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. TORRES for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering two bills that will never become law. They are not going to be taken up by the Senate. If they did, they would not pass, and the President likely would not sign them.

The first bill, H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, was drafted by the majority as an attempted fix of the multiemployer pension crisis. Unfortunately, the bill does nothing but create more government, increase the deficit, and kick the can down the road for another generation that will have to ultimately deal with it.

So let's examine the facts.

Multiemployer pension plans are pensions run jointly by a union and multiple companies whose employees are members of that union. These are defined benefit plans that guarantee employees receive a specific amount upon retirement regardless of the funding available. These plans must comply with collective bargaining agreements and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and pay into the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the Federal insurer of the plans.

Over 1,300 multiemployer plans cover more than 10 million participants, and well over a million are in plans that are either insolvent or will be within the next two decades. This means that more than 1 million retirees may have their retirement plan benefits cut if no action is taken.

Multiemployer pension plans are currently underfunded by $638 billion, and the figure increases by $15 billion each and every year. The largest plan is the Central States Pension Fund, which has been sponsored by the Teamsters. It has approximately 385,000 participants and is underfunded by $41 billion.

To ensure struggling pension plans would not affect the defined benefit promise to employers, Congress created the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to provide financial assistance to pay participant benefits. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is funded through premiums paid by plan funds and is currently not backed by the taxpayer.

Since 2003, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has held a deficit when comparing its current multiemployer pension assets to its outstanding liabilities due to these insolvent union-managed pension plans. Today, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has a deficit of $54 billion. The entity Congress created to protect insolvent plans is estimated to be insolvent itself.

This crisis did not materialize suddenly. During the 2008 recession, retirement plans throughout the country lost nearly 30 percent of their value, but the weaknesses of the multiemployer system were not conceived in one event. The American Academy of Actuaries outlined some of the decisions that led to this instability.

Generally, many plans overleveraged their risk, increased their benefits in an unsustainable fashion, did not maintain appropriate resources to recover from losses, and kept fewer working employees. Additionally, many employers have left their multiemployer pension plans, further limiting funding for those that remain.

At the end of the day, these plans were mismanaged in a way that has increased costs and decreased revenue.

So how are our colleagues across the aisle hoping to fix this troubling situation? The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act would create a trust fund called the pension rehabilitation trust fund that would be administered by a brand-new Federal agency within the Department of the Treasury called the Pension Rehabilitation Administration.

This new agency would provide unsecured, federally subsidized 30-year loans to critical or declining multiemployer plans without requiring the plans to make any actuarial changes to bring them back to solvency. If the plan cannot certify that it can repay the loan, the plan would also receive a grant from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to pay retiree benefits and to pay back the loan, essentially double-dipping Federal support. If a plan cannot make interest or principal payments on the loan, payments can be forgiven to pay retiree benefits.

Finally, H.R. 397 would reverse reforms made in 2014 that allowed certain plans greater flexibility to regain solvency.

Earlier this month, the Congressional Budget Office published a report on the estimated budget impact of a previous version of H.R. 397. The new subsidies and the expanded assistance would increase the Federal deficit by $64 billion without truly addressing the underlying financial issues.

Should this bill be signed into law, it will be the first time that the Federal Government has placed United States taxpayers on the hook to subsidize private pension plans.

It is important to note that many taxpayers who would finance this subsidy have not, themselves, been included in a pension plan.

As presented today, H.R. 397 would result in a large balloon payment due in year 30 of the pension rehabilitation trust fund loan. And if a plan cannot afford loan payments without cutting benefits, the new Pension Rehabilitation Administration would be allowed to forgive these debts. This is the definition of a taxpayer bailout.

Mr. Speaker, the majority knows this bill will never move in the Senate, and I do urge my colleagues to reconsider this legislation. There, perhaps, are ways to fix this crisis and address it in a fiscally and actuarially sound manner. A bipartisan agreement is the only way for a solution to this crisis that will actually make it to the President's desk.

The second bill in this rule is yet another attempt to fix the crisis at our southern border without addressing any root cause. H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act, is a reactionary bill attempting to restructure Customs and Border Protection through overly prescriptive, one-size-fits-all mandates that actually ignore what CBP has as resources and its core mission.

If this legislation were to be signed into law, Customs and Border Protection would be required to provide health and medical screenings to all migrants who entered their custody. Customs and Border Protection must provide individuals 1 gallon of water

per day, access to safe and clean toilets and showers, diaper changing facilities, and provide sanitation products. CBP will also be required to provide three meals a day totaling 2,000 calories, interpreters, video monitoring, adequate lighting, and to keep facilities within a specific temperature range.

□ 1245

Medical staff are required to be onsite to conduct medical screenings, regardless of the number of staff or apprehensions, and specialty physicians are required to, at the very least, be on call.

These physician specialties include pediatrics, OB/GYN, family medicine, geriatric medicine, infectious diseases, mental health, and dieticians. Immediate access to such specialists is not even available to some of our veterans, yet we are mandating it be there for undocumented migrants.

The bill also requires adult chaperones for children receiving medical exams. Allowable adults will consist of parents, legal guardians, and/or adult relatives. However, ''adult relative'' is not defined, meaning that a very distant relative or someone who simply states they are a relative could pose as the child's guardian in the absence of a parent or legal guardian.

This is concerning for identifying trafficking victims. When children are victims of trafficking, often the only chance they get to be apart from their trafficker is while receiving medical care, and sometimes then the trafficker will refuse to leave the child alone.

If we mandate the presence of an adult relative during the child's medical exam, in fact, we may never learn that the child is a victim.

Additionally, children who arrive with a parent, legal guardian, or other adult relative are to be kept together in Customs and Border Protection custody. Under current law, the Office of Refugee Resettlement has custody of and must provide care for each unaccompanied alien child, defined as a child without lawful immigration status under the age of 18 without a parent or legal guardian to provide care.

If children who arrive with an adult relative are not allowed to be transferred to the Office of Refugee Resettlement, this bill is simultaneously mandating that ORR violate current law.

Customs and Border Protection's mission is to safeguard America's borders to protect the public from dangerous people and materials while facilitating legal trade and travel. Due to the migrant crisis, more CBP agents and officers are concentrated on the southern border, taking them away from their other lawful responsibilities.

If Customs and Border Protection is required to implement the mandates that are in this bill, customs inspections will be limited, and lines at ports of entry will become much longer.

Customs and Border Protection inspects our agriculture and food, checks for counterfeit or defective consumer products, and searches for and seizes illicit drugs, much of which is currently fueling the opioid crisis. If they are not on the line to do their job, these things don't happen.

Customs and Border Protection officers are also the first to welcome Americans home from abroad and foreigners with legal documentation into the country. Due to the Democrats' refusal to deal with our southern border crisis, these important functions will also suffer.

We must also remember that Customs and Border Protection facilities do not just exist along the southern border. Customs and Border Protection is located in every State and territory, in addition to several overseas preclearance facilities. Mandating the presence of specialty medical personnel and certain facility upgrades is not only unfeasible in some of these remote locations, but it would also cost an enormous amount of money.

The cost to comply with the provisions in this bill is unclear because we don't have a Congressional Budget Office score, but it is likely to be high.

Customs and Border Protection currently has around $3 billion in unmet funding needs due to the crisis on our southern border. Requiring updates to hundreds of Customs and Border Protection facilities, increasing personnel and equipment, and providing training would add significantly to this shortfall.

Here is the really amazing part: This bill contains no authorization for appropriations. Last night at the Rules Committee, it was asked how Democrats were planning to pay for the mandates in this bill. The response was that there is money there, that it has previously been appropriated in the recent border supplemental.

Remember that is the very same supplemental that the House Democratic leadership told us last May was not necessary because this was a manufactured crisis. Then suddenly, right before the Fourth of July recess, it became a very real crisis, and the Congress did step up to provide the additional funding that was required. But this funding was provided for specific purposes, not for new requirements upon Customs and Border Protection.

The answer is that there is no funding provided to implement this bill, which amounts to an unfunded mandate. That diminishes the likelihood that any of it would actually happen, should it become law.

Most importantly, this bill does nothing to stop the flow of irregular migrants, including vulnerable children, to our southern border.

Placing overly burdensome and unreasonable standards of care on Customs and Border Protection will only exacerbate the security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border.

Let me just say this: Having been at the Clint facility last Friday, the men and women of the Customs and Border Protection are doing the job that Congress asked them to do. Congress didn't ask them to do; they told them to do. We passed laws. They are delivering on what we told them to do.

But the men and women at Customs and Border Protection are good people who are driven to do the right thing. They care, but at the same time, we complicate their lives so much by not funding the needs that they actually have and then adding on top of it all of these unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Democratic colleagues to work across the aisle to find and implement real solutions rather than unfunded mandates. I urge opposition to this rule.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues had read the bill, they would know that not only are there numerous incentives for plans to repay the loans, there is a statutory requirement for plan actuaries to demonstrate that the plan will be able to pay the loan back with interest.

Let's talk about how we got in this situation. After the 9/11 attacks, the airline industry was in desperate need of help, and Congress stepped up and approved loan assistance. We acted because it was seen as an emergency.

In 2008, during the greatest financial crisis in our lifetimes, Wall Street banks and the auto industry were in trouble and in desperate need of help. Congress again acted because it was seen as an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, what makes this situation any different?

Congress disbursed approximately $624.6 billion in taxpayer money during these emergencies, and roughly $699.7 billion has come back: revenue, interest, fees, and asset sales. Ultimately, it earned taxpayers more than $75 billion in profit.

To the 898 retirees of Texas' 26th Congressional District, I say to you: Democrats have your back, and Democrats are fighting for you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I rise in support of strong bipartisan passage of the Butch Lewis Act and this rule. I thank Congresswoman TORRES for yielding me this time and Chairman RICHARD NEAL of the Ways and Means Committee for moving this legislation expeditiously.

The Butch Lewis Act will provide the economic security this body ripped out from under millions of hardworking Americans in past Congresses.

Across our country, 1.3 million workers—truck drivers, candymakers, coal

miners—and retirees face serious and significant threats of cuts to their hard-earned multiemployer pension plans through no fault of their own.

Several of these plans are large enough to take down the entire Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, threatening the security of another 10 million hardworking Americans.

I have heard the message time and again from retirees in our district and across this Nation: They worked for decades to earn these pensions, and they cannot sustain massive cuts. Now, they are too old or their health too unstable to return to the workforce. The stress and anxiety are sapping their will, and some have even taken their own lives.

The Butch Lewis Act will ensure they receive their much-needed and long-overdue pensions, again, which they earned.

The Butch Lewis Act keeps the promises made to retirees, guaranteeing their pensions into the future, and does so by allowing impacted pension plans to borrow the money needed to remain solvent over a 30-year period of time, with low-interest loans that they must pay back.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

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

Pensions have afforded millions of middle-class Americans the opportunity to enjoy their golden years with economic peace of mind. Let us restore this peace to 1.3 million Americans and retirees who earned these benefits with the swift and, finally, just passage of the Butch Lewis Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a valuable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding.

I am on the Ways and Means Committee. I was at the markup for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I do want to correct the RECORD from the previous statement that my colleague on the other side of the aisle made that this was a bipartisan legislative initiative. Not one Republican voted for this bill.

We offered up several amendments. None of them were taken. One of them, for example, was one that I proposed whereby these employees would take out a guaranty policy that would ensure that taxpayers get paid back for these ''loans.''

They call them loans, and the gentlewoman says that they must be paid back. That is not true. Read the fine print, my fellow Americans. It says that they can be forgiven, that they can be converted into grants.

This is a bailout. This is one of the most reckless, fiscally irresponsible pieces of legislation I have ever seen.

Yes, we need to help those workers. They were the real victims. The culprits? The unions and the employers making benefit promises that they knew good and well they couldn't deliver on.

Who is now going to hold the bag? Our children and grandchildren.

Today, we are bailing out $100 billion worth, about 130 plans irresponsibly managed—grossly, irresponsibly managed. It is our children who will pay for this.

This is the first $100 billion. There is $650 billion, roughly, underfunded liabilities in multiemployer pensions. Of the 1,300 pension plans, whereby 10 million workers are covered, 75 percent of the workers are in plans that are less than 50 percent funded.

This is a disaster. This is a terrible precedent. This is a moral hazard if I have ever seen it because we will do this for $100 billion, but we won't fix the problem. We don't do anything to get at the root cause that brought us here, and there will be a line as long as the eye can see to bail out the next $100 billion and the next $100 billion. It won't be the multiemployer pension. It will be State pensions and local pensions.

We are bankrupt, Mr. Speaker. We are bankrupt in this country, and this is the most irresponsible way to try to solve this problem of underfunded and unfunded liabilities for these workers.

Hold the people who are responsible accountable. Don't just give a blank check from the taxpayers to bail out this program and be right back here doing the same thing.

I was a regulator at the FDIC. We would close down a bank that gave these so-called loans so fast that your heads would spin.

This is not a loan. This is a complete write-off of irresponsible behavior. We shouldn't have anything to do with this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. I oppose it. I hope they will, too.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, painting this greedy picture of union bosses who mismanage funds and overpromise benefits doesn't get us anywhere, and it is simply not true.

I will tell you what is true. What is true is that 399 retirees in Texas' Congressional District 19 will lose. But guess what? Democrats got your back in Texas 19. Know that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

□ 1300

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Custody Act, my legislation to ensure CBP upholds basic standards to meet the humanitarian needs of children, women, and families.

My bill is an American-values-based, basic public health approach to prevent the deaths of children under CBP's custody and responsibility, and to develop a professional, humane response to the humanitarian challenges at our border.

Why are these humanitarian standards needed, you might ask?

Because when I visited the border, I saw open toilets in crowded cells without privacy, and babies who were dirty and didn't have diapers sleeping on cold cement floors; because these inhumane and unsanitary conditions threaten the mental and physical health of CBP agents; and because six children have now died in the custody and responsibility of CBP.

To address this crisis, we need to do more than send money to an administration that has urged, in court, that children in CBP custody do not need soap and toothbrushes for basic hygiene needs.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Passing this rule is the first step to ensure CBP facilities have basic necessities like humane sleeping conditions, private and clean bathrooms, sufficient water and nutrition, and showers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow representatives to support my bill, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Custody Act, to protect the health of our agents, prevent the deaths of children, and restore humanity to our treatment of children and families seeking asylum.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to add H. Con. Res. 54 that will reconstitute the Joint Select Committee on Multiemployer Pensions through February of 2020. The select committee worked to find solutions to reestablish the solvency of multiemployer plans. While a draft proposal was released, ultimately, no legislative solution was achieved.

By reconstituting the select committee through February of 2020, we will build upon the work of a previous committee to finally ensure the solvency of the multiemployer pension plans. This is an opportunity to work across the dais on an issue that affects millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question so that we can come together to protect Americans in retirement.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington to fight for workers. I also came to Congress to make tough choices, not easy ones. That is why we are here today: to stand up for workers throughout Wisconsin and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that my resolution, H. Con. Res. 54, can be voted on. My resolution, H. Con. Res. 54, will reestablish the congressional joint select committee to address the multiemployer pension crisis, bringing together a nonpartisan group to take this problem head on.

Pension plans for nearly half a million Americans are in jeopardy. Roughly, 130 union-managed pension funds, covering over 1.3 million workers, are severely underfunded. This accounts for more than 23,000 workers from the Central States' plan in Wisconsin alone. In just 5½ years, their pension fund may become insolvent. Unfortunately, the actions of a few have resulted in uncertainty for many.

We all know that Central States and other pension plans are in crisis. These underfunded plans pose a threat to workers, to retirees, and to our economy. We need to address this now.

I have offered H. Con. Res. 54 as a real solution to this problem. This is a good-faith effort to protect pensions. This is an opportunity to make real change in Americans' lives. This is a path for Democrats and Republicans to protect pension benefits for thousands of Americans.

The joint select committee will be required to come to a legislative solution no later than April 30, 2020. This holds Members accountable and gives the issue the urgency it requires.

Like many Federal programs, we should look at the States. For example, in Wisconsin, the State's public employee pension system is designed to avoid the challenges that we see in today's multiemployer pensions. Contributions to the State's pension fund are recalculated yearly to ensure the pension fund continues to be funded.

Wisconsin's retirement system is fully funded. It isn't reliant on political wins, and it has a formula that protects retirees by making proactive, not reactive changes. This is one of many possible solutions that should be on the table.

H.R. 397 does not solve the actual problem. Why? Because it does not prevent this crisis from happening again in 5 years, in 10 years, or in 20 years. We owe it to workers to provide them with the certainty that they will have a retirement living in dignity. H.R. 397 does not do that.

Democrats and Republicans agree: the retirees and future retirees are the victims here. We need to protect them. These are men and women who have or are currently working and supporting their families. They have planned for retirement and, through no fault of their own, their financial future is at risk.

Are we capable of working together in the House? We must.

However, throughout this process, the majority did not allow other voices to be heard. H.R. 397 did not even receive a public hearing. We can do better. We must do better.

My resolution would require us to work together. As my resolution says, we should establish the select committee focused solely on this issue. We should support hardworking Americans who are vested in the system. Democrats and Republicans should protect workers and retirees and ensure new benefits are adequately funded. Reform the broken system to prevent this from occurring again. And use this as an opportunity to work together.

Just like the pension system is broken, so is our political system. We can do better. We must do better. The clock is ticking. This is an opportunity to protect retirees and workers. They deserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately consider my resolution and reconstitute the joint committee and fix this problem for the long term.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the joint select committee held five hearings. Enough with the talk. These hardworking American retirees are demanding action. They want Congress to act.

We are here because of failed IRS regulations in the eighties and nineties that deterred employers from increasing contributions in times of surplus. We are here because when a contributing employer went bankrupt, the remaining employers got saddled with the unfunded liabilities.

Most importantly, we are not here because of the millions of Americans participating in these plans. They did nothing wrong.

I want to point to one plan in Wisconsin's First District. There are 3,285 retirees. And, to them, I want to repeat and say: Democrats in Congress have your back.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on reconstituting the select committee that Mr. STEIL just spoke of on the issue on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring the House's attention to an editorial in The Washington Post from April 25. Before we initiated this discussion today, they wrote that the retirement livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of working class Americans are in jeopardy. So, too, are many businesses for which pension obligations have become a growth-stifling burden.

Quoting The Washington Post:

''A meltdown must be avoided, but so, too, must a massive Federal bailout that would soak the rest of society, including many taxpayers who do not even have pensions. Between those poles lie inevitable shared sacrifices: a significant but finite injection of public funds, offset by limited benefit reductions, conditioned on long-term reforms to stabilize the system.''

And they go on to say:

''Congress actually adopted such a proposal on a bipartisan basis in 2014, but the Obama administration balked at implementing the required benefit haircut for Central States' retirees on the eve of the 2016 election, which sent Congress back to the drawing board. Lawmakers from both parties and both Chambers formed a committee to write a new bill, which would have gotten expedited consideration on the floors of both Chambers. Unfortunately, the committee missed a self-imposed November 30, 2018 deadline.''

Leaving The Washington Post for a moment, now we are talking about reconstituting that select committee. And, in fact, that is what the editorial board of The Washington Post was suggesting last April. We find ourselves at that juncture now.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question and defeat the previous question so we can consider the amendment brought by Mr. STEIL.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, also known as the Butch Lewis Act.

Without this bill, millions of retired workers, including truck drivers, electricians, steelworkers, locomotive engineers, boilermakers, machinists, and others will lose their earned pension benefits. We should all agree that these pensions should not be cut.

This is about basic fairness. These are hardworking people who agreed to exchange some of their pay during their working years for the promise of a secure retirement. This bill will provide loans to pension plans in need of help to pay these benefits. These are loans.

Many of us remember the dark days of the financial crisis. During this crisis, pension plans took a big hit. Back then, Congress bailed out Wall Street. Although I did not support that bill, I think we should all agree now that we should help support pensions for retirees. Let's do right by the everyday families who count on these plans. Let's pass this rule and pass the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. It is the right thing to do.

□ 1315

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, both bills under consideration as part of this rule provide Band-Aids to what are much more systemic problems. We simply cannot keep placing Band-Aids on open wounds.

Republicans agree that there is a multiemployer pension crisis, but as my Republican colleagues on the committees of jurisdiction have stated many times before, it has to be addressed through reforms to the financial structure of these plans to ensure that the plans will not be underfunded in the future.

The security humanitarian crisis on the southern border continues. At least we are to a point right now that we admit that it is a crisis. Republicans will keep working on solutions to secure the border and help stabilize Central American countries in order to eliminate the surge in irregular migration.

These are not problems that can be solved on a partisan basis alone. I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us in finding a long-lasting solution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, a ''no'' vote on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the core, how we choose to vote on these bills reflects our values.

This morning, I read a report that a school district in Pennsylvania tried to create a family separation program in order to collect school lunch debts. Imagine that. Family separation because children are too poor to pay for their lunch.

This maltreatment at our southern border is spreading across our Nation, dehumanizing people because they are poor. This is how we want to treat the weakest among us?

Will we lock children in cages and allow babies to sit in dirty diapers for days, give asylees toothbrushes but no toothpaste, and deny children regular showers and proper medical care?

Will we turn a blind eye when children are dying at the hands of the CBP officers?

Will we watch as retirees are forced to choose between paying for rent, paying for groceries, or paying for their medication?

Will we stand by and watch as our neighbors, our parents are forced to stretch their medication because they are being denied the pension that they were promised, that they worked for?

We are a country where migrants and asylees can come for a better life. We are a nation where you can work hard and retire with the peace of mind that you have earned your keep.

Democrats are fighting to protect the promise of the American Dream for everyone. Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for myself when I say this, but I refuse to be a party to breaking that promise, because it means that much to me.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and to pass these critical pieces of legislation.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 509

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) establishing the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3409) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3409

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 ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 101. Authorizations of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.
Sec. 103. Determination of budgetary effects.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

Sec. 201. Grade on retirement.
Sec. 202. Congressional affairs; Director.
Sec. 203. Limitations on claims.
Sec. 204. Authority for officers to opt out of promotion board consideration.
Sec. 205. Temporary promotion authority for officers in certain grades with critical skills.
Sec. 206. Career intermission program.
Sec. 207. Major acquisitions; operation and sustainment costs.
Sec. 208. Employment assistance.
Sec. 209. Reports on gender diversity in the Coast Guard.
Sec. 210. Disposition of infrastructure related to E–LORAN.
Sec. 211. Positions of importance and responsibility.
Sec. 212. Research projects; transactions other than contracts and grants.
Sec. 213. Acquisition workforce authorities.
Sec. 214. Report on Coast Guard defense readiness resources allocation.
Sec. 215. Report on the feasibility of liquefied natural gas fueled vessels.

TITLE III—SHIPPING

Sec. 301. Electronic charts; equivalency.
Sec. 302. Passenger vessel security and safety requirements; application.
Sec. 303. Non-operating individual.
Sec. 304. Small passenger vessels and uninspected passenger vessels.
Sec. 305. Installation vessels.
Sec. 306. Advisory committees.
Sec. 307. Expired maritime liens.
Sec. 308. Training; emergency response providers.
Sec. 309. Aiming a laser pointer at a vessel.
Sec. 310. Maritime transportation assessment.
Sec. 311. Safety of special activities.
Sec. 312. Engine cut-off switches; use requirement.
Sec. 313. Exemptions and equivalents.
Sec. 314. Security plans; reviews.
Sec. 315. Waiver of navigation and vessel inspection laws.
Sec. 316. Requirement for small shipyard grantees.
Sec. 317. Independent study on the United States Merchant Marine Academy.
Sec. 318. Centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education.
Sec. 319. Renewal of merchant mariner licenses and documents.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 401. Coastwise trade.
Sec. 402. Unmanned maritime systems and satellite vessel tracking technologies.
Sec. 403. Expedited transfer in cases of sexual assault; dependents of members of the Coast Guard.
Sec. 404. Towing vessels; operation outside the boundary line.
Sec. 405. Coast Guard authorities study.
Sec. 406. Cloud computing strategy.
Sec. 407. Report on effects of climate change on Coast Guard.
Sec. 408. Shore infrastructure.
Sec. 409. Physical access control system report.
Sec. 410. Coastwise endorsements.
Sec. 411. Polar security cutter acquisition report.
Sec. 412. Sense of the Congress on the need for a new Great Lakes icebreaker.
Sec. 413. Cargo preference study.
Sec. 414. Insider Threat program.
Sec. 415. Fishing safety grants.
Sec. 416. Plans for demonstration programs.
Sec. 417. Waters deemed not navigable waters of the United States for certain purposes.
Sec. 418. Coast Guard housing; status and authorities briefing.

Sec. 419. Conveyance of Coast Guard property at Point Spencer, Alaska.
Sec. 420. Prohibition.
Sec. 421. Certificate extensions.
Sec. 422. Homeland security rotational cybersecurity research program at the Coast Guard Academy.
Sec. 423. Towing vessel inspection fees.
Sec. 424. Subrogated claims.
Sec. 425. Loan provisions under Oil Pollution Act of 1990.
Sec. 426. Liability limits.
Sec. 427. Report on drug interdiction in the Caribbean basin.
Sec. 428. Voting Requirement.
Sec. 429. Transportation work identification card pilot program.
Sec. 430. Plan for wing-in-ground demonstration plan.

TITLE V—REORGANIZATION

Sec. 501. Uninspected commercial fishing industry vessels.
Sec. 502. Transfers.
Sec. 503. Repeals.

TITLE VI—TECHNICAL, CONFORMING, AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 601. Maritime transportation system.
Sec. 602. References to ''persons'' and ''seamen''.
Sec. 603. Common appropriation structure.
Sec. 604. References to ''himself'' and ''his''.
Sec. 605. References to ''motorboats'' and ''yachts''.
Sec. 606. Miscellaneous technical corrections.
Sec. 607. Technical corrections relating to codification of Ports and Waterways Safety Act.

TITLE VII—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Sec. 701. Short title.
Sec. 702. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE VIII—COAST GUARD ACADEMY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Sec. 801. Short title.
Sec. 802. Coast Guard Academy study.
Sec. 803. Annual report.
Sec. 804. Assessment of Coast Guard Academy admission processes.
Sec. 805. Coast Guard Academy minority outreach team program.
Sec. 806. Coast Guard college student pre-commissioning initiative.
Sec. 807. Annual board of visitors.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 4902 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''year 2019'' and inserting ''years 2020 and 2021'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''provided for, $7,914,195,000 for fiscal year 2019.'' and inserting ''provided for—

''(i) $8,122,912,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(ii) $8,538,324,000 for fiscal year 2021.'';

(3) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''subparagraph (A)—'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)(i), $17,035,000 shall be for environmental compliance and restoration.'';

(4) by striking paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (1)(B)(ii);

(5) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Of the amount authorized under subparagraph (A)(ii) $17,376,000 shall be for environmental compliance and restoration.'';

(6) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''For the procurement'' and inserting ''(A) For the procurement'';

(B) by striking ''and equipment, $2,694,745,000 for fiscal year 2019.'' and inserting ''and equipment—

''(i) $2,748,640,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(ii) $2,803,613,000 for fiscal year 2021.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Of the amounts authorized under subparagraph (A), the following amounts shall be for the alteration of bridges:

''(i) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(ii) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.'';

(7) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and equipment, $29,141,000 for fiscal year 2019.'' and inserting ''and equipment—

''(A) $13,834,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(B) $14,111,000 for fiscal year 2021.''; and

(8) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) For the Coast Guard's Medicare-eligible retiree health care fund contribution to the Department of Defense—

''(A) $205,107,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(B) $209,209,000 for fiscal year 2021.''.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

Section 4904 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''43,000 for fiscal year 2018 and 44,500 for fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''44,500 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''fiscal years 2018 and 2019'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2020 and 2021''.

SEC. 103. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

SEC. 201. GRADE ON RETIREMENT.

(a) COMMANDANT OR VICE COMMANDANT.—Section 303 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''A'' each place it appears and inserting ''Subject to section 2501, a''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''An'' and inserting ''Subject to section 2501, an''.

(b) OTHER OFFICERS.—Section 306 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''An officer'' each place it appears and inserting ''Subject to section 2501, an officer''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the officer's''.

(c) COMMISSIONED OR WARRANT OFFICER.—Section 2501 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''COMMISSIONED OFFICER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any'';

(B) by striking ''him'' and inserting ''such officer'';

(C) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the officer's''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONDITIONAL DETERMINATION.—When an officer is under investigation for alleged misconduct at the time of retirement, the Secretary may conditionally determine the highest grade of satisfactory service of the officer pending completion of the investigation. Such grade is subject to resolution under subsection (c)(2).'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''WARRANT OFFICER.—Any'';

(B) by striking ''him'' and inserting ''such warrant officer''; and

(C) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the warrant officer's''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) RETIREMENT IN LOWER GRADE.—

''(1) MISCONDUCT IN LOWER GRADE.—In the case of an officer whom the Secretary determines committed misconduct in a lower grade, the Secretary may determine the officer has not served satisfactorily in any grade equal to or higher than that lower grade.

''(2) CONDITIONAL DETERMINATION.—A determination of the retired grade of an officer shall be resolved following a conditional determination under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) if the investigation of or personnel action against the officer or warrant officer, as applicable, results in adverse findings.

''(3) RETIRED PAY; RECALCULATION.—If the retired grade of an officer is reduced, the retired pay of the officer under chapter 71 of title 10 shall be recalculated, and any modification of the retired pay of the officer shall go into effect on the effective date of the reduction in retired grade.

''(d) FINALITY OF RETIRED GRADE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATIVE FINALITY.—Except as otherwise provided by law, a determination of the retired grade of an officer pursuant to this section is administratively final on the day the officer is retired, and may not be reopened.

''(2) REOPENING DETERMINATION.—A determination of the retired grade of an officer may be reopened as follows:

''(A) If the retirement or retired grade of the officer was procured by fraud.

''(B) If substantial evidence comes to light after the retirement that could have led to a lower retired grade under this section if known by competent authority at the time of retirement.

''(C) If a mistake of law or calculation was made in the determination of the retired grade.

''(D) In the case of a retired grade following a conditional determination under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2), if the investigation of or personnel action against the officer, as applicable, results in an adverse finding.

''(E) If the Secretary determines, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, that good cause exists to reopen the determination or certification.

''(3) NOTIFICATION OF REOPENING.—If a determination or certification of the retired grade of an officer is reopened, the Secretary—

''(A) shall notify the officer of the reopening; and

''(B) may not make an adverse determination on the retired grade of the officer until the officer has had a reasonable opportunity to respond regarding the basis of the reopening.

''(4) RETIRED PAY; RECALCULATION.—If the retired grade of an officer is reduced through the reopening of the officer's or warrant officer's retired grade, the retired pay of the officer under chapter 71 of title 10 shall be recalculated, and any modification of the retired pay of the officer shall go into effect on the effective date of the reduction of the officer's retired grade.''.

SEC. 202. CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS; DIRECTOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 320. Congressional affairs; Director

''The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall appoint a Director of Congressional Affairs from among officers of the Coast Guard who are in a grade above captain.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 3 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''320. Congressional affairs; Director.''.

SEC. 203. LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.

(a) ADMIRALTY CLAIMS.—Section 937 of title 14, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a) by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$425,000''.

(b) CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 938 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$425,000''.

SEC. 204. AUTHORITY FOR OFFICERS TO OPT OUT OF PROMOTION BOARD CONSIDERATION.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF OFFICERS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR PROMOTION.—Section 2113 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Commandant may provide that an officer may, upon the officer's request and with the approval of the Commandant, be excluded from consideration by a selection board convened under section 2106(a).

''(2) The Commandant shall approve a request under paragraph (1) only if—

''(A) the basis for the request is to allow the officer to complete a broadening assignment, advanced education, another assignment of significant value to the Coast Guard, a career progression requirement delayed by the assignment or education, or a qualifying personal or professional circumstance, as determined by the Commandant;

''(B) the Commandant determines the exclusion from consideration is in the best interest of the Coast Guard; and

''(C) the officer has not previously failed of selection for promotion to the grade for which the officer requests the exclusion from consideration.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE OFFICER FOR PROMOTION.—Section 3743 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 3743. Eligibility for promotion

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a Reserve officer is eligible for consideration for promotion and for promotion under this subchapter, if that officer is in an active status.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—A Reserve officer who has been considered but not recommended for retention in an active status by a board convened under subsection 3752(a) of this title, is not eligible for consideration for promotion.

''(c) REQUEST FOR EXCLUSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant may provide that an officer may, upon the officer's request and with the approval of the Commandant, be excluded from consideration by a selection board convened under section 3740(b) of this title to consider officers for promotion to the next higher grade.

''(2) APPROVAL OF REQUEST.—The Commandant shall approve a request under paragraph (1) only if—

''(A) the basis for the request is to allow an officer to complete a broadening assignment, advanced education, another assignment of significant value to the Coast Guard, a career progression requirement delayed by the assignment or education, or a qualifying personal or professional circumstance, as determined by the Commandant;

''(B) the Commandant determines the exclusion from consideration is in the best interest of the Coast Guard; and

''(C) the officer has not previously failed of selection for promotion to the grade for which the officer requests the exclusion from consideration.''.

SEC. 205. TEMPORARY PROMOTION AUTHORITY FOR OFFICERS IN CERTAIN GRADES WITH CRITICAL SKILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of Chapter 21 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2130. Promotion to certain grades for officers with critical skills: captain, commander, lieutenant commander, lieutenant

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), lieutenant, lieutenant commander, or commander, who is described in subsection (b) may be temporarily promoted to the grade of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, commander, or captain under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Appointments under this section shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(b) COVERED OFFICERS.—An officer described in this subsection is any officer in a grade specified in subsection (a) who—

''(1) has a skill in which the Coast Guard has a critical shortage of personnel (as determined by the Secretary); and

''(2) is serving in a position (as determined by the Secretary) that—

''(A) is designated to be held by a lieutenant, lieutenant commander, commander, or captain; and

''(B) requires that an officer serving in such position have the skill possessed by such officer.

''(c) PRESERVATION OF POSITION AND STATUS OF OFFICERS APPOINTED.—

''(1) The temporary positions authorized under this section shall not be counted among or included in the list of positions on the active duty promotion list.

''(2) An appointment under this section does not change the position on the active-duty list or the permanent, probationary, or acting status of the officer so appointed, prejudice the officer in regard to other promotions or appointments, or abridge the rights or benefits of the officer.

''(d) BOARD RECOMMENDATION REQUIRED.—A temporary promotion under this section may be made only upon the recommendation of a board of officers convened by the Secretary for the purpose of recommending officers for such promotions.

''(e) ACCEPTANCE AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—Each appointment under this section, unless expressly declined, is, without formal acceptance, regarded as accepted on the date such appointment is made, and a member so appointed is entitled to the pay and allowances of the grade of the temporary promotion under this section beginning on the date the appointment is made.

''(f) TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT.—Unless sooner terminated, an appointment under this section terminates—

''(1) on the date the officer who received the appointment is promoted to the permanent grade of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, commander, or captain;

''(2) on the date the officer is detached from a position described in subsection (b)(2), unless the officer is on a promotion list to the permanent grade of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, commander, or captain, in which case the appointment terminates on the date the officer is promoted to that grade; or

''(3) when the appointment officer determines that the officer who received the appointment has engaged in misconduct or has displayed substandard performance.

''(g) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE POSITIONS.—An appointment under this section may only be made for service in a position designated by the Secretary for the purposes of this section. The number of positions so designated may not exceed the following percentages of the respective grades:

''(1) As lieutenant, 0.5 percent.

''(2) As lieutenant commander, 3.0 percent.

''(3) As commander, 2.6 percent.

''(4) As captain, 2.6 percent.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2130. Promotion to certain grades for officers with critical skills: captain, commander, lieutenant commander, lieutenant.''.

SEC. 206. CAREER INTERMISSION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 25 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2514. Career flexibility to enhance retention of members

''(a) PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant may carry out a program under which members of the Coast Guard may be inactivated from active service in order to meet personal or professional needs and returned to active service at the end of such period of inactivation from active service.

''(b) PERIOD OF INACTIVATION FROM ACTIVE SERVICE; EFFECT OF INACTIVATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The period of inactivation from active service under a program under this section of a member participating in the program shall be such period as the Commandant shall specify in the agreement of the member under subsection (c), except that such period may not exceed three years.

''(2) EXCLUSION FROM YEARS OF SERVICE.—Any service by a Reserve officer while participating in a program under this section shall be excluded from computation of the total years of service of that officer pursuant to section 14706(a) of title 10.

''(3) EXCLUSION FROM RETIREMENT.—Any period of participation of a member in a program under this section shall not count toward—

''(A) eligibility for retirement or transfer to the Ready Reserve under either chapter 571 or 1223 of title 10; or

''(B) computation of retired or retainer pay under chapter 71 or 1223 of title 10.

''(c) AGREEMENT.—Each member of the Coast Guard who participates in a program under this section shall enter into a written agreement with the Commandant under which that member shall agree as follows:

''(1) To accept an appointment or enlist, as applicable, and serve in the Coast Guard Ready Reserve during the period of the inactivation of the member from active service under the program.

''(2) To undergo during the period of the inactivation of the member from active service under the program such inactive service training as the Commandant shall require in order to ensure that the member retains proficiency, at a level determined by the Commandant to be sufficient, in the military skills, professional qualifications, and physical readiness of the member during the inactivation of the member from active service.

''(3) Following completion of the period of the inactivation of the member from active service under the program, to serve two months as a member of the Coast Guard on active service for each month of the period of the inactivation of the member from active service under the program.

''(d) CONDITIONS OF RELEASE.—The Commandant shall prescribe regulations specifying the guidelines regarding the conditions of release that must be considered and addressed in the agreement required by subsection (c). At a minimum, the Commandant shall prescribe the procedures and standards to be used to instruct a member on the obligations to be assumed by the member under paragraph (2) of such subsection while the member is released from active service.

''(e) ORDER TO ACTIVE SERVICE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Commandant, a member of the Coast Guard participating in a program under this section may, in the discretion of the Commandant, be required to terminate participation in the program and be ordered to active service.

''(f) PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—

''(1) BASIC PAY.—During each month of participation in a program under this section, a member who participates in the program shall be paid basic pay in an amount equal to two-thirtieths of the amount of monthly basic pay to which the member would otherwise be entitled under section 204 of title 37 as a member of the uniformed services on active service in the grade and years of service of the member when the member commences participation in the program.

''(2) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—

''(A) PROHIBITION.—A member who participates in such a program shall not, while participating in the program, be paid any special or incentive pay or bonus to which the member is otherwise entitled under an agreement under chapter 5 of title 37 or section 1925 of this title that is in force when the member commences participation in the program.

''(B) NOT TREATED AS FAILURE TO PERFORM SERVICES.—The inactivation from active service of a member participating in a program shall not be treated as a failure of the member to perform any period of service required of the member in connection with an agreement for a special or incentive pay or bonus under chapter 5 of title 37 that is in force when the member commences participation in the program.

''(3) RETURN TO ACTIVE SERVICE.—

''(A) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), upon the return of a member to active service after completion by the member of participation in a program—

''(i) any agreement entered into by the member under chapter 5 of title 37 for the payment of a special or incentive pay or bonus that was in force when the member commenced participation in the program shall be revived, with the term of such agreement after revival being the period of the agreement remaining to run when the member commenced participation in the program; and

''(ii) any special or incentive pay or bonus shall be payable to the member in accordance with the terms of the agreement concerned for the term specified in clause (i).

''(B) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by that subparagraph with respect to a member if, at the time of the return of the member to active service as described in that subparagraph—

''(I) such pay or bonus is no longer authorized by law; or

''(II) the member does not satisfy eligibility criteria for such pay or bonus as in effect at the time of the return of the member to active service.

''(ii) PAY OR BONUS CEASES BEING AUTHORIZED.—Subparagraph (A) shall cease to apply to any special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by that subparagraph with respect to a member if, during the term of the revived agreement of the member under subparagraph (A)(i), such pay or bonus ceases being authorized by law.

''(C) REPAYMENT.—A member who is ineligible for payment of a special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by this paragraph by reason of subparagraph (B)(i)(II) shall be subject to the requirements for repayment of such pay or bonus in accordance with the terms of the applicable agreement of the member under chapter 5 of title 37.

''(D) REQUIRED SERVICE IS ADDITIONAL.—Any service required of a member under an agreement covered by this paragraph after the member returns to active service as described in subparagraph (A) shall be in addition to any service required of the member under an agreement under subsection (c).

''(4) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a member who participates in a program is entitled, while participating in the program, to the travel and transportation allowances authorized by section 474 of title 37 for—

''(i) travel performed from the residence of the member, at the time of release from active service to participate in the program, to the location in the United States designated by the member as the member's residence during the period of participation in the program; and

''(ii) travel performed to the residence of the member upon return to active service at the end of the participation of the member in the program.

''(B) SINGLE RESIDENCE.—An allowance is payable under this paragraph only with respect to travel of a member to and from a single residence.

''(5) LEAVE BALANCE.—A member who participates in a program is entitled to carry forward the leave balance existing as of the day on which the member begins participation and accumulated in accordance with section 701 of title 10, but not to exceed 60 days.

''(g) PROMOTION.—

''(1) OFFICERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An officer participating in a program under this section shall not, while participating in the program, be eligible for consideration for promotion under chapter 21 or 37 of this title.

''(B) RETURN TO SERVICE.—Upon the return of an officer to active service after completion by the officer of participation in a program—

''(i) the Commandant may adjust the date of rank of the officer in such manner as the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of this section; and

''(ii) the officer shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when officers of the same competitive category, grade, and seniority are eligible for consideration for promotion.

''(2) ENLISTED MEMBERS.—An enlisted member participating in a program shall not be eligible for consideration for advancement during the period that—

''(A) begins on the date of the inactivation of the member from active service under the program; and

''(B) ends at such time after the return of the member to active service under the program that the member is treatable as eligible for promotion by reason of time in grade and such other requirements as the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of the program.

''(h) CONTINUED ENTITLEMENTS.—A member participating in a program under this section shall, while participating in the program, be treated as a member of the Armed Forces on active duty for a period of more than 30 days for purposes of—

''(1) the entitlement of the member and of the dependents of the member to medical and dental care under the provisions of chapter 55 of this title; and

''(2) retirement or separation for physical disability under the provisions of chapter 61 of title 10 and chapters 21 and 23 of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2513 the following:

''2514. Career flexibility to enhance retention of members.''.

SEC. 207. MAJOR ACQUISITIONS; OPERATION AND SUSTAINMENT COSTS.

Section 5103(e)(3) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D) respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) operate and sustain the cutters and aircraft described under paragraph (2);''.

SEC. 208. EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 27 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2713. Employment assistance

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve the accuracy and completeness of a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by section 1143(a)(1) of title 10, the Secretary shall—

''(1) establish a database to record all training performed by members of the Coast Guard that may have application to employment in the civilian sector; and

''(2) make unclassified information regarding such information available to States and other potential employers referred to in section 1143(c) of title 10 so that State and other entities may allow military training to satisfy licensing or certification requirements to engage in a civilian profession.

''(b) FORM OF CERTIFICATION OR VERIFICATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by section 1143(a)(1) of title 10 is rendered in such a way that States and other potential employers can confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the certification or verification.

''(c) REQUESTS BY STATES.—A State may request that the Secretary confirm the accuracy and authenticity of a certification or verification of jobs skills and experience provided under section 1143(c) of title 10.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2712 the following:

''2713. Employment assistance.''.

SEC. 209. REPORTS ON GENDER DIVERSITY IN THE COAST GUARD.

(a) ACTION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall—

(A) determine which recommendations in the RAND gender diversity report can practicably be implemented to promote gender diversity in the Coast Guard; and

(B) submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the actions the Coast Guard has taken or plans to take to implement such recommendations.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''RAND diversity report'' means the RAND Corporation's Homeland Security Operational Analysis Center 2019 report entitled ''Improving Gender Diversity in the U.S. Coast Guard: Identifying Barriers to Female Retention''.

(b) RECURRING REPORT.—Chapter 51 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5109. Report on gender diversity in the Coast Guard

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15, 2022, and biennially thereafter, the Commandant shall submit a report on gender diversity in the Coast Guard to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

''(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall contain the following:

''(1) GENDER DIVERSITY OVERVIEW.—An overview of Coast Guard active duty and Reserve members, including the number of officers and enlisted members and the percentages of men and women in each.

''(2) RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.—(A) An analysis of the changes in the recruitment and retention of women over the previous two years.

''(B) A discussion of any changes to Coast Guard recruitment and retention over the previous two years that were aimed at increasing the recruitment and retention of female members.

''(3) PARENTAL LEAVE.—(A) The number of men and women who took parental leave during each year covered by the report, including the average length of such leave periods.

''(B) A discussion of the ways in which the Coast Guard worked to mitigate the impacts of parental leave on Coast Guard operations and on the careers of the members taking such leave.

''(4) LIMITATIONS.—An analysis of current gender-based limitations on Coast Guard career opportunities, including discussion of—

''(A) shipboard opportunities;

''(B) opportunities to serve at remote units; and

''(C) any other limitations on the opportunities of female members.

''(5) PROGRESS UPDATE.—An update on the Coast Guard's progress on the implementation of the action plan required under section 209 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5109. Report on gender diversity in the Coast Guard.''.

SEC. 210. DISPOSITION OF INFRASTRUCTURE RELATED TO E–LORAN.

Section 914 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''date'' and inserting ''later of the date of the conveyance of the properties directed under section 533(a) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–120) or the date''; and

(B) by striking ''determination by the Secretary'' and inserting ''determination by the Secretary of Transportation under section 312(d) of title 49''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF PROCEEDS.—The proceeds of such sales, less the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration, shall be deposited into the Coast Guard Housing Fund for uses authorized under section 2946 of this title.''.

SEC. 211. POSITIONS OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY.

Section 2103(c)(3) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''rear admiral (lower half)'' and inserting ''vice admiral''.

SEC. 212. RESEARCH PROJECTS; TRANSACTIONS OTHER THAN CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 720. Research projects; transactions other than contracts and grants

''(a) ADDITIONAL FORMS OF TRANSACTIONS AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant may enter into transactions (other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants) in carrying out basic, applied, and advanced research projects. The authority under this subsection is in addition to the authority provided in section 717 to use contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants in carrying out such projects.

''(b) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—The authority under subsection (a) may be exercised without regard to section 3324 of title 31.

''(c) RECOVERY OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (d), a cooperative agreement for performance of basic, applied, or advanced research authorized by section 717, and a transaction authorized by subsection (a), may include a clause that requires a person or other entity to make payments to the Coast Guard or any other department or agency of the Federal Government as a condition for receiving support under the agreement or transaction, respectively.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The amount of any payment received by the Federal Government pursuant to a requirement imposed under paragraph (1) may be credited, to the extent authorized by the Commandant, to an appropriate appropriations account. Amounts so credited shall be merged with other funds in the account and shall be available for the same purposes and the same period for which other funds in such account are available.

''(d) CONDITIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall ensure that—

''(A) to the extent that the Commandant determines practicable, no cooperative agreement containing a clause described in subsection (c)(1), and no transaction entered into under subsection (a), provides for research that duplicates research being conducted under existing programs carried out by the Coast Guard; and

''(B) to the extent that the Commandant determines practicable, the funds provided by the Federal Government under a cooperative agreement containing a clause described in subsection (c)(1), or under a transaction authorized by subsection (a), do not exceed the total amount provided by other parties to the cooperative agreement or other transaction, respectively.

''(2) OTHER AGREEMENTS NOT FEASIBLE.—A cooperative agreement containing a clause described in subsection (c)(1), or under a transaction authorized by subsection (a), may be used for a research project only if the use of a standard contract, grant, or cooperative agreement for such project is not feasible or appropriate.

''(e) EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—The Commandant shall—

''(1) ensure that management, technical, and contracting personnel of the Coast Guard involved in the award or administration of transactions under this section or other innovative forms of contracting are afforded opportunities for adequate education and training; and

''(2) establish minimum levels and requirements for continuous and experiential learning for such personnel, including levels and requirements for acquisition certification programs.

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prescribe regulations, as necessary, to carry out this section.

''(g) PROTECTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION FROM DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Disclosure of information described in paragraph (2) is not required, and may not be compelled, under section 552 of title 5 for five years after the date on which the information is received by the Coast Guard.

''(2) LIMITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) applies to information described in subparagraph (B) that is in the records of the Coast Guard only if the information was submitted to the Coast Guard in a competitive or noncompetitive process having the potential for resulting in an award, to the party submitting the information, of a cooperative agreement for performance of basic, applied, or advanced research authorized by section 717 or another transaction authorized by subsection (a).

''(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information referred to in subparagraph (A) is the following:

''(i) A proposal, proposal abstract, and supporting documents.

''(ii) A business plan submitted on a confidential basis.

''(iii) Technical information submitted on a confidential basis.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Commandant shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing each use of the authority provided under this section during the most recently completed fiscal year, including details of each use consisting of—

''(1) the amount of each transaction;

''(2) the entities or organizations involved;

''(3) the product or service received; and

''(4) the research project for which the product or service was required.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''720. Research projects; transactions other than contracts and grants.''.

SEC. 213. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 1110 the following:

''§ 1111. Acquisition workforce authorities

''(a) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of section 3304 of title 5, the Commandant may—

''(A) designate any category of acquisition positions within the Coast Guard as shortage category positions; and

''(B) use the authorities in such section to recruit and appoint highly qualified persons directly to positions so designated.

''(2) REPORTS.—The Commandant shall include in reports under section 1102 information described in that section regarding positions designated under this subsection.

''(b) REEMPLOYMENT AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an annuitant receiving an annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund becomes employed in any category of acquisition positions designated by the Commandant under subsection (a), the annuity of the annuitant so employed shall continue. The annuitant so reemployed shall not be considered an employee for purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5.

''(2)(A) ELECTION.—An annuitant retired under section 8336(d)(1) or 8414(b)(1)(A) of title 5, receiving an annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, who becomes employed in any category of acquisition positions designated by the Commandant under subsection (a) after date of enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, may elect to be subject to section 8344 or 8468 of such title (as the case may be).

''(i) DEADLINE.—An election for coverage under this subsection shall be filed not later than 90 days after the Commandant takes reasonable actions to notify an employee who may file an election.

''(ii) COVERAGE.—If an employee files an election under this subsection, coverage

shall be effective beginning on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after the date of the filing of the election.

''(B) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to an individual who is eligible to file an election under such subparagraph and does not file a timely election under clause (i).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1110 the following:

''1111. Acquisition workforce authorities.''.

SEC. 214. REPORT ON COAST GUARD DEFENSE READINESS RESOURCES ALLOCATION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on the allocation of resources by the Coast Guard to support its defense readiness mission.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) Funding levels allocated by the Coast Guard to support defense readiness missions for each of the past ten fiscal years.

(2) Funding levels transferred or otherwise provided by the Department of Defense to the Coast Guard in support of the Coast Guard's defense readiness missions for each of the past ten fiscal years.

(3) The number of Coast Guard detachments assigned in support of the Coast Guard's defense readiness mission for each of the past ten fiscal years.

(c) ASSESSMENT.—In addition to the elements detailed in subsection (b), the report shall include an assessment of the impacts on the Coast Guard's non-defense mission readiness and operational capabilities due to the annual levels of reimbursement provided by the Department of Defense to compensate the Coast Guard for its expenses to fulfill its defense readiness mission.

SEC. 215. REPORT ON THE FEASIBILITY OF LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FUELED VESSELS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the following:

(1) The feasibility, safety, and cost effectiveness of using liquefied natural gas to fuel new Coast Guard vessels.

(2) The feasibility, safety, and cost effectiveness of converting existing vessels to run on liquefied natural gas fuels.

(3) The operational benefits of using liquefied natural gas to fuel Coast Guard vessels.

TITLE III—SHIPPING

SEC. 301. ELECTRONIC CHARTS; EQUIVALENCY.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 3105(a)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) ELECTRONIC CHARTS IN LIEU OF MARINE CHARTS, CHARTS, AND MAPS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the following vessels, while operating on the navigable waters of the United States, shall be equipped with and operate electronic navigational charts conforming to a standard acceptable to the Secretary in lieu of any marine charts, charts, and maps required by titles 33 and 46, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph:

''(A) A self-propelled commercial vessel of at least 65 feet overall length.

''(B) A vessel carrying more than a number of passengers for hire determined by the Secretary.

''(C) A towing vessel of more than 26 feet in overall length and 600 horsepower.

''(D) Any other vessel for which the Secretary decides that electronic charts are necessary for the safe navigation of the vessel.''.

(b) EXEMPTIONS AND WAIVERS.—Section 3105(a)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''operates; and'' and inserting ''operates;'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''those waters.'' and inserting ''those waters; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) permit vessels that operate solely landward of the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured to utilize software-based, platform-independent electronic chart systems that the Secretary determines are capable of displaying electronic navigational charts with necessary scale and detail to ensure safe navigation for the intended voyage.''.

SEC. 302. PASSENGER VESSEL SECURITY AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATION.

Section 3507(k)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (D).

SEC. 303. NON-OPERATING INDIVIDUAL.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (23) the following:

''(23a) 'non-operating individual' means an individual who—

''(A) does not perform—

''(i) with respect to the operation of a vessel, watchstanding, automated engine room duty watch, navigation, or personnel safety functions;

''(ii) with respect to the loading and unloading of merchandise, cargo handling functions, including any activity relating to the loading or unloading of cargo, the operation of cargo-related equipment (whether or not integral to the vessel), and the handling of mooring lines on the dock when the vessel is made fast or let go;

''(iii) vessel maintenance, including any repairs that can be performed by the vessel's crew or a riding gang; or

''(iv) safety, security, or environmental protection activities directly related to the operation of the vessel and normally conducted by the vessel's crew;

''(B) does not serve as part of the crew complement required under section 8101;

''(C) does not serve as a riding gang member;

''(D) is not a member of the steward's department;

''(E) is not a citizen or temporary or permanent resident of a country designated by the United States as a sponsor of terrorism or any other country that the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the heads of other appropriate United States agencies, determines to be a security threat to the United States;

''(F) is not specifically exempted from the requirement to have a merchant mariner's document under section 8701(a);

''(G) has not been convicted in any jurisdiction of an offense described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 7703;

''(H) whose license, certificate of registry, or merchant mariner's document has not been suspended or revoked under section 7704; and

''(I) who does not otherwise constitute a threat to the safety of the vessel.''.

(b) CITIZENSHIP AND NAVY RESERVE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8103(j) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking ''RIDING GANG MEMBER'' and inserting ''RIDING GANG MEMBER OR NON-OPERATING INDIVIDUAL''; and

(2) inserting ''or a non-operating individual'' before the period.

(c) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO NON-OPERATING INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 8107 as section 8108; and

(B) by inserting after section 8106 the following:

''§ 8107. Requirements relating to non-operating individuals

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The owner or managing operator of a merchant vessel of the United States of at least 100 gross tons as measured under section 14502, or an alternate tonnage measured under section 14302 as prescribed by the Secretary under section 14104, shall—

''(1) ensure that—

''(A) each non-operating individual on the vessel—

''(i) is a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; or

''(ii) possesses a United States non-immigrant visa for individuals desiring to enter the United States temporarily for business, employment-related and personal identifying information, and any other documentation required by the Secretary;

''(B) all required documentation for such individual is kept on the vessel and available for inspection by the Secretary; and

''(C) each non-operating individual is identified on the manifest;

''(2) ensure that—

''(A) each non-operating individual possesses—

''(i) a merchant mariner's document;

''(ii) a transportation worker identification credential under section 70105; or

''(iii) a current security clearance issued by a Federal agency; or

''(B) the employer of such an individual attests in a certificate to the owner or managing operator that—

''(i) the background of such individual has been examined and found to be free of any credible information indicating a material risk to the security of the vessel, the vessel's cargo, the ports the vessel visits, or other individuals onboard the vessel;;

''(ii) such examination—

''(I) met the requirements of section 70105(d)(2), for persons described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) of this subsection; or

''(II) consisted of a search of all information reasonably available to the owner or managing operator in the individual's country of citizenship and any other country in which the individual works, receives employment referrals, or resides, for persons described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii) of this subsection; and

''(iii) the information derived from any such examination is made available to the Secretary upon request;

''(3) ensure that each non-operating individual of the vessel, while on board the vessel, is subject to the same random chemical testing and reporting regimes as crew members;

''(4) ensure that each such individual employed on the vessel receives basic safety familiarization and basic safety training approved by the Coast Guard; and

''(5) ensure that every non-operating individual of the vessel is employed on board the vessel under conditions that meet or exceed

the minimum international standards of all applicable international labor conventions to which the United States is a party, including all of the merchant seamen protection and relief provided under United States law.

''(b) RECORDKEEPING.—In addition to the requirements of subsection (a), the owner or managing operator of a vessel to which subsection (a) applies shall ensure that all information necessary to ensure compliance with this section, as determined by the Secretary, is entered into the vessel's official logbook required by chapter 113.

''(c) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person (including an individual) violating this section is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of $1,250.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The analysis for chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 8107 and inserting the following:

''8107. Requirements relating to non-operating individuals.
''8108. Use of force against piracy.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) MERCHANT MARINERS' DOCUMENTS REQUIRED.—Section 8701 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) This section does not apply to non-operating individuals.''.

(B) TRAINING FOR USE OF FORCE AGAINST PIRACY.—Section 51705(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''46 U.S.C. 8107 note'' and inserting ''46 U.S.C. 8108 note''.

SEC. 304. SMALL PASSENGER VESSELS AND UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSELS.

Section 12121 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) was built in the United States;

''(B) was not built in the United States and is at least 3 years old; or

''(C) if rebuilt, was rebuilt—

''(i) in the United States; or

''(ii) outside the United States at least 3 years before the certificate requested under subsection (b) would take effect.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''12132,'' after ''12113,''.

SEC. 305. INSTALLATION VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 551 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 55123. Installation vessels

''(a) INITIAL DETERMINATION OF COASTWISE QUALIFIED VESSEL.—No later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Transportation shall determine whether an installation vessel exists for which a coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112.

''(b) APPLICATION.—If the Secretary of Transportation determines under subsection (a) that no such coastwise qualified vessel exists, then, after the date on which such determination is made, lifting operations between a vessel for which a coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112 and an installation vessel for which no such endorsement has been issued is not transportation of merchandise for the purposes of section 55102.

''(c) REQUESTS FOR DETERMINATIONS OF COASTWISE QUALIFIED VESSELS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After the date on which the determination is made under subsection (a), an installation vessel for which a coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112, the owner or operator of such installation vessel may seek a new determination from the Secretary of Transportation that an installation vessel for which a coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112 exists.

''(2) APPLICATION TO NON-QUALIFIED VESSELS.—If the Secretary of Transportation makes a determination under paragraph (1) that a coastwise qualified vessel exists, then—

''(A) the owner or operator of an installation vessel for which no coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112 shall seek a determination of the availability of a coastwise qualified vessel under paragraph (3) before using such non-coastwise qualified vessel for the transportation of a platform jacket; and

''(B) after the date on which such determination is made, the owner or operator of an installation vessel for which no coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112 shall not use such non-coastwise qualified vessel for the transportation of a platform jacket unless the Secretary of Transportation determines a coastwise qualified is not available under paragraph (4).

''(3) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION OF AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall determine a coastwise qualified vessel is not available if—

''(A) the owner or operator of a non-coastwise qualified vessel submits to the Secretary of Transportation an application for the use of a non-coastwise qualified installation vessel for transportation of a platform jacket under this section that includes all relevant information, including engineering details and timing requirements, and such application is submitted not less than 1 year before the date such vessel is required for such use;

''(B) the Secretary provides the application made under subparagraph (A) to the owner of each coastwise qualified vessel listed as an installation vessel in the inventory under section 12138(c) and promptly publishes in the Federal Register a notice—

''(i) describing the project and the platform jacket involved;

''(ii) advising that all relevant information reasonably needed to assess the transportation and installation requirements for the platform jacket will be made available to an interested person on request; and

''(iii) requesting that information on the availability of coastwise qualified vessels be submitted within a 45-day period beginning on the date of such publication; and

''(C)(i) within such 45-day period no information is submitted to the Secretary from owners or operators of coastwise qualified installation vessels to meet the requirements of the application required under paragraph (A); or

''(ii) the owner or operator of a coastwise qualified installation vessel submits information to the Secretary asserting that the owner or operator has a suitable coastwise qualified installation vessel available to meet the requirements of the application required under paragraph (A), but the Secretary determines, within 90 days after the notice is first published, that the coastwise qualified installation vessel is not suitable or reasonably available for the transportation.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) INSTALLATION VESSEL.—The term 'installation vessel' means a vessel using a crane suitable for offshore use that—

''(A) is used to install platform jackets;

''(B) has a slewing or luffing capability;

''(C) has a lifting capacity of at least 1,000 metric tons; and

''(D) conducts lifting operations to construct or remove offshore facilities or subsea infrastructure or to install and uninstall component parts or materials from offshore facilities or subsea infrastructure.

''(2) LIFTING OPERATIONS.—The term 'lifting operations' means the lifting of platform jackets by crane from the time that the lifting activity begins when unlading from a vessel or removing offshore facilities or subsea infrastructure until the time that the lifting activities are terminated for a particular unlading, installation, or removal of offshore facilities or subsea infrastructure.

''(3) PLATFORM JACKET.—The term 'platform jacket' has the meaning given such term in section 55108(a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 551 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''55123. Installation vessels.''.

(c) INVENTORY.—Section 12138(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking the period and inserting '', AND INSTALLATION.'';

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

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall develop, maintain, and periodically update an inventory of vessels that are—

''(A) documented under this chapter;

''(B) at least 200 feet in length;

''(C) have the capability to lay, maintain, or repair a submarine cable, without regard to whether a particular vessel is classed as a cable ship or cable vessel; and

''(D) installation vessels within the meaning of such term in section 55123.''; and

(3) by amending paragraph (2)(B) to read as follows:

''(B) the abilities and limitations of the vessel with respect to—

''(i) in the case of a vessel required to be inventoried under paragraph (1)(A), laying, maintaining, and repairing a submarine cable; and

''(ii) in the case of a vessel required to be inventoried under paragraph (1)(B), installing platform jackets; and''.

(d) NOTICE OF MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION.—No later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, shall issue a notice, including an opportunity for public comment, on the modification or revocation of Letter Rulings 101925, 108442, 113841, 114435, 115185, 115218, 115311, 115487, 115522, 115771, 115938, 116078, H004242 with respect to the application of the section 55102 of title 46, Shipping, United States Code, to certain offshore operations.

SEC. 306. ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) NATIONAL OFFSHORE SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE; REPRESENTATION.—Section 15106(c)(3) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''mineral and oil operations, including geophysical services'' and inserting ''operations'';

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''exploration and recovery'';

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''engaged in diving services related to offshore construction, inspection, and maintenance'' and inserting ''providing diving services to the offshore industry'';

(4) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''engaged in safety and training services related to offshore exploration and construction'' and inserting ''providing safety and training services to the offshore industry'';

(5) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''engaged in pipelaying services related to offshore construction'' and inserting ''providing subsea engineering, construction, or remotely operated vehicle support to the offshore industry'';

(6) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''mineral and energy'';

(7) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''national environmental entities'' and inserting ''entities providing environmental protection, compliance, or response services to the offshore industry''; and

(8) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''deepwater ports'' and inserting ''entities engaged in offshore oil exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf adjacent to Alaska''.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES; TESTIMONY.—Section 15109(j)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) TESTIMONY.—The members of a committee shall be available to testify before appropriate committees of the Congress with respect to the advice, reports, and recommendations submitted under paragraph (2).''.

(c) MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 555 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 55502. Maritime Transportation System National Advisory Committee

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Maritime Transportation System National Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the 'Committee').

''(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary of Transportation on matters relating to the United States maritime transportation system and its seamless integration with other segments of the transportation system, including the viability of the United States Merchant Marine.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 27 members appointed by the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with this section and section 15109.

''(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

''(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

''(A) At least 1 member shall represent the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(B) At least 1 member shall represent the Department of Commerce.

''(C) At least 1 member shall represent the Army Corps of Engineers.

''(D) At least 1 member shall represent the Coast Guard.

''(E) At least 1 member shall represent Customs and Border Protection.

''(F) At least 1 member shall represent State and local governmental entities.

''(G) Additional members shall represent private sector entities that reflect a cross-section of maritime industries, including port and water stakeholders, academia, and labor.

''(H) The Secretary may appoint additional representatives from other Federal agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(4) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of section 15109—

''(A) the Committee shall be treated as a committee established under chapter 151; and

''(B) the Secretary of Transportation shall fulfill all duties and responsibilities and have all authorities of the Secretary of Homeland Security with regard to the Committee.''.

(2) TREATMENT OF EXISTING COMMITTEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) an advisory committee substantially similar to the Committee established by section 55502 of title 46, United States Code, and that was in force or in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the charter, membership, and other aspects of such committee, may remain in force or in effect for the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section; and

(B) during such 2-year period—

(i) requirements relating the Maritime Transportation System National Advisory Committee established by such section shall be treated as satisfied by such substantially similar advisory committee; and

(ii) the enactment of this section shall not be the basis—

(I) to deem, find, or declare such committee, including the charter, membership, and other aspects thereof, void, not in force, or not in effect;

(II) to suspend the activities of such committee; or

(III) to bar the members of such committee from a meeting.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 555 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''55502. Maritime Transportation System National Advisory Committee.''.

(4) REPEAL.—Section 55603 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the analysis for chapter 556 of that title, are repealed.

(d) GREAT LAKES PILOTAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking section 9307 and inserting the following:

''§ 9307. Great Lakes Pilotage Advisory Committee

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Great Lakes Pilotage Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the 'Committee').

''(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee—

''(1) may review proposed Great Lakes pilotage regulations and policies and make recommendations to the Secretary that the Committee considers appropriate;

''(2) may advise, consult with, report to, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters relating to Great Lakes pilotage; and

''(3) may only make recommendations to the Secretary under paragraph (2) if such recommendations have been approved by all but one of the members then serving on such Committee.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of 7 members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this section and section 15109.

''(2) EXPERTISE.—Each member of the Committee shall have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in matters relating to the function of the Committee.

''(3) REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

''(A) The President of each of the 3 Great Lakes pilotage districts, or the President's representative.

''(B) At least 1 member shall represent the interests of vessel operators that contract for Great Lakes pilotage services.

''(C) At least 1 member shall represent the interests of Great Lakes ports.

''(D) At least 1 member shall represent the interests of shippers whose cargoes are transported through Great Lakes ports.

''(E) At least 1 member shall have a background in finance or accounting and must have been recommended to the Secretary by a unanimous vote of the other members of the Committee.

''(4) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of section 15109, the Committee shall be treated as a committee established under chapter 151.''.

(2) TREATMENT OF EXISTING COMMITTEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) an advisory committee substantially similar to the Great Lakes Pilotage Advisory Committee established by section 9307 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, and that was in force or in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the charter, membership, and other aspects of the committee, may remain in force or in effect for a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) during such 2-year period—

(i) requirements relating to the Great Lakes Pilotage Advisory Committee established by section 9307 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, shall be treated as satisfied by the substantially similar advisory committee; and

(ii) the enactment of this section and the amendments made by this section shall not be the basis—

(I) to deem, find, or declare such committee, including the charter, membership, and other aspects thereof, void, not in force, or not in effect;

(II) to suspend the activities of such committee; or

(III) to bar the members of such committee from a meeting.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 15109 of title 46 is amended by inserting ''or to which this chapter applies'' after ''committee established under this chapter'' each place it appears.

SEC. 307. EXPIRED MARITIME LIENS.

Section 31343(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''A notice''; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), as so designated by this section, the following:

''(2) On expiration of a notice of claim of lien under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall remove such expired notice.''.

SEC. 308. TRAINING; EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROVIDERS.

(a) SECURITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—Section 70107 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''law enforcement personnel'' and inserting ''emergency response providers'';

(2) in subsection (b)(8), by striking ''law enforcement personnel—'' and inserting ''emergency response providers—''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2)(C), by striking ''law enforcement agency personnel'' and inserting ''emergency response providers''.

(b) CREDENTIALING FOR STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT.—Section 70132 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''law enforcement personnel—'' and inserting ''emergency response providers—'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''law enforcement personnel'' each place it appears and inserting ''emergency response providers''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'emergency response providers' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).''.

SEC. 309. AIMING A LASER POINTER AT A VESSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 70014. Aiming a laser pointer at a vessel

''(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful to cause the beam of a laser pointer to strike a vessel operating on the navigable waters of the United States.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to a member or element of the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security acting in an official capacity for

the purpose of research, development, operations, testing, or training.

''(c) LASER POINTER DEFINED.—In this section the term 'laser pointer' means any device designed or used to amplify electromagnetic radiation by stimulated emission that emits a beam designed to be used by the operator as a pointer or highlighter to indicate, mark, or identify a specific position, place, item, or object.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subchapter the following:

''70014. Aiming a laser pointer at a vessel.''.

SEC. 310. MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT.

Section 55501(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''an assessment of the condition'' and inserting ''a conditions and performance analysis'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (5) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) a compendium of the Federal programs engaged in the maritime transportation system.''.

SEC. 311. SAFETY OF SPECIAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 70005 the following:

''§ 70006. Safety of special activities

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a safety zone to address special activities in the exclusive economic zone.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'safety zone' has the meaning provided in section 165.20 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(2) The term 'special activities' includes—

''(A) space activities, including launch and reentry, as those terms are defined in section 50902 of title 51, carried out by United States citizens; and

''(B) offshore energy development activities, as described in section 8(p)(1)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(1)(C)), on or near a fixed platform.

''(3) The term 'United States citizen' has the meaning given the term 'eligible owners' in section 12103.

''(4) The term 'fixed platform' means an artificial island, installation, or structure permanently attached to the sea-bed for the purpose of exploration or exploitation of resources or for other economic purposes.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 70005 the following:

''70006. Safety of special activities.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish regulations to implement this section.

(2) ALIGNMENT WITH OTHER REGULATIONS.—Such regulations shall align with subchapter C of chapter III of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 312. ENGINE CUT-OFF SWITCHES; USE REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4312 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) USE REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual operating a covered recreational vessel shall use an engine cut-off switch link while operating on plane or above displacement speed.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall not apply if—

''(A) the main helm of the covered vessel is installed within an enclosed cabin; or

''(B) the vessel does not have an engine cut-off switch and is not required to have one under subsection (a).''.

(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—Section 4311 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by—

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

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

''(c) A person violating section 4312(b) of this title is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not more than—

''(1) $100 for the first offense;

''(2) $250 for the second offense; and

''(3) $500 for any subsequent offense.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made in subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, unless the Commandant of the Coast Guard, prior to the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, determines that the use requirement enacted in subsection (a) would not promote recreational boating safety.

SEC. 313. EXEMPTIONS AND EQUIVALENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4305 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

''§ 4305. Exemptions and equivalents'';

(2) by striking ''If the Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(a) EXEMPTIONS.—If the Secretary''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) EQUIVALENTS.—The Secretary may accept a substitution for associated equipment performance or other safety standards for a recreational vessel if the substitution provides an equivalent level of safety.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 43 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4305 and inserting the following:

''4305. Exemptions and equivalents.''.

SEC. 314. SECURITY PLANS; REVIEWS.

Section 70103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b)(3) to read as follows:

''(3) The Secretary shall review and approve Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and updates under this subsection.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(4), by inserting ''or update'' after ''plan'' each place it appears.

SEC. 315. WAIVER OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS.

Section 501(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''On request'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—On request''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXPLANATION.—Not later than 24 hours after making a request under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Armed Services of the Senate a written explanation of the circumstances requiring such a waiver in the interest of national defense, including a confirmation that there are insufficient qualified vessels to meet the needs of national defense without such a waiver.''.

SEC. 316. REQUIREMENT FOR SMALL SHIPYARD GRANTEES.

Section 54101(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Grants awarded'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) BUY AMERICA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no funds may be obligated by the Administrator of the Maritime Administration under this section, unless each product and material purchased with those funds (including products and materials purchased by a grantee), and including any commercially available off-the-shelf item, is—

''(i) an unmanufactured article, material, or supply that has been mined or produced in the United States; or

''(ii) a manufactured article, material, or supply that has been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the requirements of that subparagraph shall not apply with respect to a particular product or material if such Administrator determines—

''(I) that the application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the public interest;

''(II) that such product or material is not available in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities, of a satisfactory quality, or on a timely basis; or

''(III) that inclusion of a domestic product or material will increase the cost of that product or material by more than 25 percent, with respect to a certain contract between a grantee and that grantee's supplier.

''(ii) FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination made by such Administrator under this subparagraph shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE OFF-THE-SHELF ITEM.—The term 'commercially available off-the-shelf item' means—

''(I) any item of supply (including construction material) that is—

''(aa) a commercial item, as defined by section 2.101 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations; and

''(bb) sold in substantial quantities in the commercial marketplace; and

''(II) does not include bulk cargo, as that term is defined in section 40102(4) of this title, such as agricultural products and petroleum products.

''(ii) PRODUCT OR MATERIAL.—The term 'product or material' means an article, material, or supply brought to the site by the recipient for incorporation into the building, work, or project. The term also includes an item brought to the site preassembled from articles, materials, or supplies. However, emergency life safety systems, such as emergency lighting, fire alarm, and audio evacuation systems, that are discrete systems incorporated into a public building or work and that are produced as complete systems, are evaluated as a single and distinct construction material regardless of when or how the individual parts or components of those systems are delivered to the construction site.

''(iii) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.''.

SEC. 317. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Public Administration (referred to in this section as the ''Academy'') to carry out the activities described in this section.

(b) STUDY ELEMENTS.—In accordance with the agreement described in subsection (a), the Academy shall conduct a study of the United States Merchant Marine Academy that consists of the following:

(1) A comprehensive assessment of the United States Merchant Marine Academy's systems, training, facilities, infrastructure, information technology, and stakeholder engagement.

(2) Identification of needs and opportunities for modernization to help the United States Merchant Marine Academy keep pace with more modern campuses.

(3) Development of an action plan for the United States Merchant Marine Academy with specific recommendations for—

(A) improvements or updates relating to the opportunities described in paragraph (2); and

(B) systemic changes needed to help the United States Merchant Marine Academy achieve its mission of inspiring and educating the next generation of the mariner workforce on a long-term basis.

(c) DEADLINE AND REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the agreement described in subsection (a), the Academy shall prepare and submit to the Administrator of the Maritime Administration a report containing the action plan described in subsection (b)(3), including specific findings and recommendations.

SEC. 318. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR DOMESTIC MARITIME WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 54102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting ''or subsection (d)'' after ''designated under subsection (a)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) STATE MARITIME ACADEMY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall designate each State maritime academy, as defined in section 51102(4) of this title, as a center of excellence under this section.''.

SEC. 319. RENEWAL OF MERCHANT MARINER LICENSES AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 7507 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) RENEWAL.—With respect to any renewal of an existing merchant mariner credential that is not an extension under subsection (a) or (b), such credential shall begin the day after the expiration of the credential holder's existing credential.''.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. COASTWISE TRADE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall review the adequacy of and continuing need for provisions in title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, that require a United States vessel documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, possessing a coastwise endorsement under that chapter, and engaged in coastwise trade, to comply with regulations for vessels engaged in an international voyage.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a briefing on the findings of the review required under subsection (a) and a discussion of how existing laws and regulations could be amended to ensure the safety of vessels described in subsection (a) while infringing as little as possible on commerce.

SEC. 402. UNMANNED MARITIME SYSTEMS AND SATELLITE VESSEL TRACKING TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard, acting through the Blue Technology Center of Expertise, shall regularly assess available unmanned maritime systems and satellite vessel tracking technologies for potential use to support missions of the Coast Guard.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Commandant shall make the assessment required under paragraph (1) after consultation with the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, the academic sector, and developers and manufacturers of unmanned maritime systems and satellite vessel tracking technologies.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the actual and potential effects of the use of then-existing unmanned maritime systems and satellite vessel tracking technologies on the mission effectiveness of the Coast Guard.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An inventory of current unmanned maritime systems used by the Coast Guard, an overview of such usage, and a discussion of the mission effectiveness of such systems, including any benefits realized or risks or negative aspects of such usage.

(B) An inventory of satellite vessel tracking technologies, and a discussion of the potential mission effectiveness of such technologies, including any benefits or risks or negative aspects of such usage.

(C) A prioritized list of Coast Guard mission requirements that could be met with additional unmanned maritime systems, or with satellite vessel tracking technologies, and the estimated costs of accessing, acquiring, or operating such systems.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) UNMANNED MARITIME SYSTEMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''unmanned maritime systems'' means remotely operated or autonomous vehicles produced by the commercial sector designed to travel in the air, on or under the ocean surface, on land, or any combination thereof, and that function without an on-board human presence.

(B) EXAMPLES.—Such term includes the following:

(i) Unmanned undersea vehicles.

(ii) Unmanned surface vehicles.

(iii) Unmanned aerial vehicles.

(iv) Autonomous underwater vehicles.

(v) Autonomous surface vehicles.

(vi) Autonomous aerial vehicles.

(2) AVAILABLE UNMANNED MARITIME SYSTEMS.—The term ''available unmanned maritime systems'' includes systems that can be purchased commercially or are in use by the Department of Defense or other Federal agencies.

(3) SATELLITE VESSEL TRACKING TECHNOLOGIES.—The term ''satellite vessel tracking technologies'' means shipboard broadcast systems that use satellites and terrestrial receivers to continually track vessels.

SEC. 403. EXPEDITED TRANSFER IN CASES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT; DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE COAST GUARD.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall establish a policy to allow the transfer of a member of the Coast Guard whose dependent is the victim of sexual assault perpetrated by a member of the Armed Forces who is not related to the victim.

SEC. 404. TOWING VESSELS; OPERATION OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARY LINE.

(a) INTERIM EXEMPTION.—A towing vessel to which this section applies is exempt from any additional requirements of subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, and chapter I of title 33 and chapter I of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, that would result solely from such vessel operating outside the Boundary Line (as such term is defined in section 103 of title 46, United States Code) if such vessel—

(1) is listed as a response vessel on a vessel response plan and is operating outside the Boundary Line solely to perform duties of a response vessel; or

(2) is operating outside the Boundary Line solely to perform operations necessary to escort a vessel with limited maneuverability.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to a towing vessel—

(1) that is subject to inspection under chapter 33 of title 46, United States Code, and subchapter M of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) with only ''Lakes, Bays, and Sounds'' or ''Rivers'' routes recorded on such vessel's certificate of inspection under section 136.230 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(3)(A) that, with respect to a vessel that is described in subsection (a)(1), is listed—

(i) on a vessel response plan under part 155 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, on the date of approval of the vessel response plan; or

(ii) by name or reference in the vessel response plan's geographic-specific appendix on the date of approval of the vessel response plan; or

(B) that, with respect to a vessel described in subsection (a)(2), is regularly engaged in harbor assist operations, including the docking, undocking, mooring, unmooring, and escorting of vessels with limited maneuverability.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—A vessel exempted under subsection (a) is subject to the following operating limitations:

(1) RESPONSE VESSELS.—The voyage of a vessel exempted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(A) be less than 12 hours, or in the case of a voyage in the territorial waters of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, and American Samoa, have sufficient manning as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) originate and end in the inspection zone of a single Officer In-Charge, Marine Inspection, as defined in section 3305(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code.

(2) ESCORT VESSELS.—The voyage of a vessel exempted under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(A) be less than 12 hours in total duration;

(B) originate and end in the inspection zone of a single Officer In-Charge, Marine Inspection, as such term is defined in section 3305(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code; and

(C) occur no further than 10 nautical miles from the Boundary Line.

(d) TERMINATION.—The interim exemption provided under subsection (a) shall terminate on July 22, 2023.

(e) RESTRICTION.—The Officer In-Charge, Marine Inspection, as defined in section 3305(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code, for an inspection zone may restrict operations under the exemptions provided under subsection (a) for safety purposes.

(f) BRIEFING.—Not later than July 22, 2022, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall brief the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate regarding the following:

(1) The impacts of the interim exemptions provided under this section.

(2) Any safety concerns regarding the expiration of such interim exemptions.

(3) Whether such interim exemptions should be extended or made permanent in the interests of safety.

SEC. 405. COAST GUARD AUTHORITIES STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act under which the Academy shall prepare an assessment of Coast Guard authorities.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall provide—

(1) an examination of emerging issues that may require Coast Guard oversight, regulation, or action;

(2) a description of potential limitations and shortcomings of relying on current Coast Guard authorities to address emerging issues; and

(3) an overview of adjustments and additions that could be made to existing Coast Guard authorities to fully address emerging issues.

(c) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the Secretary under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall submit the assessment under this section to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(d) EMERGING ISSUES.—In this section, the term ''emerging issues'' means changes in the maritime industry and environment that in the determination of the National Academy of Sciences are reasonably likely to occur within 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, including—

(1) the introduction of new technologies in the maritime domain;

(2) the advent of new processes or operational activities in the maritime domain; and

(3) changes in the use of navigable waterways.

SEC. 406. CLOUD COMPUTING STRATEGY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a detailed description of the Coast Guard's strategy to implement cloud computing for the entire Coast Guard, including—

(1) the goals and acquisition strategies for all proposed enterprise-wide cloud computing service procurements;

(2) a strategy to sustain competition and innovation throughout the period of performance of each contract for procurement of cloud-computing goods and services for the Coast Guard, including defining opportunities for multiple cloud-service providers and insertion of new technologies;

(3) an assessment of potential threats and security vulnerabilities of the strategy, and plans to mitigate such risks; and

(4) an estimate of the cost and timeline to implement cloud computing service for all Coast Guard computing.

SEC. 407. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON COAST GUARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on vulnerabilities of Coast Guard installations and requirements resulting from climate change over the next 20 years.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A list of the 10 most vulnerable Coast Guard installations based on the effects of climate change, including rising sea tides, increased flooding, drought, desertification, wildfires, thawing permafrost, or any other categories the Commandant determines necessary.

(2) An overview of—

(A) mitigations that may be necessary to ensure the continued operational viability and to increase the resiliency of the identified vulnerable installations; and

(B) the cost of such mitigations.

(3) A discussion of the climate-change-related effects on the Coast Guard, including—

(A) the increase in the frequency of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief missions; and

(B) campaign plans, contingency plans, and operational posture of the Coast Guard.

(4) An overview of mitigations that may be necessary to ensure mission resiliency and the cost of such mitigations.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 408. SHORE INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall—

(1) develop a plan to standardize Coast Guard facility condition assessments;

(2) establish shore infrastructure performance goals, measures, and baselines to track the effectiveness of maintenance and repair investments and provide feedback on progress made;

(3) develop a process to routinely align the Coast Guard shore infrastructure portfolio with mission needs, including disposing of unneeded assets;

(4) establish guidance for planning boards to document inputs, deliberations, and project prioritization decisions for infrastructure maintenance projects;

(5) employ models for Coast Guard infrastructure asset lines for—

(A) predicting the outcome of investments in shore infrastructure;

(B) analyzing tradeoffs; and

(C) optimizing decisions among competing investments;

(6) include supporting details about competing project alternatives and report tradeoffs in congressional budget requests and related reports; and

(7) explore the development of real property management expertise within the Coast Guard workforce, including members of the Senior Executive Service.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than December 31, 2020, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall brief the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the status of the actions required under subsection (a).

SEC. 409. PHYSICAL ACCESS CONTROL SYSTEM REPORT.

Not later 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually for each of the 4 years thereafter, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the status of the Coast Guard's compliance with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD–12) and Federal Information Processing Standard 201 (FIPS–201), including—

(1) the status of Coast Guard efforts to field a comprehensive Physical Access Control System at Coast Guard installations and locations necessary to bring the Service into compliance with HSPD–12 and FIPS–201B;

(2) the status of the selection of a technological solution;

(3) the estimated phases and timeframe to complete the implementation of such a system; and

(4) the estimated cost for each phase of the project.

SEC. 410. COASTWISE ENDORSEMENTS.

(a) ''SAFARI VOYAGER''.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 12112 and 12132 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel Safari Voyager (International Maritime Organization number 8963753).

(2) REVOCATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTIFICATE.—A certificate of documentation issued under paragraph (1) is revoked on the date of the sale of the vessel or the entity that owns the vessel.

(b) ''PACIFIC PROVIDER''.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 12112 and 12132 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel Pacific Provider (United States official number 597967).

(2) REVOCATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTIFICATE.—A certificate of documentation issued under paragraph (1) is revoked on the date of the sale of the vessel or the entity that owns the vessel.

(c) DOCUMENTATION OF LNG TANKERS.—Section 7(b)(3) of the America's Cup Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–61) is amended by—

(1) striking ''The coastwise endorsement issued'' and inserting ''No coastwise endorsement shall be issued''; and

(2) striking ''shall expire on'' and inserting ''after''.

(d) REPLACEMENT VESSEL.—Notwithstanding section 208(g)(5) of the American Fisheries Act (Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), a vessel eligible under section 208(e)(21) of such Act that is replaced under section 208(g) of such Act shall be subject to a sideboard restriction catch limit of zero metric tons in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands and in the Gulf of Alaska unless that vessel is also a replacement vessel under section 679.4(o)(4) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, in which case such vessel shall not be eligible to be a catcher/processor under section 206(b)(2) of such Act.

SEC. 411. POLAR SECURITY CUTTER ACQUISITION REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Commerce, Science and Transportation and Armed Services of the Senate on—

(1) the extent to which specifications, key drawings, and detail design for the Polar Security Cutter are complete before the start of construction;

(2) the extent to which Polar Security Cutter hulls numbers one, two, and three are science ready; and

(3) what actions will be taken to ensure that Polar Security Cutter hull number four is science capable, as described in the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine's Committee on Polar Icebreaker Cost Assessment letter report entitled ''Acquisition and Operation of Polar Icebreakers: Fulfilling the Nation's Needs'' and dated July 11, 2017.

SEC. 412. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A NEW GREAT LAKES ICEBREAKER.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Great Lakes shipping industry is crucial to the American economy, including the U.S. manufacturing base, providing important economic and national security benefits.

(2) A recent study found that the Great Lakes shipping industry supports 237,000 jobs and tens of billions of dollars in economic activity.

(3) United States Coast Guard icebreaking capacity is crucial to full utilization of the Great Lakes shipping system, as during the winter icebreaking season up to 15 percent of annual cargo loads are delivered and many industries would have to reduce their production if Coast Guard icebreaking services were not provided.

(4) Six of the Coast Guard's nine icebreaking cutters in the Great Lakes are more than 30 years old and are frequently inoperable during the winter icebreaking season, including those that have completed a recent service life extension program.

(5) During the previous 10 winters, Coast Guard Great Lakes icebreaking cutters have been inoperable for an average of 65 cutter-days during the winter icebreaking season, with this annual lost capability exceeding 100 cutter-days, with a high of 246 cutter-days during the winter of 2017–2018.

(6) The 2019 ice season provides further proof that current Coast Guard icebreaking capacity is inadequate for the needs of the Great Lakes shipping industry, as only six of the nine icebreaking cutters are operational and millions of tons of cargo was not loaded or was delayed due to inadequate Coast Guard icebreaking assets during a historically average winter for Great Lakes ice coverage.

(7) The Congress has authorized the Coast Guard to acquire a new Great Lakes icebreaker as capable as Coast Guard Cutter MACKINAW (WLBB–30), the most capable Great Lakes icebreaker, and $10 million has been appropriated to fund the design and initial acquisition work for this icebreaker.

(8) The Coast Guard has not initiated a new acquisition program for this Great Lakes icebreaker.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress of the United States that a new Coast Guard icebreaker as capable as Coast Guard Cutter MACKINAW (WLBB–30) is needed on the Great Lakes and the Coast Guard should acquire this icebreaker as soon as possible.

SEC. 413. CARGO PREFERENCE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit regarding the enforcement of the United States Cargo Preference Laws set forth in sections 55302, 55303, 55304, and 55305 of title 46, United States Code, and section 2631 of title 10, United States Code (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ''United States Cargo Preference Laws'').

(b) SCOPE.—The audit conducted under subsection (a) shall include, for the period from October 14, 2008, until the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) a listing of the agencies and organizations required to comply with the United States Cargo Preference Laws;

(2) an analysis of the compliance or noncompliance of such agencies and organizations with such laws, including—

(A) the total amount of oceangoing cargo that each such agency, organization, or contractor procured for its own account or for which financing was in any way provided with Federal funds, including loan guarantees;

(B) the percentage of such cargo shipped on privately owned commercial vessels of the United States;

(C) an assessment of internal programs and controls used by each such agency or organization to monitor and ensure compliance with the United States Cargo Preference Laws, to include education, training, and supervision of its contracting personnel, and the procedures and controls used to monitor compliance with cargo preference requirements by contractors and subcontractors; and

(D) instances in which cargoes are shipped on foreign-flag vessels under non-availability determinations but not counted as such for purposes of calculating cargo preference compliance; and

(3) an overview of enforcement activities undertaken by the Maritime Administration from October 14, 2008, until the date of the enactment of this Act, including a listing of all bills of lading collected by the Maritime Administration during that period.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing the results of the audit and providing recommendations related to such results, to include—

(1) actions that should be taken by agencies and organizations to fully comply with the United States Cargo Preference Laws; and

(2) Other measures that may compel agencies and organizations, and their contractors and subcontractors, to use United States flag vessels in the international transportation of ocean cargoes as mandated by the United States Cargo Preference Laws.

SEC. 414. INSIDER THREAT PROGRAM.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall brief the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on a plan to expand the Coast Guard Insider Threat program to include the monitoring of all Coast Guard devices, including mobile devices.

SEC. 415. FISHING SAFETY GRANTS.

The cap on the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with a grant under subsections (i) and (j) of section 4502 of title 46, United States Code, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018, shall apply to any funds appropriated under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Public Law 115–31) for the purpose of making such grants.

SEC. 416. PLANS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall develop plans for demonstration programs that will assess the feasibility of using unmanned maritime systems for surveillance of marine protected areas, the transit zone, and the Arctic to—

(1) gather regular maritime domain awareness of marine protected areas, the transit zone, and the Arctic; and

(2) ensure sufficient response to illegal activities in marine protected areas, the transit zone, and the Arctic.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall collaborate with local, State, and Tribal authorities and international partners for surveillance permissions over their waters in conducting any demonstration program under subsection (a).

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The plans required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) discussion of the feasibility, safety, and cost effectiveness of using unmanned maritime systems for the purposes of enhancing maritime domain awareness in marine protected areas, the transit zone, and the Arctic;

(2) coordination and communication plans to facilitate coordination with other relevant Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies, and international partners;

(3) consideration of the potential impacts of such a demonstration program on the Coast Guard's existing unmanned vehicle programs;

(4) an overview of areas that could be surveilled under such program;

(5) a timeline and technical milestones for the implementation of such a program;

(6) resource requirements to implement and sustain such a program; and

(7) the operational benefits of such a program.

(d) CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall consult with relevant stakeholders including the Department of Defense, other agencies, the academic sector, and developers and manufacturers of unmanned maritime systems on the appropriate technologies for successful implementation of any demonstration program under subsection (a).

(e) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant shall brief the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the plans required under subsection (a).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARCTIC.—The term ''Arctic'' has the meaning given that term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).

(2) MARINE PROTECTED AREA.—The term ''marine protected area'' means any discrete area of the marine environment under a Federal statute.

(3) TRANSIT ZONE.—The term ''transit zone'' has the meaning given that term in section 1092(a)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (6 U.S.C. 223(a)(8)).

(4) UNMANNED MARITIME SYSTEMS.—The term ''unmanned maritime systems'' has the meaning given such term in section 402(c)(1).

SEC. 417. WATERS DEEMED NOT NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

The Coalbank Slough in Coos Bay, Oregon, is deemed to not be navigable waters of the United States for all purposes of subchapter J of Chapter I of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 418. COAST GUARD HOUSING; STATUS AND AUTHORITIES BRIEFING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a briefing on Coast Guard housing, including—

(1) a description of the material condition of Coast Guard housing facilities;

(2) the amount of current Coast Guard housing construction and deferred maintenance backlogs;

(3) an overview of the manner in which the Coast Guard manages and maintains housing facilities;

(4) a discussion of whether reauthorizing housing authorities for the Coast Guard similar to those provided in section 208 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–324); and

(5) recommendations regarding how the Congress could adjust those authorities to prevent mismanagement of Coast Guard housing facilities.

SEC. 419. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY AT POINT SPENCER, ALASKA.

(1) Section 533 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–120) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REMEDIAL ACTIONS.—For purposes of the transfers under this section, the remedial actions required under section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) may be completed by the United States Coast Guard after the date of such transfer and a deed entered into for such transfer shall include a clause granting the United States Coast Guard access to the property in any case in which remedial action or corrective action is found to be necessary after the date of such transfer.''.

(2) Section 534(a) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–120) is amended by—

(A) striking ''Nothing'' and inserting ''After the date on which the Secretary of the Interior conveys land under section 533 of this Act, nothing''; and

(B) by inserting '', with respect to contaminants on such land prior to the date on which the land is conveyed'' before the period.

SEC. 420. PROHIBITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall not establish anchorage grounds on the Hudson River between Yonkers, New York, and Kingston, New York, under section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1915 (33 U.S.C. 471) or chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, in addition to any anchorage grounds in effect in such area on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RESTRICTION.—The Commandant may not establish or expand any anchorage grounds outside of the reach on the Hudson River described in subsection (a) without first providing notice to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 180 days prior to the establishment or expansion of any such anchorage grounds.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section—

(1) prevents the master or pilot of a vessel operating on the reach of the Hudson River described in subsection (a) from taking emergency actions necessary to maintain the safety of the vessel or to prevent the loss of life or property; or

(2) shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to exercise authority over the movement of a vessel under section 70002 of title 46, United States Code, or any other applicable laws or regulations governing the safe navigation of a vessel.

(d) STUDY.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard, in consultation with the Hudson River Safety, Navigation, and Operations Committee, shall conduct a study of the Hudson River north of Tarrytown, New York to examine—

(1) the nature of vessel traffic including vessel types, sizes, cargoes, and frequency of transits;

(2) the risks and benefits of historic practices for commercial vessels anchoring; and

(3) the risks and benefits of establishing anchorage grounds on the Hudson River.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the study required under subsection (b).

SEC. 421. CERTIFICATE EXTENSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 12108. Authority to extend the duration of vessel certificates

''(a) CERTIFICATES.—Provided a vessel is in compliance with inspection requirements in section 3313, the Secretary of the Department in which in the Coast Guard is operating may, if he makes the determination described in subsection (b), extend for a period of not more than one year an expiring—

''(1) certificate of documentation issued for a vessel under chapter 121; or

''(2) certificate of financial responsibility required for a vessel by section 1016(a) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2716(a)) or Section 108 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608).

''(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination referred to in subsection (a) is a determination that such extension is required to enable the Coast Guard to—

''(1) eliminate a backlog in processing applications for such certificates; or

''(2) act in response to a national emergency or natural disaster.

''(c) MANNER OF EXTENSION.—Any extension granted under this section may be granted to individual vessels or to a specifically identified group of vessels.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''12108. Authority to extend the duration of vessel certificates.''.

SEC. 422. HOMELAND SECURITY ROTATIONAL CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle E of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 411 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 846. ROTATIONAL CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

''To enhance the Department's cybersecurity capacity, the Secretary may establish a rotational research, development, and training program for—

''(1) detail to the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (including the national cybersecurity and communications integration center authorized by section 2209) of Coast Guard Academy graduates and faculty; and

''(2) detail to the Coast Guard Academy, as faculty, of individuals with expertise and experience in cybersecurity who are employed by—

''(A) the Agency (including the center);

''(B) the Directorate of Science and Technology; or

''(C) institutions that have been designated by the Department as a Center of Excellence for Cyber Defense, or the equivalent.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following:

''Sec. 846. Rotational cybersecurity research program.''.

SEC. 423. TOWING VESSEL INSPECTION FEES.

Notwithstanding section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, and section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not charge an inspection fee for towing vessels required to have a Certificate of Inspection under subchapter M of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, until—

(1) the completion of the review required under section 815 of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282); and

(2) the promulgation of regulations to establish specific inspection fees for such vessels.

SEC. 424. SUBROGATED CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1012(b) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SUBROGATED RIGHTS.—Except for a guarantor claim pursuant to a defense under section 1016(f)(1), Fund compensation of any claim by an insurer or other indemnifier of a responsible party or injured third party is subject to the subrogated rights of that responsible party or injured third party to such compensation.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 425. LOAN PROVISIONS UNDER OIL POLLUTION ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1013 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2713) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1012(a) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by adding ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5)(D), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 426. LIABILITY LIMITS.

Section 1004(d)(2) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) DEEPWATER PORTS AND ASSOCIATED VESSELS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the design and operation of a deepwater port results in a lower risk of oil pollution than the design and operation of such deepwater ports as existed on the date of the enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, the Secretary may initiate a rulemaking proceeding to lower the limitation of liability under subsection (a)(4) for such deepwater port and each other deepwater port which achieves such lower risk level through such port's design and operation.

''(B) RISK DETERMINATION.—In determining the risk of oil pollution, the Secretary shall take into account, as applicable—

''(i) the size of the deepwater ports and associated vessels;

''(ii) oil storage capacity of the deepwater ports and associated vessels;

''(iii) oil handling capacity of the deepwater ports and associated vessels;

''(iv) oil throughput;

''(v) proximity to sensitive areas;

''(vi) type of oil handled;

''(vii) history of oil discharges; and

''(viii) such other factors relevant to the oil pollution risks posed by the class or category of deepwater port and associated vessels as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(C) LIMIT OF LIABILITY; TRANSPORTATION OF OIL.—For deepwater ports used in connection with the transportation of oil, the Secretary may establish a limitation of liability under subparagraph (A) of not more than $350,000,000 and not less than $50,000,000.

''(D) LIMIT OF LIABILITY; TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.—For deepwater ports used in connection with the transportation of natural gas, the Secretary may establish a limitation of liability under subparagraph (A) of not more than $350,000,000 and not less than $1,000,000.''.

SEC. 427. REPORT ON DRUG INTERDICTION IN THE CARIBBEAN BASIN.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on drug interdiction in the Caribbean basin.

(b) CONTENT.—Such report shall include—

(1) a statement of the Coast Guard mission requirements for drug interdiction in the Caribbean basin;

(2) the number of maritime surveillance hours and Coast Guard assets used in each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019 to counter the illicit trafficking of drugs and other related threats throughout the Caribbean basin; and

(3) a determination of whether such hours and assets satisfied the Coast Guard mission requirements for drug interdiction in the Caribbean basin.

SEC. 428. VOTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 305(i)(1)(G)(iv) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1855(i)(1)(G)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

''(iv) VOTING REQUIREMENT.—The panel may act only by the affirmative vote of at least five of its members.''.

SEC. 429. TRANSPORTATION WORK IDENTIFICATION CARD PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 70105(g) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''shall concurrently'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''shall—

''(1) develop and, no later than one year after the date of enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, implement a joint application for merchant mariner's documents under chapter 73 of title 46, United States Code, and for a transportation security card issued under this section; and

''(2) upon receipt of a joint application developed under paragraph (1) concurrently process an application from an individual for merchant mariner's documents under chapter 73 of title 46, United States Code, and an application from such individual for a transportation security card under this section.''.

SEC. 430. PLAN FOR WING-IN-GROUND DEMONSTRATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Commandant of the Coast Guard, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration with regard to any regulatory or safety matter regarding airspace, air space authorization, or aviation, shall develop plans for a demonstration program that will determine whether wing-in-ground craft, as that term is defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, that is capable of carrying at least one individual, can—

(A) provide transportation in areas in which energy exploration, development or production activity takes place on the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(B) under the craft's own power, safely reach helidecks or platforms located on offshore energy facilities.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The plans required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) examine and explain any safety issues with regard to the operation of the such craft as a vessel, or as an aircraft, or both;

(B) include a timeline and technical milestones for the implementation of such a demonstration program;

(C) outline resource requirements needed to undertake such a demonstration program;

(D) describe specific operational circumstances under which the craft may be used, including distance from United States land, altitude, number of individuals, amount of cargo, and speed and weight of vessel;

(E) describe the operations under which Federal Aviation Administration statutes, regulations, circulars, or orders apply; and

(F) describe the certifications, permits, or authorizations required to perform any operations.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant, along with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration with regard to any regulatory or safety matter regarding airspace, air space authorization, or aviation, shall brief the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate on the plan developed under subsection (a), including—

(1) any regulatory changes needed regarding inspections and manning, to allow such craft to operate between onshore facilities and offshore energy facilities when such craft is operating as a vessel;

(2) any regulatory changes that would be necessary to address potential impacts to air traffic control, the National Airspace System, and other aircraft operations, and to ensure safe operations on or near helidecks and platforms located on offshore energy facilities when such craft are operating as aircraft; and

(3) any other statutory or regulatory changes related to authority of the Federal Aviation Administration over operations of the craft.

TITLE V—REORGANIZATION

SEC. 501. UNINSPECTED COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking chapter 45 and inserting the following:

"CHAPTER 45—UNINSPECTED COMMERCIAL INDUSTRY VESSELS

''Sec.
''4501. Application.
''4502. Definitions.
''4503. Safety standards.
''4504. Vessel construction.
''4505. Operating stability.
''4506. Training.
''4507. Vessel certification.
''4508. Alternate safety compliance program.
''4509. Substitute safety compliance program.
''4510. Enhanced substitute safety compliance program.
''4511. Prohibited acts.
''4512. Termination of unsafe operations.
''4513. Penalties.
''4514. Compliance; Secretary actions.
''4515. Exemptions.
''4516. Regulations; considerations and limitations.
''4517. Fishing safety grants.

"§ 4501. Application

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter applies to an uninspected vessel that is a fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, or fish tender vessel.

''(b) CARRIAGE OF BULK DANGEROUS CARGOES.—This chapter does not apply to the carriage of bulk dangerous cargoes regulated under chapter 37.

"§ 4502. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) The term 'accountable vessel' means a vessel to which this chapter applies that—

''(A)(i) was built after December 31, 1988, or undergoes a major conversion completed after that date; and

''(ii) operates with more than 16 individuals on board; or

''(B) in the case of a fish tender vessel, engages in the Aleutian trade.

''(2) The term 'auxiliary craft' means a vessel that is carried onboard a fishing vessel and is normally used to support fishing operations.

''(3)(A) The term 'built' means, with respect to a vessel, that the vessel's construction has reached any of the following stages:

''(i) The vessel's keel is laid.

''(ii) Construction identifiable with the vessel has begun and assembly of that vessel has commenced comprising of at least 50 metric tons or one percent of the estimated mass of all structural material, whichever is less.

''(B) In the case of a vessel greater than 79 feet in overall length, for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), a keel is deemed to be laid when a marine surveyor affirms that a structure adequate for serving as a keel for such vessel is in place and identified for use in the construction of such vessel.

''(4) The term 'subject vessel' means a vessel to which this chapter applies that—

''(A) operates beyond 3 nautical miles from the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured or beyond 3 nautical miles from the coastline of the Great Lakes;

''(B) operates with more than 16 individuals on board; or

''(C) in the case of a fish tender vessel, engages in the Aleutian trade.

''(5) The term 'substitute-eligible vessel' means a fishing vessel or fish tender vessel that is—

''(A) a subject vessel;

''(B) at least 50 feet overall in length, and not more than 180 feet overall in length as listed on the vessel's certificate of documentation or certificate of number; and

''(C) built after February 8, 2016.

"§ 4503. Safety standards

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations that require that each vessel to which this chapter applies shall be equipped with—

''(1) readily accessible fire extinguishers capable of promptly and effectively extinguishing a flammable or combustible liquid fuel fire;

''(2) at least one readily accessible life preserver or other lifesaving device for each individual on board;

''(3) an efficient flame arrestor, backfire trap, or other similar device on the carburetors of each inboard engine that uses gasoline as fuel;

''(4) the means to properly and efficiently ventilate enclosed spaces, including engine and fuel tank compartments, so as to remove explosive or flammable gases;

''(5) visual distress signals;

''(6) other equipment required to minimize the risk of injury to the crew during vessel operations, if the Secretary determines that a risk of serious injury exists that can be eliminated or mitigated by that equipment; and

''(7) a placard as required by regulations prescribed under section 10603(b).

''(b) SUBJECT VESSELS.—In addition to the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary shall prescribe regulations requiring that

subject vessels install, maintain, and use the following equipment:

''(1) Alerting and locating equipment, including emergency position indicating radio beacons.

''(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), a survival craft that—

''(i) ensures that no part of an individual is immersed in water; and

''(ii) is sufficient to accommodate all individuals on board.

''(B) Except for a nonapplicable vessel, an auxiliary craft shall satisfy the equipment requirement under paragraph (2)(B) if such craft is—

''(i) necessary for normal fishing operations;

''(ii) readily accessible during an emergency; and

''(iii) capable, in accordance with the Coast Guard capacity rating, when applicable, of safely holding all individuals on board the vessel to which the craft functions as an auxiliary.

''(3) At least one readily accessible immersion suit for each individual on board the vessel when operating on the waters described in section 3102.

''(4) Marine radio communications equipment sufficient to effectively communicate with a land-based search and rescue facility.

''(5) Navigation equipment, including compasses, nautical charts, and publications.

''(6) First aid equipment and medical supplies sufficient for the size and area of operation of the vessel.

''(7) Ground tackle sufficient for the vessel.

''(c) ACCOUNTABLE VESSELS.—In addition to the requirements described in subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary may prescribe regulations establishing minimum safety standards for accountable vessels, including standards relating to—

''(1) navigation equipment, including radars and fathometers;

''(2) lifesaving equipment, immersion suits, signaling devices, bilge pumps, bilge alarms, life rails, and grab rails;

''(3) fire protection and firefighting equipment, including fire alarms and portable and semiportable fire extinguishing equipment;

''(4) use and installation of insulation material;

''(5) storage methods for flammable or combustible material; and

''(6) fuel, ventilation, and electrical systems.

''§ 4504. Vessel construction

''A vessel to which this chapter applies shall be constructed in a manner that provides a level of safety equivalent to the minimum safety standards the Secretary may establish for recreational vessels under section 4302, if the vessel is—

''(1) a subject vessel;

''(2) less than 50 feet overall in length; and

''(3) built after January 1, 2010.

''§ 4505. Operating stability

''(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the operating stability of a vessel to which this chapter applies—

''(1) that was built after December 31, 1989; or

''(2) the physical characteristics of which are substantially altered after December 31, 1989, in a manner that affects the vessel's operating stability.

''(b) EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary may accept, as evidence of compliance with this section, a certification of compliance issued by the person providing insurance for the vessel or by another qualified person approved by the Secretary.

''§ 4506. Training

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The individual in charge of a subject vessel must pass a training program approved by the Secretary that meets the requirements of subsection (b) and hold a valid certificate issued under that program.

''(b) TRAINING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The training program shall—

''(1) be based on professional knowledge and skill obtained through sea service and hands-on training, including training in seamanship, stability, collision prevention, navigation, firefighting and prevention, damage control, personal survival, emergency medical care, emergency drills, and weather;

''(2) require an individual to demonstrate ability to communicate in an emergency situation and understand information found in navigation publications;

''(3) recognize and give credit for recent past experience in fishing vessel operation; and

''(4) provide for issuance of a certificate to an individual who has successfully completed the program.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations implementing this section. The regulations shall require that an individual who is issued a certificate under subsection (b)(4) must complete refresher training at least once every 5 years as a condition of maintaining the validity of the certificate.

''(d) ELECTRONIC DATABASE.—The Secretary shall establish an electronic database listing the names of individuals who have participated in and received a certificate confirming successful completion of a training program approved by the Secretary under this section.

''§ 4507. Vessel certification

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A vessel to which this section applies may not be operated unless the vessel—

''(1) meets all survey and classification requirements prescribed by the American Bureau of Shipping or another similarly qualified organization approved by the Secretary; and

''(2) has on board a certificate issued by the American Bureau of Shipping or such other organization evidencing compliance with this subsection.

''(b) APPLICATION.—

''(1) Except as provided in section 4509, this section applies to a fish processing vessel to which this chapter applies that—

''(A) is built after July 27, 1990; or

''(B) undergoes a major conversion completed after that date.

''(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), this section applies to a subject vessel that is at least 50 feet overall in length and is built after July 1, 2013.

''(B) This section does not apply to a substitute-eligible vessel if such vessel complies with—

''(i) the substitute safety compliance program established under section 4509; or

''(ii) the enhanced substitute safety compliance program established by the Secretary under section 4510.

''§ 4508. Alternate safety compliance program

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) The Secretary shall establish an alternate safety compliance program developed in coordination with the commercial fishing industry.

''(2) The program established under paragraph (1) may include requirements for—

''(A) a specific region or fishery (or both); and

''(B) any combination of regions or fisheries (or both).

''(b) VESSELS REQUIRED TO COMPLY.—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date the Secretary prescribes an alternate safety compliance program, the following vessels shall comply with such program:

''(1) A subject vessel that is—

''(A) at least 50 feet overall in length;

''(B) built before July 1, 2013; and

''(C) 25 years of age or older.

''(2) A fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, or fish tender vessel built before July 1, 2013, that undergoes a major conversion completed after the date the Secretary prescribes an alternate safety compliance program.

''(c) EXEMPT VESSELS.—

''(1) Notwithstanding subsection (b), vessels owned by a person that owns more than 30 vessels subject to that subsection are not required to comply with alternate safety compliance program requirements until January 1, 2030, if that owner—

''(A) enters into a compliance agreement with the Secretary that provides for a fixed schedule for all such vessels owned by that person to meet requirements of such paragraph by such date; and

''(B) is meeting such schedule.

''(2) A subject vessel that was classed before July 1, 2012, is exempt from the requirements of this section if such vessel—

''(A) remains subject to the requirements of a classification society approved by the Secretary; and

''(B) has on board a certificate from that society.

''§ 4509. Substitute safety compliance program

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a substitute safety compliance program for substitute-eligible vessels that includes the following requirements:

''(1) A substitute-eligible vessel shall be designed by an individual licensed by a State as a naval architect or marine engineer, and the design shall incorporate standards equivalent to those prescribed by a classification society to which the Secretary has delegated authority under section 3316 or another qualified organization approved by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph.

''(2) Construction of a substitute-eligible vessel shall be overseen and certified as being in accordance with its design by a marine surveyor of an organization accepted by the Secretary.

''(3) A substitute-eligible vessel shall—

''(A) complete a stability test performed by a qualified individual;

''(B) have written stability and loading instructions from a qualified individual that are provided to the owner or operator; and

''(C) have an assigned loading mark.

''(4) A substitute-eligible vessel shall not be substantially altered without the review and approval of an individual licensed by a State as a naval architect or marine engineer before the beginning of such substantial alteration.

''(5) A substitute-eligible vessel shall undergo a condition survey at least twice in 5 years, with not more than 3 years between surveys, to the satisfaction of a marine surveyor of an organization accepted by the Secretary.

''(6) A substitute-eligible vessel shall undergo an out-of-water survey at least once every 5 years to the satisfaction of a certified marine surveyor of an organization accepted by the Secretary.

''(7) Once every 5 years, and at the time of a substantial alteration to a substitute-eligible vessel, compliance of the vessel with the requirements of paragraph (3) is reviewed and updated as necessary.

''(8) For the life of a substitute-eligible vessel, the owner of the vessel shall maintain records to demonstrate compliance with this subsection and make such records readily available for inspection by an official authorized to enforce this chapter.

''(b) COMPLIANCE.—Section 4507 of this title shall not apply to a substitute-eligible vessel

that complies with the requirements of the program established under this section.

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 8, 2026, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that provides an analysis of the adequacy of the substitute safety compliance program requirements established under subsection (a) in maintaining the safety of substitute-eligible fishing vessels and fish tender vessels and that comply with such requirements.

''§ 4510. Enhanced substitute safety compliance program

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If the report required under section 4509(c) includes a determination that the substitute safety compliance program established under section 4509(a) is not adequate or that additional safety measures are necessary, then the Secretary may establish an enhanced substitute safety compliance program for fishing vessels or fish tender vessels (or both) that are substitute-eligible vessels and that comply with the requirements of section 4509.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The enhanced substitute safety compliance program established under this subsection shall include requirements for—

''(1) vessel construction;

''(2) a vessel stability test;

''(3) vessel stability and loading instructions;

''(4) an assigned vessel loading mark;

''(5) a vessel condition survey at least twice in 5 years, not more than 3 years apart;

''(6) an out-of-water vessel survey at least once every 5 years;

''(7) maintenance of records to demonstrate compliance with the program, and the availability of such records for inspection; and

''(8) such other aspects of vessel safety as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(c) COMPLIANCE.—Section 4507 shall not apply to a substitute-eligible vessel that complies with the requirements of the program established under this section.

''§ 4511. Prohibited acts

''A person may not operate a vessel in violation of this chapter or a regulation prescribed under this chapter.

''§ 4512. Termination of unsafe operations

''An official authorized to enforce this chapter—

''(1) may direct the individual in charge of a vessel to which this chapter applies to immediately take reasonable steps necessary for the safety of individuals on board the vessel if the official observes the vessel being operated in an unsafe condition that the official believes creates an especially hazardous condition, including ordering the individual in charge to return the vessel to a mooring and to remain there until the situation creating the hazard is corrected or ended; and

''(2) may order the individual in charge of an uninspected fish processing vessel that does not have on board the certificate required under section 4507 to return the vessel to a mooring and to remain there until the vessel is in compliance with such section, unless the vessel is required to comply with section 4508.

''§ 4513. Penalties

''(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—The owner, charterer, managing operator, agent, master, and individual in charge of a vessel to which this chapter applies that is operated in violation of this chapter or a regulation prescribed under this chapter may each be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than $10,260. Any vessel with respect to which a penalty is assessed under this subsection is liable in rem for the penalty.

''(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—An individual willfully violating this chapter or a regulation prescribed under this chapter shall be fined not more than $5,000, imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

''§ 4514. Compliance; Secretary actions

''To ensure compliance with the requirements of this chapter, the Secretary—

''(1) shall require the individual in charge of a subject vessel to keep a record of equipment maintenance and required instruction and drills;

''(2) shall examine at dockside a subject vessel at least once every 5 years, but may require an exam at dockside every 2 years for certain subject vessels if requested by the owner or operator; and

''(3) shall issue a certificate of compliance to a vessel meeting the requirements of this chapter and satisfying the requirements of paragraph (2).

''§ 4515. Exemptions

''The Secretary may exempt a vessel from any part of this chapter if, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary (including regulations on special operating conditions), the Secretary finds that—

''(1) good cause exists for granting an exemption; and

''(2) the safety of the vessel and those on board will not be adversely affected.

''§ 4516. Regulations; considerations and limitations

''In prescribing a regulation under this chapter, the Secretary—

''(1) shall consider the specialized nature and economics of the operations and the character, design, and construction of the vessel; and

''(2) may not require the alteration of a vessel or associated equipment that was constructed or manufactured before the effective date of such regulation.

''§ 4517. Fishing safety grants

''(a) SAFETY TRAINING GRANTS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a Fishing Safety Training Grant Program to provide funding to municipalities, port authorities, other appropriate public entities, not-for-profit organizations, and other qualified persons that provide commercial fishing safety training.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Entities receiving funds under this section may use such funds—

''(A) to conduct fishing vessel safety training for vessel operators and crewmembers that—

''(i) in the case of vessel operators, meets the requirements of section 4506; and

''(ii) in the case of crewmembers, meets the requirements of sections 4506(b)(1), 4506(b)(4), 4506(c), and 4506(d), and such requirements of section 4506(b)(2) as are appropriate for crewmembers; and

''(B) for purchase of safety equipment and training aids for use in such fishing vessel safety training programs.

''(3) AWARD CRITERIA.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with and based on criteria established by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis.

''(4) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL SHARE OF COST.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with a grant under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under this subsection.

''(b) RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a Fishing Safety Research Grant Program to provide funding to individuals in academia, not-for-profit organizations, businesses involved in fishing and maritime matters, and other persons with expertise in fishing safety, to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of the commercial fishing industry, including vessel design, emergency and survival equipment, enhancement of vessel monitoring systems, communications devices, de-icing technology, and severe weather detection.

''(2) AWARD CRITERIA.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with and based on criteria established by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis.

''(3) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL SHARE OF COST.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with a grant under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal year 2020 and 2021 for activities under this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3104(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''under section 4503(d)'' and inserting ''under section 4502(3)''.

(c) SAFETY STANDARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and without regard to the provisions of chapters 5 and 6 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall promulgate the regulations required by section 4503(b) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section.

SEC. 502. TRANSFERS.

(a) TRANSFERS OF PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Section 215 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–293; 14 U.S.C. 504 note) is redesignated as section 321 of title 14, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 320 of that title, and amended so that the enumerator, section heading, typeface, and typestyle conform to those appearing in other sections in title 14, United States Code.

(B) Section 406 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law (107–295; 14 U.S.C. 501 note) is redesignated as section 719 of title 14, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 718 of that title, and amended so that the enumerator, section heading, typeface, and typestyle conform to those appearing in other sections in title 14, United States Code.

(C) Section 1110 of title 14, United States Code, is redesignated as section 5110 of that title, and transferred to appear after section 5109 of that title.

(D) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(i) Section 401 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–281) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(ii) Subchapter I of chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1110. Elevation of Disputes to the Chief Acquisition Officer

''If, after 90 days following the elevation to the Chief Acquisition Officer of any design or other dispute regarding level 1 or level 2 acquisition, the dispute remains unresolved, the Commandant shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed description of the issue and the rationale underlying the decision taken by the Chief Acquisition Officer to resolve the issue.''.

(E) Section 217 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–281; 14 U.S.C. 504 note)—

(i) is redesignated as section 5111 of title 14, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 5110 of that title, and amended so that the enumerator, section heading, typeface, and typestyle conform to those appearing in other sections in title 14, United States Code; and

(ii) is amended—

(I) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

"§ 5111. Sexual assault and sexual harassment in the Coast Guard"; and

(II) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) The number of instances in which a covered individual was accused of misconduct or crimes considered collateral to the investigation of a sexual assault committed against the individual.

''(B) The number of instances in which adverse action was taken against a covered individual who was accused of collateral misconduct or crimes as described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) The percentage of investigations of sexual assaults that involved an accusation or adverse action against a covered individual as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(D) In this paragraph, the term 'covered individual' means an individual who is identified as a victim of a sexual assault in the case files of a military criminal investigative organization.''.

(F) Section 305 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking ''The Federal'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal''; and

(ii) by inserting after section (a) the following:

''(b) TRANSPARENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the transmittal by the President to the Congress of the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 2021 and biennially there-after, the Federal Maritime Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives reports that describe the Commission's progress toward addressing the issues raised in each unfinished regulatory proceeding, regardless of whether the proceeding if subject to a statutory or regulatory deadline.

''(2) FORMAT OF REPORTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall, among other things, clearly identify for each unfinished regulatory proceeding—

''(A) the popular title;

''(B) the current stage of the proceeding;

''(C) an abstract of the proceeding;

''(D) what prompted the action in question;

''(E) any applicable statutory, regulatory, or judicial deadline;

''(F) the associated docket number;

''(G) the date the rulemaking was initiated;

''(H) a date for the next action; and

''(I) if a date for the next action identified in the previous report is not met, the reason for the delay.''.

(G) Section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1915 (33 U.S.C. 471) is amended—

(i) by transferring such section to appear after section 70006 of title 46, United States Code;

(ii) by striking ''SEC. 7.'' and inserting **''§70007. Establishment by Secretary of Homeland Security of anchorage grounds and regulations generally''**; and

(iii) by adjusting the margins with respect to subsections (a) and (b) for the presence of a section heading accordingly.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The analysis for chapter 3 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''321. Redistricting notification requirement.''.

(B) The analysis for chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''719. VHF communication services.''.

(C) The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1110 and inserting the following:

''1110. Elevation of disputes to the Chief Acquisition Officer.''.

(D) The analysis for chapter 51 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5110. Mission need statement.

''5111. Sexual assault and sexual harassment in the Coast Guard.''.

(E) The analysis for chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by section 311(b), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 70006 the following:

''70007. Establishment by the Secretary of Homeland Security of anchorage grounds and regulations generally.''.

(b) TRANSFERS.—

(1) SECTION 204 OF THE MARINE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT.—

(A) The Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 is amended by striking section 204 (33 U.S.C. 1902a).

(B) Section 3 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1902)—

(i) is amended by redesignating subsections (e) through (i) as subsections (f) through (j) respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) DISCHARGE OF AGRICULTURAL CARGO RESIDUE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the discharge from a vessel of any agricultural cargo residue material in the form of hold washings shall be governed exclusively by the provisions of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) that implement Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships.''.

(2) LNG TANKERS.—

(A) The Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 is amended by striking section 304 (Public Law 109–241; 120 Stat. 527).

(B) Section 5 of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1504) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) LNG TANKERS.—

''(1) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Transportation shall develop and implement a program to promote the transportation of liquefied natural gas to and from the United States on United States flag vessels.

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED.—When the Coast Guard is operating as a contributing agency in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's shoreside licensing process for a liquefied natural gas or liquefied petroleum gas terminal located on shore or within State seaward boundaries, the Coast Guard shall provide to the Commission the information described in section 5(c)(2)(K) of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1504(c)(2)(K)) with respect to vessels reasonably anticipated to be servicing that port.''.

SEC. 503. REPEALS.

(a) LICENSE EXEMPTIONS; REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SERVICE UNDER LICENSES ISSUED WITHOUT EXAMINATION.—

(A) REPEAL.—Section 8303 of title 46, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the analysis for chapter 83 of that title, are repealed.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 14305(a)(10) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 8303 and 8304'' and inserting ''section 8304''.

(2) STANDARDS FOR TANK VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 9102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(a)'' before the first sentence; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(b) REPEAL.—Section 343 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–295; 116 Stat. 2106) is repealed.

(c) ACCIDENT AND INCIDENT NOTIFICATION.—Subsection (c) of section 9 of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90; 125 Stat 1912)) is repealed and is deemed not to have been enacted.

TITLE VI—TECHNICAL, CONFORMING, AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 601. MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

(a) MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.—Section 312(b)(4) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''marine transportation system'' and inserting ''maritime transportation system''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE TO MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PROGRAMS.—Section 50307(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''marine transportation'' and inserting ''maritime transportation''.

SEC. 602. REFERENCES TO "PERSONS" AND "SEAMEN".

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF REFERENCES TO ''PERSONS''.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In section 312(d), by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''.

(2) In section 313(d)(2)(B), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(3) In section 504—

(A) in subsection (a)(19)(B), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(4), by striking ''seamen;'' and inserting ''mariners;''.

(4) In section 521, by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''.

(5) In section 522—

(A) by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) by striking ''person'' the second and third place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(6) In section 525(a)(1)(C)(ii), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(7) In section 526—

(A) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual'';

(B) by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''; and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''.

(8) In section 709—

(A) by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(9) In section 933(b), by striking ''Every person'' and inserting ''An individual''.

(10) In section 1102(d), by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''.

(11) In section 1902(b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''person or persons'' and inserting ''individual or individuals''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(12) In section 1941(b), by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''.

(13) In section 2101(b), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(14) In section 2102(c), by striking ''A person'' and inserting ''An individual''.

(15) In section 2104(b)—

(A) by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) by striking ''A person'' and inserting ''An individual''.

(16) In section 2118(d), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual who is''.

(17) In section 2147(d), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(18) In section 2150(f), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual who is''.

(19) In section 2161(b), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(20) In section 2317—

(A) by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals'';

(B) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''; and

(C) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''.

(21) In section 2531—

(A) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''; and

(B) by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''.

(22) In section 2709, by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''.

(23) In section 2710—

(A) by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(24) In section 2711(b), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(25) In section 2732, by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(26) In section 2733—

(A) by striking ''A person'' and inserting ''An individual''; and

(B) by striking ''that person'' and inserting ''that individual''.

(27) In section 2734, by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(28) In section 2735, by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(29) In section 2736, by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(30) In section 2737, by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(31) In section 2738, by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(32) In section 2739, by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(33) In section 2740—

(A) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''; and

(B) by striking ''one'' the second place it appears.

(34) In section 2741—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''; and

(C) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(35) In section 2743, by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(36) In section 2744—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) in subsections (a) and (c), by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(37) In section 2745, by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(38)(A) In section 2761—

(i) in the section heading, by striking ''**Persons**'' and inserting ''**Individuals**'';

(ii) by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(iii) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(B) In the analysis for chapter 27, by striking the item relating to section 2761 and inserting the following:

''2761. Individuals discharged as result of court-martial; allowances to.''.

(39)(A) In the heading for section 2767, by striking ''**persons**'' and inserting ''**individuals**''.

(B) In the analysis for chapter 27, by striking the item relating to section 2767 and inserting the following:

''2767. Reimbursement for medical-related travel expenses for certain individuals residing on islands in the continental United States.''.

(40) In section 2769—

(A) by striking ''a person's'' and inserting ''an individual's''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(41) In section 2772(a)(2), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(42) In section 2773—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(43) In section 2775, by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(44) In section 2776, by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(45)(A) In section 2777—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''**persons**'' and inserting ''**individuals**''; and

(ii) by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''.

(B) In the analysis for chapter 27, by striking the item relating to in section 2777 and inserting the following:

''2777. Clothing for destitute shipwrecked individuals.''.

(46) In section 2779, by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals''.

(47) In section 2902(c), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(48) In section 2903(b), by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''.

(49) In section 2904(b)(1)(B), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(50) In section 3706—

(A) by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''.

(51) In section 3707—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''individual''; and

(ii) by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(52) In section 3708, by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(53) In section 3738—

(A) by striking ''a person'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual'';

(B) by striking ''person's'' and inserting ''individual's''; and

(C) by striking ''A person'' and inserting ''An individual''.

(b) CORRECTION OF REFERENCES TO PERSONS AND SEAMEN.—

(1) Section 2303a(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''persons'' and inserting ''individuals''.

(2) Section 2306(a)(3) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3) An owner, charterer, managing operator, or agent of a vessel of the United States notifying the Coast Guard under paragraph (1) or (2) shall—

''(A) provide the name and identification number of the vessel, the names of individuals on board, and other information that may be requested by the Coast Guard; and

''(B) submit written confirmation to the Coast Guard within 24 hours after nonwritten notification to the Coast Guard under such paragraphs.''.

(3) Section 7303 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''seaman'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(4) Section 7319 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''seaman'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''.

(5) Section 7501(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''seaman'' and inserting ''holder''.

(6) Section 7508(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''individual seamen or a specifically identified group of seamen'' and inserting ''an individual or a specifically identified group of individuals''.

(7) Section 7510 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(8)(B), by striking ''merchant seamen'' and inserting ''merchant mariner''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''merchant seaman'' and inserting ''merchant mariner''.

(8) Section 8103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''seaman'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual'';

(B) by striking ''seamen'' each place it appears and inserting ''individuals'';

(C) in the headings for paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (k), by striking ''SEAMEN'' each place it appears and inserting ''INDIVIDUALS'';

(D) in subsection (k)(3)(A)(iv)(II), by striking ''seaman's'' and inserting ''individual's''; and

(E) in subsection (k)(3)(C), by striking ''merchant mariners'' each place it appears and inserting ''merchant mariner's''.

(9) Section 8104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''a licensed individual or seaman'' and inserting ''an individual'';

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''A licensed individual or seaman'' and inserting ''An individual'';

(C) in subsection (e), by striking ''a seaman'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''; and

(D) in subsection (j), by striking ''seaman'' and inserting ''individual''.

(10) Section 8302(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''3 persons'' and inserting ''3 individuals''.

(11) Section 11201 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a person'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''.

(12) Section 11202 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''a person'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) by striking ''the person'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual''.

(13) Section 11203 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''a person'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''that person'' and inserting ''that individual''.

(14) Section 15109(i)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''additional persons'' and inserting ''additional individuals''.

SEC. 603. COMMON APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO CONFORM TO COMMON APPROPRIATIONS STRUCTURE.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT OF FUNDS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE.—Section

506 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''established under chapter 56 of title 10'' after ''Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(2) USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 903 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities, for research, development, test, and evaluation;'' and inserting ''procurement, construction, and improvement of facilities and for research and development''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(3) CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 944 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''necessary expenses for the operation'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(4) PROCUREMENT OF PERSONNEL.—Section 2701 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''operating expense'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(5) COAST GUARD HOUSING FUND.—Section 2946(b)(2) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''acquisition'' and inserting ''procurement''.

(6) REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 4901 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''maintenance'' and inserting ''support'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''acquisition'' and inserting ''procurement'';

(C) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), and (6);

(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''research, development, test, and evaluation'' and inserting ''research and development''.

(b) COMMON APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE.—Sections 3317(b), 7504, and 80505(b)(3) of title 46, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(c) COMMON APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE.—

(1) OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.—Section 1012(a)(5)(A) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)(A)) is amended by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(2) HISTORIC LIGHT STATION SALES.—Section 305106 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) by striking ''Operating Expenses'' and inserting ''Operations and Support''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(2) by striking ''Operating Expense'' and inserting ''Operations and Support'';

(3) BRIDGE PERMITS.—Section 712(a)(2) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–213; 126 Stat. 1582) is amended by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

(4) CONTRACTS.—Section 557(a) of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 377) is amended by striking ''Acquisition'' and inserting ''Procurement''.

(5) CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES.—Section 214(d)(1) of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–281; 128 Stat. 3034) is amended by striking ''operating expenses'' and inserting ''operations and support''.

SEC. 604. REFERENCES TO ''HIMSELF'' AND ''HIS''.

(a) Section 1927 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking ''of his initial'' and inserting ''of an initial''; and

(2) striking ''from his pay'' and inserting ''from the pay of such cadet''.

(b) Section 2108(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''himself'' and inserting ''such officer''.

(c) Section 2732 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by striking ''distinguishes himself conspicuously by'' and inserting ''displays conspicuous''; and

(2) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''such individual's''.

(d) Section 2736 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking ''distinguishes himself by'' and inserting ''performs''.

(e) Section 2738 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act is further amended by striking ''distinguishes himself by'' and inserting ''displays''.

(f) Section 2739 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking ''distinguishes himself by'' and inserting ''displays''.

(g) Section 2742 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''he distinguished himself'' and inserting ''of the acts resulting in the consideration of such award''.

(h) Section 2743 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by striking ''distinguishes himself''; and

(2) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''such individual''.

SEC. 605. REFERENCES TO ''MOTORBOATS'' AND ''YACHTS''.

(a) CORRECTION OF REFERENCES TO MOTORBOATS AND YACHTS.—

(1) Section 3901(d)(4) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motor boats, yachts,'' and inserting ''vessels,''.

(2) Section 3903(1)(A) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboats, yachts'' and inserting ''vessels,''.

(3) Section 3907(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''MOTOR BOATS, YACHTS,'' and inserting ''VESSELS,''; and

(B) by striking ''motorboat, yacht,'' and inserting ''vessels,''.

(4) Section 3908 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboat or yacht'' and inserting ''vessel''.

(5) Section 3911(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboat, yacht,'' each place it appears and inserting ''vessel,''.

(6) Section 3912 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboat, yacht,'' and inserting ''vessel,''.

(7) Section 4101 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboats, yachts,'' and inserting ''vessels,''.

(8) Section 4102 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''motorboat, yacht, or any other vessel,'' and inserting ''or vessel,''.

(b) CONFORMING REFERENCES TO YACHTS.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in parts F and G of subtitle II, by striking ''yacht'' each place it appears and inserting ''recreational vessel'';

(2) in subtitle III—

(A) in section 30506(a), by striking ''pleasure yachts'' and inserting ''recreational vessels''; and

(B) in section 30508(a), by striking ''pleasure yachts'' and inserting ''recreational vessels''; and

(3) in section 60504—

(A) by striking ''yachts'' each place it appears and inserting ''recreational vessels''; and

(B) by striking ''yacht'' and inserting ''recreational vessel''.

(c) VESSELS.—Section 352(a)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 352(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''Yachts'' and inserting ''Recreational vessels, as defined in section 2101(46) of title 46, United States Code,''.

SEC. 606. MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 3305(d)(3)(B) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017'' and inserting ''Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018''.

(2) Section 4312 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017'' each place it appears and inserting ''Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282)''.

(3) The analysis for chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to the heading for the first subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER I—VESSEL OPERATIONS'';

(B) by striking the item relating to the heading for the second subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER II—PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY'';

(C) by striking the items relating to the heading for the third subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER III—CONDITION FOR ENTRY INTO PORTS IN THE UNITED STATES

''70021. Conditions for Entry Into Ports in the United States.'';

(D) by striking the item relating to the heading for the fourth subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—DEFINITIONS REGULATIONS, ENFORCEMENT, INVESTIGATORY POWERS, APPLICABILITY'';

(E) by striking the item relating to the heading for the fifth subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER V—REGATTAS AND MARINE PARADES'';

and

(F) by striking the item relating to the heading for the sixth subchapter and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VI—REGULATION OF VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES''.

(4) Section 70031 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''A through C'' and inserting ''I through III''.

(5) Section 70032 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''A through C'' and inserting ''I through III''.

(6) Section 70033 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''A through C'' and inserting ''I through III''.

(7) Section 70034 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''A through C'' each place it appears and inserting ''I through III''.

(8) Section 70035(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''A through C'' and inserting ''I through III''.

(9) Section 70036 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by—

(A) striking ''A through C'' each place it appears and inserting ''I through III''; and

(B) striking ''A, B, or C'' each place it appears and inserting ''I, II, or III''.

(b) ALTERATION OF BRIDGES; TECHNICAL CHANGES.—The Act of June 21, 1940 (33 U.S.C. 511 et seq.), popularly known as the Truman-Hobbs Act, is amended by striking section 12 (33 U.S.C. 522).

(c) REPORT OF DETERMINATION; TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 105(f)(2) of the Pribilof

Islands Transition Act (16 U.S.C. 1161 note; Public Law 106–562) is amended by striking ''subsection (a),'' and inserting ''paragraph (1),''.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO FRANK LOBIONDO COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018.—

(1) Section 408 of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) and the item relating to such section in section 2 of such Act are repealed, and the provisions of law redesignated, transferred, or otherwise amended by section 408 are amended to read as if such section were not enacted.

(2) Section 514(b) of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) is amended by striking ''Chapter 30'' and inserting ''Chapter 3''.

(3) Section 810(d) of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) is amended by striking ''within 30 days after receiving the notice under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall, by not later than 60 days after transmitting such notice,'' and inserting ''in accordance within subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall''.

(4) Section 820(a) of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) is amended by striking ''years 2018 and'' and inserting ''year''.

(5) Section 820(b)(2) of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) is amended by inserting ''and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141)'' after ''(Public Law 115–31)''.

(6) Section 821(a)(2) of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) is amended by striking ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017'' and inserting ''Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018''.

(7) This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282) and apply as if included therein.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 533(d)(2)(A) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–120) is amended by striking ''Tract 6'' and inserting ''such Tract''.

(f) DISTANT WATER TUNA FLEET; TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 421 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–241) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'treaty area' has the meaning given the term in the Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–241).''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''12.6 or 12.7'' and inserting ''13.6''; and

(B) by striking ''and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Authorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 607. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO CODIFICATION OF PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY ACT.

Effective upon the enactment of section 401 of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–282), and notwithstanding section 402(e) of such Act—

(1) section 16 of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act, as added by section 315 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 947)—

(A) is redesignated as section 70022 of title 46, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 70021 of that title, and amended so that the enumerator, section heading, typeface, and typestyle conform to those appearing in other sections in title 46, United States Code; and

(B) as so redesignated and transferred, is amended—

(i) in subsections (b) and (e), by striking ''section 4(a)(5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 70001(a)(5)'';

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''thereafter,'' and inserting ''periodically''; and

(iii) by striking subsection (h); and

(2) chapter 700 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 70002(2), by inserting ''or 70022'' after ''section 70021'';

(B) in section 70036(e), by inserting ''or 70022'' after ''section 70021''; and

(C) in the analysis for such chapter—

(i) by inserting ''Sec.'' above the section items, in accordance with the style and form of such an entry in other chapter analyses of such title; and

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 70021 and inserting the following:

''70021. Conditions for entry to ports in the United States

''70022. Prohibition on entry and operation''.

TITLE VII—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 702. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 308 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$28,012,310 for fiscal year 2018 and $28,544,543 for fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''$29,086,888 for fiscal year 2020 and $29,639,538 for fiscal year 2021''.

TITLE VIII—COAST GUARD ACADEMY IMPROVEMENT ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Coast Guard Academy Improvement Act''.

SEC. 802. COAST GUARD ACADEMY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Public Administration not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the this Act under which the National Academy of Public Administration shall—

(1) conduct an assessment of the cultural competence of the Coast Guard Academy as an organization and of individuals at the Coast Guard Academy to carry out effectively the primary duties of the United States Coast Guard listed in section 102 of title 14, United States Code, when interacting with individuals of different races, ethnicities, genders, religions, sexual orientations, socioeconomic backgrounds, or from different geographic origins; and

(2) issue recommendations based upon the findings in such assessment.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL COMPETENCE.—

(1) CULTURAL COMPETENCE OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY.—The arrangement described in subsection (a) shall require the National Academy of Public Administration to, not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the Secretary under subsection (a), submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the assessment described under subsection (a)(1).

(2) ASSESSMENT SCOPE.—The assessment described under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(A) describe the level of cultural competence described in subsection (a)(1) based on the National Academy of Public Administration's assessment of the Coast Guard Academy's relevant practices, policies, and structures, including an overview of discussions with faculty, staff, students, and relevant Coast Guard Academy affiliated organizations;

(B) examine potential changes which could be used to further enhance such cultural competence by—

(i) modifying institutional practices, policies, and structures; and

(ii) any other changes deemed appropriate by the National Academy of Public Administration; and

(C) make recommendations to enhance the cultural competence of the Coast Guard Academy described in subparagraph (A), including any specific plans, policies, milestones, performance measures, or other information necessary to implement such recommendations.

(c) FINAL ACTION MEMORANDUM.—Not later than three months after submission of the assessment under section 802(b)(1), the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a final action memorandum in response to all recommendations contained in the assessment. The Final Action Memorandum shall include the rationale for accepting, accepting in part, or rejecting each recommendation, and shall specify, where applicable, actions to be taken to implement such recommendations, including an explanation of how each action enhances the ability of the Coast Guard to carry out the primary duties of the United States Coast Guard listed in section 102 of title 14, United States Code.

(d) PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of the submission of the final action memorandum required under subsection (c), the Commandant of the Coast Guard, in coordination with the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, shall submit a plan to carry out the recommendations or the parts of the recommendations accepted in the Final Action Memorandum to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) STRATEGY WITH MILESTONES.—If any recommendation or parts of recommendations accepted in the Final Action Memorandum address any of the following actions, then the plan required in paragraph (1) shall include a strategy with appropriate milestones to carry out such recommendations or parts of recommendations:

(A) Improve outreach and recruitment of a more diverse Coast Guard Academy cadet candidate pool based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, and geographic origin.

(B) Modify institutional structures, practices, and policies to foster a more diverse cadet corps body, faculty, and staff workforce based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, and geographic origin.

(C) Modify existing or establish new policies and safeguards to foster the retention of cadets, faculty, and staff of different races, ethnicities, genders, religions, sexual orientations, socioeconomic backgrounds, and

geographic origins at the Coast Guard Academy.

(D) Restructure the admissions office of the Coast Guard Academy to be headed by a civilian with significant relevant higher education recruitment experience.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—Unless otherwise directed by an Act of Congress, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall begin implementation of the plan developed under this subsection not later than 180 days after the submission of such plan to Congress.

(4) UPDATE.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall include in the first annual report required under chapter 51 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, submitted after the date of enactment of this section, the strategy with milestones required in paragraph (2) and shall report annually thereafter on actions taken and progress made in the implementation of such plan.

SEC. 803. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 51 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 5112. Report on diversity at the Coast Guard Academy

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15, 2021, and annually thereafter, the Commandant shall submit a report on diversity at the Coast Guard Academy to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

''(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) the status of the implementation of the plan required section 802 of the Coast Guard Academy Improvement Act;

''(2) specific information on outreach and recruitment activities for the preceding year, including the effectiveness of the Coast Guard Academy Minority Outreach Team Program described under section 1905 and of outreach and recruitment activities in the territories and other possessions of the United States;

''(3) enrollment information about the incoming class, including the gender, race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic background, and State of residence of Coast Guard Academy cadets;

''(4) information on class retention, outcomes, and graduation rates, including the race, gender, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic background, and State of residence of Coast Guard Academy cadets; and

''(5) information on efforts to retain diverse cadets, including through professional development and professional advancement programs for staff and faculty.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 51 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5112. Report on diversity at the Coast Guard Academy.''.

SEC. 804. ASSESSMENT OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY ADMISSION PROCESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Public Administration under which the National Academy of Public Administration shall, not later than 1 year after submitting an assessment under section 802(a), submit an assessment of the Coast Guard Academy admissions process to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(b) ASSESSMENT SCOPE.—The assessment required to be sought under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include—

(1) a study, or an audit if appropriate, of the process the Coast Guard Academy uses to—

(A) identify candidates for recruitment;

(B) recruit applicants;

(C) assist applicants in the application process;

(D) evaluate applications; and

(E) make admissions decisions;

(2) discussion of the consideration during the admissions process of diversity, including—

(A) race;

(B) ethnicity;

(C) gender;

(D) religion;

(E) sexual orientation;

(F) socioeconomic background; and

(G) geographic origin;

(3) an overview of the admissions processes at other Federal service academies, including—

(A) discussion of consideration of diversity, including any efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants, in those processes; and

(B) an analysis of how the congressional nominations requirement in current law related to military service academies and the Merchant Marine Academy impacts those processes and the overall demographics of the student bodies at those academies;

(4) a determination regarding how a congressional nominations requirement for Coast Guard Academy admissions could impact diversity among the student body and the ability of the Coast Guard to carry out effectively the Service's primary duties described in section 102 of title 14, United States Code; and

(5) recommendations for improving Coast Guard Academy admissions processes, including whether a congressional nominations process should be integrated into such processes.

SEC. 805. COAST GUARD ACADEMY MINORITY OUTREACH TEAM PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1904 the following:

"§ 1905. Coast Guard Academy minority outreach program

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Coast Guard Academy a minority outreach team program (in this section referred to as the 'Program') under which officers, including minority officers and officers from territories and other possessions of the United States, who are Academy graduates may volunteer their time to recruit minority students and strengthen cadet retention through mentorship of cadets.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Not later than July 15, 2020, the Commandant, in consultation with Program volunteers and Academy alumni that participated in prior programs at the Academy similar to the Program, shall appoint a permanent civilian position at the Academy to administer the Program by, among other things—

''(1) overseeing administration of the Program;

''(2) serving as a resource to volunteers and outside stakeholders;

''(3) advising Academy leadership on recruitment and retention efforts based on recommendations from volunteers and outside stakeholders;

''(4) establishing strategic goals and performance metrics for the Program with input from active volunteers and Academy leadership; and

''(5) reporting annually to the Commandant on academic year and performance outcomes of the goals for the Program before the end of each academic year.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1904 the following:

''1905. Coast Guard Academy minority outreach team program.''.

SEC. 806. COAST GUARD COLLEGE STUDENT PRE-COMMISSIONING INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2131. College student pre-commissioning initiative

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized within the Coast Guard the College Student Pre-Commissioning Initiative program (in this section referred to as the 'program') for eligible undergraduate students to enlist and receive a guaranteed commission as an officer in the Coast Guard.

''(b) CRITERIA FOR SELECTION.—To be eligible for the program a student must meet the following requirements upon submitting an application:

''(1) AGE.—A student must be not less than 19 years old and not more than 27 years old as of September 30 of the fiscal year in which the program selection panel selecting such student convenes.

''(2) CHARACTER.—

''(A) ALL APPLICANTS.—All applicants must be of outstanding moral character and meet other character requirements as set forth by the Commandant.

''(B) COAST GUARD APPLICANTS.—An applicant serving in the Coast Guard may not be commissioned if in the 36 months prior to the first Officer Candidate School class convening date in the selection cycle, such applicant was convicted by a court-martial or awarded non-judicial punishment, or did not meet performance or character requirements set forth by the Commandant.

''(3) CITIZENSHIP.—A student must be a United States citizen.

''(4) CLEARANCE.—A student must be eligible for a secret clearance.

''(5) DEPENDENCY.—

''(A) A student may not have more than 2 dependents; and

''(B) A student who is single may not have sole or primary custody of dependents.

''(6) EDUCATION.—

''(A) INSTITUTION.—A student must be an undergraduate sophomore or junior—

''(i) at a historically Black college or university described in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)) or an institution of higher education described in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)); or

''(ii) who is active in minority-serving organizations and pursuing a degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics at an institution of higher education described in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001) that is not a historically Black college or university or institution of higher education referred to in clause (i) of this subparagraph.

''(B) LOCATION.—The institution at which such student is an undergraduate must be within 100 miles of a Coast guard unit or Coast Guard Recruiting Office unless otherwise approved by the Commandant.

''(C) RECORDS.—A student must meet credit and grade point average requirements set forth by the Commandant.

''(7) MEDICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE.—A student must meet other medical and administrative requirements as set forth by the Commandant.

''(c) ENLISTMENT AND OBLIGATION.—Individuals selected and accept to participate in the program shall enlist in the Coast Guard in pay grade E–3 with a four year duty obligation and four year inactive Reserve obligation.

''(d) MILITARY ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL.—Individuals enrolled in

the program shall participate in military activities each month, as required by the Commandant, prior to attending Officer Candidate School.

''(e) PARTICIPATION IN OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL.—Each graduate of the program shall attend the first enrollment of Officer Candidate School that commences after the date of such graduate's graduation.

''(f) COMMISSIONING.—Upon graduation from Officer Candidate School, program graduates shall be discharged from enlisted status and commissioned as an O–1 with an initial three-year duty obligation.

''(g) BRIEFING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 15 of each year, the Commandant shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the College Student Pre-Commissioning Initiative.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The briefing required under paragraph (1) shall describe—

''(A) outreach and recruitment efforts over the previous year; and

''(B) demographic information of enrollees including—

''(i) race;

''(ii) ethnicity;

''(iii) gender;

''(iv) geographic origin; and

''(v) educational institution.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2131. College Student Pre-Commissioning Initiative.''.

SEC. 807. ANNUAL BOARD OF VISITORS.

Section 1903(d) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) recruitment and retention;''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3409, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today and speak in strong support of H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2019. This is genuinely bipartisan legislation which will reauthorize funding for the United States Coast Guard Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2020 and 2021.

The bill also advances other important provisions to help both the economic competitiveness and effective regulation of the U.S. maritime industry.

It is the latest in a long line of major legislation from this committee, reported to the House on a bipartisan basis and underpinning essential functions of government such as, in this case, the United States Coast Guard and the Federal Maritime Commission.

I couldn't have better partners than I had: my ranking member, SAM GRAVES; the chair of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY; and the ranking subcommittee member, Representative BOB GIBBS. They worked hard on this legislation, and many of their concerns were included in the final product. Each of them has joined as an original cosponsor, which I appreciate.

We have also worked with other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle and the House to include provisions that address concerns raised by them or their constituents.

We all know that, over the last few years, the Coast Guard budgets have been inadequate, mostly a byproduct of mandatory cuts imposed by the so-called Budget Control Act. This inadequate funding has left the Coast Guard, as Admiral Schultz has said, at a tipping point. This legislation, at long last, begins to reverse that downward spiral.

Mr. Speaker, there is $11 billion for the Coast Guard's discretionary budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021. This tracks the recently increased appropriations of the last 2 fiscal years and builds in a 2 percent inflation adjustment to arrive at the highest authorized funding levels for the Coast Guard in recent memory.

Is that totally adequate? No, it isn't. But it is at least incremental progress in a time where we aren't seeing a lot of progress on a lot of things these days.

I am particularly please that the topline numbers for procurement, acquisitions, and improvement have been pushed up to $2.7 billion and $2.8 billion. That means the Coast Guard should be able to maintain its ongoing recapitalization programs, including the critically important offshore patrol cutter; the new fleet of polar security cutters, which will be absolutely vital to deal particularly with the opening of the Northwest Passage; and, also, to continue critical support for our assets and activities in Antarctica.

It wasn't a great year for the Coast Guard when we had the stupid government shutdown. They were continuing to carry out their critical homeland security duties in addition to their daily lifesaving duties and their drug interdiction duties, many in a high-risk profession, and yet they weren't being paid.

They were escorting the subs out of Bremerton. The sailors were being paid on the subs. The Coast Guard, which was providing critical surface support and protection, was not being paid.

I had originally included in this legislation provisions to assure that the Coast Guard would be paid in case of another government shutdown. Unfortunately, the very stupid budget rules we have around here say that we will pretend that they will never be paid—and if that is the case, then we won't have a Coast Guard anymore—therefore, to mandatorily pay them during a shutdown would count as new deficit, like we are never going to pay them.

It is a pretty dumb rule, but those concerns were raised by people above my pay grade, and I reluctantly removed the provision from the bill. I am going to continue to push for that provision as we move forward through the appropriations process and elsewhere. I will look for any opportunity I can to recognize the service of the Coast Guard.

There is also, in this bill, a modest $1.4 million increase in the budget of the Federal Maritime Commission. This will help them implement the most extensive package of amendments to the Ocean Shipping Reform Act since 1998, particularly looking at antitrust oversight of foreign-flag commercial carrier alliances that transport nearly 98 percent of U.S. foreign commerce.

Our overreliance on foreign-flag carriers to move the commerce of the United States is a growing liability and, yet, unintended consequence of our trade policies. Only now are we beginning to recognize and grapple with the implications of this dependence on our national and economic security.

The increased authorized funding of $29 million for the operating budget should provide them with the additional resources they need to actually be a cop on the beat and ensure foreign carriers abide by fair shipping practices and compliance with all U.S. antitrust requirements.

I am also pleased with provisions that would boost coastwise trades and, potentially, our shipbuilding industry.

We are reaffirming, yet again, long-term support for the Jones Act, including clarifications as to how the Jones Act applies to maritime transportation and heavy-lift activities that occur offshore.

I believe the language in this bill strikes a sensible path forward. I look forward to resolving any outstanding questions and concerns in conference with the United States Senate.

Just as important, the bill provides new authorities to address new or emerging ocean technologies, including unmanned systems, to ensure Coast Guard has enough competence to either use, or regulate the use of, said systems; amendments to build on progress made last Congress to improve maritime safety requirements; and it strengthens standards to prevent discrimination, sexual assault and harassment and promote gender equity in the Coast Guard at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and across the U.S. maritime industry.

This is vital legislation to the Coast Guard, and the maritime shipyard workers across this country.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: I write to you regarding H.R. 3409, the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019.''

H.R. 3409 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Homeland Security waiving, altering, or otherwise affecting its jurisdiction over subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this or similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the legislative report on H.R. 3409 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2019.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2019, which was ordered to be reported out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on June 26, 2019. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that by foregoing a sequential referral on H.R. 3409, the Committee on Homeland Security does not waive any future jurisdictional claims to provisions in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving provisions within this legislation on which the Committee on Homeland Security has a valid jurisdictional claim.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3409.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3409 represents the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's commitment to the men and women serving in the Coast Guard and lays the groundwork for maintaining their mission capability in the future.

It also represents the bipartisan spirit that so often falls below the radar on Capitol Hill. At a time when the issues dominating the headlines fuel political fighting, it is refreshing to work with colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

H.R. 3409 recognizes that port and coastal security, drug interdiction, and maritime safety are commonsense issues, not Republican or Democrat issues. This Coast Guard authorization addresses priorities important to both East and West Coasts, the inland river system, and the Great Lakes. All these regions are well-represented by the chairs and ranking members of the committee and subcommittee.

The Coast Guard plays an important and unique role in national security and maritime safety. It is a critical component in carrying out drug interdiction efforts, keeping our ports and coasts safe, and conducting icebreaking operations. H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, helps the Coast Guard better perform their missions and encourages the use of cutting-edge technology to improve operations. Utilizing drone technology and upgrading computer systems will help the Coast Guard personnel complete their missions.

I am also proud of the commitment made to the Great Lakes in this bill. Working with Congressman MIKE GALLAGHER from Wisconsin, we emphasized the economic importance of the Great Lakes and the necessity for new, dedicated icebreakers on the lakes to keep commerce moving.

It is unfortunate that the provisions in the bill to ensure the Coastguardsmen were paid during lapses in appropriations were stripped from the bill. Nonetheless, I commend Chairman DEFAZIO and the 186 cosponsors of the Pay Our Coast Guard Act for pursuing this important initiative.

I thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and Subcommittee Chairman MALONEY for working in a bipartisan fashion to give the Coast Guard the resources it needs to accomplish its missions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which incorporates the Coast Guard Shore Infrastructure Improvement Act that I introduced with Representative GARRET GRAVES of Louisiana. It directs the Commandant of the Coast Guard to tackle the maintenance backlog of its shore infrastructure.

The Coast Guard currently has a $2.6 billion project backlog, and 25 percent of its assets have exceeded their service lives.

We must rebuild our Coast Guard in a strategic way, one that accounts for stronger storms that will only worsen with climate change.

This bill will ensure that the Coast Guard has the processes in place to carry out crucial shore infrastructure repairs. Coasties often spend their personal time working on infrastructure improvements. It is unacceptable that they have to sacrifice their rest time and family time to repair crumbling buildings.

Passing this bill will ensure America's security, the success of our Coast Guard, and the well-being of our servicemembers.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), who is the ranking member of the full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard is one of the Nation's five armed services, and this bipartisan bill is going to provide the resources to help them carry out their vital missions more effectively. These missions are critical to ensuring maritime safety, stopping the flow of illegal drugs and migrants into the country, enforcing U.S. laws at sea, and protecting our Nation's borders.

In order to carry out the tens of thousands of operations each year, the Coast Guard must also replace and modernize their assets—from cutters to icebreakers to helicopters. This bill is going to help them do that.

This legislation also takes steps necessary to provide the men and women of the Coast Guard, as has been pointed out, parity with other servicemembers in the Department of Defense. The Coast Guard is the only one of the armed services that is not in the Department of Defense, and the only armed service with law enforcement authority.

I agree with the chairman on the bipartisan nature of this bill and how it was put together. I commend Chairman DEFAZIO and Subcommittee Chairman MALONEY, and Subcommittee Ranking Member GIBBS for working diligently and coming up with a very good piece of legislation and a very good bipartisan agreement that we have here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3409. I am glad to have worked with Chairman DEFAZIO to integrate major provisions from legislation I authored to drive long overdue reforms at the Coast Guard Academy.

Our armed services should reflect the diverse fabric of this Nation. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard Academy has struggled to attract and retain a diverse student body and faculty. The absence of diverse voices at the Coast Guard Academy has contributed to what many acknowledge as a hostile

environment for cadets and faculty with diverse backgrounds punctuated by hateful incidents. I have engaged with the Commandant regarding conditions at the academy and, to his credit, he is open to change. To that end, H.R. 3409 directs the Commandant to secure the services of outside experts to carry out an independent, top-to-bottom review of conditions at the academy with an eye to issuing recommendations to foster a more inclusive and supportive environment.

Additionally, the independent body would be directed to assess the academy's admissions processes and consider the potential benefits of congressional nominations to increase diversity. The true test for the Coast Guard will come when recommendations are issued. At that point it will be clear if, as an organization, the Coast Guard is willing to abandon its historically insular ways and embrace real reform.

Other noteworthy provisions of my legislation that are reflected here include requiring a Coast Guard strategy to increase the representation of cadets, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds, and authorizing both the Academy Minority Outreach Team Program and the College Student Pre-Commissioning Initiative.

I am pleased that the bill also includes language authored by Congressman RICHMOND to enhance the Coast Guard's capacity to combat and defend against cyber threats.

Before I close, I would like to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Chairman CUMMINGS and their staffs, particularly Dave Jansen on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee staff, for partnering with me and my staff to put the academy on a positive trajectory.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for working on these bills. This is an important one in Puerto Rico.

I am really proud about the work the Coast Guard did during both Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, which authorizes the service for the next 2 years, gives the Coast Guard parity with the other military branches in the Department of Defense, addresses a backlog of shore-side infrastructure, and reauthorizes the Federal Maritime Commission.

I worked with Delegate Plaskett from the Virgin Islands to get on board to help determine if the Coast Guard's maritime surveillance hours used for drug interdictions in the Caribbean Basin meet mission requirements. The U.S. Coast Guard has been vital in addressing these threats and securing our maritime region as well.

For example, during the first half of fiscal year 2019, the Coast Guard removed over 9 metric tons of cocaine and interdicted 722 migrants around the Puerto Rico area of operations. That is the reason I also was able to include a provision in this bill which ensures recruitment activities in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and all the territories as well. We are proud to answer the call to serve in our Nation's service branches, and the Coast Guard is no exception.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon and chairman of the illustrious Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Authorization Act—bipartisan legislation that authorizes programs and funding of over $11 billion for the United States Coast Guard through fiscal year 2021.

I am proud to represent New Jersey's Second Congressional District, home to the United States Coast Guard Training Center in Cape May, Air Station Atlantic City, and thousands more of our brave men and brave women who protect our shores and our coastal communities.

This comprehensive bill authorizes critical funding to upgrade and modernize our fleets and improve offshore navigation safety. It requires a report on the effects of climate change and the vulnerabilities of our Coast Guard installations, directs the use of drone technology for potential use to support missions and operations, and orders the Commandant of the Coast Guard to brief Congress on the conditions and need for Coast Guard housing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for bringing this important bill to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Authorization Act. These are our brave men and women who protect our seas.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, our ranking member of the subcommittee, for all of his work on this. I want to thank Congressman SEAN PATRICK MALONEY from New York, our chairman; Chairman DEFAZIO and the ranking member of the full committee, SAM GRAVES, for all their work on this.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is a bipartisan bill, and I do appreciate everyone working together to make sure that we are doing the right thing.

The Coast Guard, in many cases, is not held to the level of regard and respect that they deserve.

Let's think about all of the things that the Coast Guard is responsible for:

They are in charge of drug interdiction on our seas; they are in charge of alien interdiction on our seas; they are in charge of enforcing all U.S. laws on our waterways; securing our maritime borders; defense readiness; port and coastal security issues; search and rescue; marine safety; maintaining aids to navigation; icebreaking; marine environmental protection; oil spill prevention and response; and many other things.

Mr. Speaker, I often refer to them as the Swiss Army knife of the Federal Government. They have an incredibly broad jurisdiction. These are men and women who are serving their Nation on a daily basis.

I want to thank all of the leaders of this committee for the work in the committee, where we took the Coast Guard Parity Act and added it to this bill. The Coast Guard Parity Act recognized that the men and women of the Coast Guard were treated differently from all of the other armed services whenever the Federal Government goes into a shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, when the government shuts down, it is because Congress failed to do its job together with an administration. The men and women in the Coast Guard do not deserve to be punished.

There is something that is really important to point out: the men and women of the Coast Guard can't just go say: Hey, I am going to go work for another job. I am going to leave this one because I am not being paid because the government is shut down. I am going to go work and do this other job.

They are contractually obligated to continue doing their work and their service for our Nation. So the Coast Guard Parity Act was added to this bill in committee, and I am very disappointed that it was pulled out. I know the chairman and the ranking member were both very supportive of this.

We need to address this issue. Let me say it again: the men and women of the Coast Guard are not responsible for when the government shuts down, and they should not be penalized for it either. I hope that we can continue to work together to solve this.

But going back, Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard does an incredible job in an incredibly broad mission. This bill helps to recapitalize an antiquated network or system of equipment, antiquated vessels that have lasted well beyond their intended service life. It helps to ensure that we can authorize the appropriate vessels, whether it is the national security cutter, the offshore patrol cutter, the fast response cutter, and the helos and winged aircraft that the men and women of the Coast Guard depend on on a daily basis.

We know that the other side—the drug traffickers and the alien smugglers and others—are using new and updated technology. We need to make sure that we continue to provide the men and women of the Coast Guard with the upper hand with the best technology and with the best equipment to deal with their daily mission of protecting our Nation and enforcing all laws on the seas of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. MALONEY for all of the work that they have done to ensure this bill moves forward. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge adoption.

□ 1345

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very strong bipartisan bill. We need to support the efforts of our men and women out there who are doing the daily work to protect this country, the Coast Guard.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just expanding a little bit on the former speaker, Representative GRAVES of Louisiana, I would recommend to people the video that became available last week of the Coast Guard boarding a semisubmersible smuggling drugs. It is an extraordinary video and extraordinary and precarious undertaking by the Coast Guard, jumping from a Zodiac onto the top of this vessel, pounding on the hatch to get the people to open the hatch and surrender.

Again, just reiterating what I said earlier, what they do with drug interdiction far exceeds all of the other Federal agencies combined, and yet they weren't paid during the shutdown doing these dangerous activities, and what they do for Homeland Security, what they do on a daily basis to provide search and rescue activities, keep our mariners safe and maritime safety inspections.

So again, I regret that the technicalities around here didn't allow us to move forward at this time, but I am determined that we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to raise another issue, and I would hope that the Coast Guard is listening.

I am very concerned. The largest acquisition program—I mentioned earlier about the acquisition budget for recapitalization—is the Offshore Patrol Cutter. Twice now, Representatives and Senators from Florida have attempted to end-run the contracting process. They have a shipyard that claims, that because of the hurricane, they didn't underbid the contract.

No, no, no. They didn't. They didn't. But they need hundreds of millions of dollars more to do the contract without going through a bidding process, without any scrutiny, and without any information being provided to this committee justifying those increases.

In fact, they are saying: Well, we can't get workers because of the hurricane; it is just impossible. Well, we are rebuilding Tyndall Air Force Base. Armed Services hasn't heard anything about that.

And then, also, they say: Well, it is going to take 1.3 million more manhours.

Well, what does that have to do with not being able to get skilled labor? The allegations by some others in the industry are that they underbid the contract, and now they are trying to come up with a rationale.

It is further disturbing that a former Commandant of the Coast Guard runs this organization. And I am very concerned that the Coast Guard is now contemplating asking Homeland Security to invoke a law they have never used before, claiming national security to renegotiate between the current Commandant of the Coast Guard and the past Commandant of the Coast Guard running this shipyard the terms of this contract.

That is not right. It doesn't protect the taxpayers. It doesn't protect the contracting process. I am going to be pushing very, very hard on this issue.

That said, there are many meritorious things in this bill, and I will yield back the balance of my time after recommending a unanimous vote by the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the Senate won't take 1½ years to get the bill done this time, so actually it will be a 2-year authorization instead of a 2-year/1-year authorization.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committees on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Budget, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3409, the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019."

H.R. 3409 is bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes appropriations for the Coast Guard and Federal Maritime Commission through the 2021 Fiscal Year.

This legislation contains improvements to promote the U.S. maritime industry and offshore renewable energy development, authorization of funding for new heavy ice breakers, and provisions to increase diversity at the United States Coast Guard Academy.

Additionally, this legislation will enhance recruitment and retention of merchant vessels, along with advancing new opportunities to strengthen the competitiveness of the U.S. maritime and shipbuilding industries.

Earlier this year the Department of Homeland Security, which oversees the United States Coast Guard, was adversely affected by the Trump Administration's government shutdown.

The shutdown affected the pay of over 40,000 active duty Coast Guard members, 6,000 reservists, and 8,500 civilian employees.

It took 35 days for Congress and the White House to agree on a FY 2019 funding bill.

During this time the brave men and women of the Coast Guard endured the cold winter weather while conducting life-saving rescues, drug interdiction operations, environmental protection missions, and costal security operations.

This bill will guarantee that the Coast Guard's active duty and civilian personnel are paid in the event of another federal government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1649 "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019" in order to ensure that the Coast Guard has all of the resources required to carry out their missions and maintain safety along our coastal borders.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the Coast Guard Authorization Act and the inclusive and bipartisan agreement that the Members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have reached.

The robust funding for the Coast Guard in this 2-year authorization is indicative of this body's strong support for the men and women serving in the Coast Guard and the important mission they undertake. I recently visited our Coasties in District 7 to see their professionalism and skills on full display—they make the impossible look routine on a daily basis.

From drug interdictions to search and rescue, the Coast Guard continues to prove its effectiveness while operating with limited resources. The passage of this bill sends the message that every dollar is a dollar well spent with respect to the U.S. Coast Guard.

This important legislation includes provisions that will further strengthen the Coast Guard by expanding the use of unmanned systems and fully integrating new and existing technologies developed both inside and outside of the service.

I am pleased that the bill contains a number of provisions aimed at increasing cultural competence in the Coast Guard and at the Coast Guard Academy. The service will only realize its full potential once it instills a culture that welcomes all people regardless of gender, race, or sexual orientation.

The bill also includes several provisions aimed to bolster the U.S. maritime industry. By clarifying certain requirements on domestic vessels, it sends a strong signal of support for the Jones Act and our coastwise maritime industry. By clarifying cargo preference requirements, we begin to address losses in the internationally trading U.S. fleet and rebuild the American mariner base.

The bill also contains important protections for the Hudson River in my district and will ensure this natural treasure is preserved for future generations to come.

I am proud to be one of the original sponsors of this important legislation and I look forward to ensuring that this important legislation is signed into law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3409, 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.

DISCLOSING AID SPENT TO ENSURE RELIEF ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1984) to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1984

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 ''Disclosing Aid Spent to Ensure Relief Act'' or the ''DISASTER Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) At a time of constrained budgets, it is fiscally prudent to understand the amount and the scope of the Federal Government's involvement in providing disaster-related assistance to communities in need.

(2) The Federal Government does not provide a single, publicly available estimate of the amount it is spending on disaster-related assistance.

(3) Because recovery is a long-term process, providing disaster-related assistance requires significant Federal resources to support a multi-agency, multi-year restoration of infrastructure and commerce in affected communities.

(4) Understanding the expenditures of individual Federal agencies for disaster-related assistance will help better inform the congressional appropriations process, as well as presidential budget requests.

(5) Knowledge about disaster-related expenses will illustrate opportunities for reducing these expenses through efforts to reduce vulnerabilities to future natural disasters.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. REPORTING OF DISASTER-RELATED ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1127. Reporting of disaster-related assistance

''(a) IN GENERAL.—On the same day that the President makes the annual budget submission to the Congress under section 1105(a) for a fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on Federal disaster-related assistance for the fiscal year ending in the calendar year immediately preceding the calendar year in which the annual budget submission is made. Disaster-related assistance encompasses Federal obligations related to disaster response, recovery, and mitigation efforts, as well as administrative costs associated with these activities, including spending by the following agencies and programs:

''(1) Department of Agriculture:

''(A) Agriculture Research Service.

''(B) Farm Service Agency.

''(C) Food and Nutrition Service.

''(D) Natural Resource Conservation Service.

''(E) Forest Service.

''(F) Rural Housing Service.

''(G) Rural Utilities Service.

''(2) Department of Commerce:

''(A) National Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

''(B) Economic Development Administration Economic Adjustment Assistance.

''(3) Army Corps of Engineers of the Department of Defense (Civil).

''(4) Department of Defense (Military):

''(A) Military Personnel.

''(B) Operations and Maintenance.

''(C) Procurement.

''(D) Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation.

''(E) Military Construction (MILCON) and Family Housing.

''(F) Management Funds.

''(G) Other Department of Defense Programs.

''(5) Department of Education:

''(A) Elementary and Secondary Education.

''(B) Higher Education.

''(6) Department of Health and Human Services:

''(A) Administration for Children and Families.

''(B) Public Health and Medical Assistance.

''(C) Public Health Emergency Fund.

''(7) Department of Homeland Security:

''(A) Federal Emergency Management Agency:

''(i) Emergency Declarations.

''(ii) Fire Management Assistance Grants.

''(iii) Major Disaster Declarations.

''(iv) Administrative Assistance.

''(B) FEMA Missions Assignments by Federal Agency.

''(C) Community Disaster Loan Program.

''(8) Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD):

''(A) Community Development Block Grants.

''(B) Rental Assistance/Section 8 Vouchers.

''(C) Supportive Housing.

''(D) Public Housing Repair.

''(E) Inspector General.

''(9) Department of the Interior:

''(A) Bureau of Indian Affairs.

''(B) United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

''(C) National Park Service.

''(D) Wildland Fire Management.

''(10) Department of Justice:

''(A) Legal Activities.

''(B) United States Marshals Service.

''(C) Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(D) Drug Enforcement Administration.

''(E) Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

''(F) Federal Prison System (Bureau of Prisons).

''(G) Office of Justice Programs.

''(11) Department of Labor:

''(A) National Emergency Grants for Dislocation Events.

''(B) Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Dislocated Worker Program.

''(12) Department of Transportation:

''(A) Federal Highway Administration: Emergency Relief Program (ER).

''(B) Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

''(C) Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

''(13) Department of the Treasury: Internal Revenue Service.

''(14) Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(15) Corporation for National and Community Service.

''(16) Environmental Protection Agency:

''(A) Hurricane Emergency Response Authorities.

''(B) EPA Hurricane Response.

''(C) EPA Regular Appropriations.

''(17) The Federal Judiciary.

''(18) Disaster Assistance Program of the Small Business Administration.

''(19) Department of Energy:

''(A) Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response.

''(B) Office of Petroleum Services.

''(20) General Services Administration.

''(21) Other authorities as appropriate.

''(b) CONTENT.—The report shall detail the following:

''(1) Overall amount of disaster-related assistance obligations during the fiscal year.

''(2) Disaster-related assistance obligations by agency and account.

''(3) Disaster for which the spending was obligated.

''(4) Obligations by disaster.

''(5) Disaster-related assistance by disaster type.

''(6) Response and recovery spending.

''(7) Mitigation spending.

''(8) Spending in the form of loans.

''(9) Spending in the form of grants.

''(c) AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The report shall be made publicly available on the website of the Office of Management and Budget and should be searchable, sortable and downloadable.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1127. Reporting of disaster-related assistance.''.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The reporting requirement under the amendment made by section 3(a) shall take effect with the budget submission of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2022.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1984.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1984, the Disclosing Aid Spent to Ensure Relief, or DISASTER Act, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

In 2018 alone, there were 14 natural disasters that each resulted in more than $1 billion in losses. Already in 2019, the President has granted over 50 major disaster emergency or fire management declarations under the authorities of the Stafford Act.

While insurance partially covers the cost of disaster recovery, the Federal Government, along with State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners, is spending billions of dollars annually to respond to and recover from these events across more than three dozen departments and agencies. That results in the fact that there is no clear and consolidated information regarding Federal spending on disasters.

The DISASTER Act would change that by requiring the Office of Management and Budget to annually compile and publicly release a report on disaster-related spending across the Federal Government.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) for introducing this bill so that we can obtain, in the future, this vital consolidated information and have it also be available to taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this commonsense measure. It will do more to shed light on how limited taxpayer resources are being spent. Doing so will help better inform how we prioritize policies and spending to drive down disaster-related expenditures in the future and more effectively provide relief.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1984, the DISASTER Act, is a bipartisan piece of legislation that requires the Federal agencies across the government to report on how much they simply spend on disasters.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that we would know how much the Federal Government spends, actually spends, on disasters. We have estimates, but we simply don't know what the actual costs are across the Federal Government.

This bill is going to help us get some real numbers. It is going to help us increase transparency for the taxpayer. It is going to help Congress make some much better-informed decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I do support this legislation. I would encourage my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), the author of this excellent legislation.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we in California and the West prepare for more scorching wildfires, the Southeast is in the heart of hurricane season, and the Midwest is still drying out from historic flooding. Across the country, natural disasters have taken the lives of loved ones, destroyed livelihoods, and caused irreparable damage to communities and businesses.

Disasters are becoming larger, more dangerous and frequent, and significantly more expensive. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, there have been more than 2,400 federally declared disasters since 2000, totaling hundreds of billions of dollars in relief aid.

However, when the Federal Government helps communities recover from these disasters, it does not calculate one comprehensive number of how much we spend on disasters per year. Those funds could come from 29 different accounts across 11 different agencies, which exacerbates delays in disaster recovery and hinders future planning and future accountability. That is why I introduced the bipartisan Disclosing Aid Spent to Ensure Relief, or DISASTER Act with Representative MARK MEADOWS of North Carolina.

This transparency bill is common sense. It requires the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, to publish an annual total of disaster-related assistance categorized by disaster type, location, and purpose.

With this and other smart reforms Congress is considering today, taxpayers will know where their dollars are going, and the Federal Government can be a better steward of those resources and will be better able to plan for the next disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation today before the next big natural disaster hits.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank Representative PETERS and Ranking Member MEADOWS of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management for working on this critical legislation.

As coming from one of those places that actually was impacted by a hurricane, I think this is one of the best ways to be accountable for the money that has been approved.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1984, the DISASTER Act, which requires the Office of Management and Budget to submit an annual report to Congress on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government. The report must include all Federal obligations related to disaster response recovery, mitigation efforts, and administrative costs associated with these activities for specified agencies and programs.

A lot has been said about how much money has been allocated to many jurisdictions across the different Federal agencies, so having this tool will help us understand how much in funds have been approved and where that money is going.

To date, Puerto Rico has been appropriated $42 billion in disaster funding; $20.6 billion has been obligated; and only $13.6 billion has been outlaid or reached the island's needs.

Having this information in a single report will help Congress and the public better understand the real cost of natural disasters and the benefits of investing in mitigation and adaptation efforts as well.

This legislation will also provide transparency and accountability when it comes to disaster relief costs. That is the reason I am a proud cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PETERS and Ranking Member MEADOWS.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, you would think that we would have a better idea of what we actually spend on disasters. We obviously don't. This legislation is going to provide the transparency.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this excellent legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1984, the Disclosing Aid Spent to Ensure Relief Act", or "DISASTER Act", which directs the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not only a reasonable exercise of Congress' power of oversight but it is also fiscally prudent.

To understand the scope of disaster-related spending and expenditures by the Federal Government, Congress must have a comprehensive understanding of the various multiagency and multiyear efforts in helping disaster-stricken areas recover.

Additionally, having estimates of these expenditures for individual Federal agencies will also help inform the congressional appropriations process as well as presidential budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, knowledge about disaster-related expenses will also yield opportunities for reducing these expenses through mitigative and preventative efforts.

Because transparency and open government are important, it is essential that Congress has a single, publicly available estimate of spending on disaster- related assistance.

The American people deserve to know how their tax dollars are being spent and how these dollars are being used to help them when disaster strikes.

This report would also be crucial in helping educate the public about the numerous agencies involved in disaster relief efforts.

While many would immediately recognize agencies such as FEMA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, less conspicuous agencies such as NOAA, EPA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, play a crucial role in disaster relief.

In short, H.R. 1984 will better inform both Congress and the public about what the Federal Government is doing to help those affected by disaster.

I strongly urge all members to support this necessary and vital legislation.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1984.

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.

RESTORE THE HARMONY WAY BRIDGE ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3245) to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3245

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 ''Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF BRIDGE AND LAND.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the White County Bridge Commission shall convey, without consideration, to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, any and all right, title, and interest of such Commission in and to the bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Indiana, in the approaches thereto, and in land underneath or adjacent to such bridge and its approaches.

SEC. 3. REPEAL.

The Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71) is repealed effective on the date that the White County Bridge Commission completes the conveyance described in section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3245.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3245, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

The legislation is very similar to a bill, H.R. 6793, which passed the House by unanimous consent during the 115th Congress but failed to achieve the consideration of the United States Senate.

H.R. 3245 conveys the Harmony Way Bridge to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority in Illinois and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority in Indiana.

The bridge currently remains owned by the Federal Government under the White County Bridge Commission, but the commission is no longer active.

The bridge, which was constructed in 1930, connects White County, Illinois, with Posey County, Indiana, across the Wabash River. It was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2007 but has been closed since 2012 when an engineer's inspection discovered structural integrity issues, which made the bridge unsafe for vehicular traffic.

This legislation allows the States of Indiana and Illinois to jointly work together to restore the Harmony Way Bridge and determine the future of this historic landmark.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for helping make this bill a bipartisan success, and I rise in support of H.R. 3245.

I really want to thank my colleague, the ranking member of the committee, Mr. GRAVES, and also our other colleague, my former boss, Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS, who allowed me to work on this project as one of his staff members back in the early 2000s.

To be able to stand on the House floor and see this solution be put forth by my other colleague from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), with the support of Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRAVES, and the Illinois and Indiana delegations in a very bipartisan way, it is a privilege for me to be able to manage this bill today.

Who would have thought that two kids from Christian County, Illinois, would one day stand here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and have a bipartisan bill that is going to help both the constituents of Indiana and Illinois, but that is exactly where we are today with my good friend Mr. BUCSHON, who grew up about 8 miles from where I grew up.

This bill is a long time coming. It is going to convey the Harmony Way Bridge from the Federal Government to the designated entities within the States of Illinois and Indiana. This is what the States of Illinois and Indiana have asked us for.

The bridge is currently managed by the White County Bridge Commission, which was created by Federal legislation in 1941. In 2012, this bridge was closed because of the inability of that commission to support its safety measures and to support the improvements that were necessary.

By conveying this bridge and repealing the 1941 legislation, the two States are going to work together for a new vision, which serves as a very important link between Illinois and Indiana as it crosses the Wabash River.

A companion bill has already been introduced by the four Senators from Illinois and Indiana. Last week, that bill, S. 1833, was approved by unanimous consent. Additionally, the House passed a similar bill last Congress by unanimous consent.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3245, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), my good friend and the ranking member.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3245, and I thank Representative BUCSHON for his hard work on this important issue.

H.R. 3245 is going to enable entities within the States of Illinois and Indiana to chart a whole new course for the Harmony Way Bridge, which is closed currently.

The bridge is not only a critical link between these States, but it is also representative of that strong bond between the people of Illinois and Indiana. That connection is further demonstrated by the fact that all members of the Indiana and Illinois delegations cosponsored this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3245.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, again, this bill is a bipartisan success story and a bistate success story.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3245, legislation sponsored by my colleague, friend, and fellow Hoosier, Dr. LARRY BUCSHON.

The Harmony Way Bridge connects Indiana to Illinois over the Wabash River. The bridge is currently managed by the White County Bridge Commission, which was created by Federal legislation in 1941.

The bridge closed in 2012 due to structural deficiencies, and current Federal law blocks local officials from taking action to repair the bridge.

I am proud to join my colleagues in both the Indiana and Illinois delegations as a cosponsor on this critical legislation.

H.R. 3245 would allow the two States to determine the future of the bridge.

Madam Speaker, supporting this bill is common sense.

A companion bill, S. 1833, was introduced by the four Senators from Indiana and Illinois and passed by unanimous consent.

Last year, the House passed a similar bill overwhelmingly. In addition, both Indiana and Illinois created State commissions to manage the bridge, and now it is our responsibility to complete the transfer.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3245 and allow the States of Illinois and Indiana, and the community residents surrounding the Harmony Way Bridge, to determine the future of this treasured landmark.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, again, I am proud to stand here next to my good friend Dr. BUCSHON, who was born in my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois, raised in Kincaid, Illinois, and went on to become a heart surgeon.

I don't know if I would trust him operating on me, but, hey, I know a lot of patients in Indiana did.

This is a guy who promised to get things done. This project, I can tell you firsthand, was not moving anywhere until Mr. BUCSHON took the lead. This is why I am proud to be able to recognize him now and thank him very much for his support of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to rise today in support of H.R. 3245, the Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act.

The Harmony Way Bridge is a local landmark and was an engineering marvel when it opened in 1930. Throughout the 20th century, the bridge connected Posey County, Indiana, and White County, Illinois, creating an access point for commerce and recreation for Hoosiers from the New Harmony and surrounding communities, as well as those from White County, Illinois.

Unfortunately, in 2012, the bridge was permanently closed due to safety concerns related to structural issues. While the community has pushed to refurbish and reopen the bridge, until now, Federal law has stood in the way.

That is why the Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act is important. It will convey the bridge to the Indiana and Illinois bridge authorities and remove the Federal conditions set out on the bridge.

I am glad to see this bill on the floor today, and I want to give thanks to all those who have helped in the effort. First, I thank Susie Davis, from my staff, for her work on this bill. I thank Lora Arneberg from the New Harmony, Indiana, community, whose hard work has been invaluable in promoting the bridge restoration.

I also thank Indiana State Senator Jim Tomes and State Representative Wendy McNamara for their efforts at the State level.

Furthermore, I thank my colleagues: Congressman SHIMKUS, Indiana Senators BRAUN and YOUNG, Illinois Senators DURBIN and DUCKWORTH, and all the members of the Indiana and Illinois House delegations, who are all cosponsors of this bill, for helping me lead this effort in Congress and finally solving this problem.

The Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act will breathe life once more into the Harmony Way Bridge.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me on this monumental occasion and support this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, again, this is a bipartisan success story. This is an issue so many of us have worked hard on together. To see it pass today with the support of Republicans and Democrats is something that I can tell you a few years ago I didn't think would happen.

This is an opportunity, too, for me, again, to thank the hardworking people in Congressman SHIMKUS' office.

I remember learning about this project from my fellow staffer who lived right near the New Harmony Way Bridge, Holly Healy, who gave me the lowdown on why it was important to pass this legislation. That was back in 2003.

I am proud to thank Holly today for her dedication and the hard work that she has done on behalf of Congressman SHIMKUS over the years. Today is the day we finally get to make this happen so that bridge can be repaired and that bridge can be reopened.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I urge that the House do support and pass this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TORRES of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3245.

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.

POST-DISASTER ASSISTANCE ONLINE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1307) to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1307

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 ''Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act''.

SEC. 2. SUBPAGE FOR TRANSPARENCY OF DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF REPOSITORY FOR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the head of each covered Federal agency, shall establish a subpage within the website established under section 2 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) to publish the information required to be made available to the public under this section.

(b) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Not later than 30 days after the end of a calendar quarter, each covered Federal agency that made disaster assistance available to an eligible recipient during such quarter shall, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, make available to the public on the subpage established under subsection (a) the information described in subsection (c), and ensure that any data asset of the agency is machine-readable.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The information described in this subsection is, with respect to disaster assistance provided by the covered Federal agency—

(1) the total amount of disaster assistance provided by the agency during such quarter;

(2) the amount of disaster assistance provided by the agency that was expended or obligated to projects or activities; and

(3) a detailed list of all projects or activities for which disaster assistance dispersed by the agency was expended, obligated, or used, including—

(A) the name of the project or activity;

(B) a description of the project or activity;

(C) an evaluation of the completion status of the project or activity;

(D) any award identification number assigned to the project;

(E) the Catalog for Disaster Assistance number assigned by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(F) the location of the project, including ZIP codes; and

(G) any reporting requirement information being collected by a covered Federal agency with respect to that agency's disaster assistance.

(d) GUIDANCE.—Each covered Federal agency, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall issue such guidance as is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.

(e) AGREEMENT WITH PRIVATE ENTITY.—The Director, if necessary for purposes of transparency, may enter into an agreement with a private entity, including a nonprofit organization, to develop the subpage required under this section.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) COVERED FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''covered Federal agency'' means—

(A) any agency providing assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.);

(B) the Small Business Administration; and

(C) the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(2) DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—The term ''disaster assistance'' means any funds that are made available by the Federal Government in response to a specified natural disaster, including—

(A) any assistance provided by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration as a result of a disaster declared under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b));

(B) any assistance provided by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for—

(i) activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, and economic revitalization in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.); and

(ii) flood insurance coverage provided under the National Flood Insurance Program pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.); and

(C) any assistance provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(3) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ''eligible recipient''—

(A) means any entity that receives disaster assistance directly from the Federal Government (including disaster assistance received through grant, loan, or contract) other than an individual; and

(B) includes a State that receives disaster assistance.

(4) SPECIFIED NATURAL DISASTER.—The term ''specified natural disaster'' means—

(A) a fire on public or private forest land or grassland described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187);

(B) a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5170);

(C) an emergency declared by the President under section 501 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5191); and

(D) any other natural disaster for which a disaster declaration is made by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 H.R. 1307.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1307, the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

When a major disaster strikes, the American people should know how and where their disaster funds are spent without wading through reams of inscrutable government paperwork.

H.R. 1307 would simplify the data collection process for Federal disaster recovery projects and activities by establishing an online repository to which agencies could submit information on projects and spending.

In order to increase transparency to the public, the bill would also create a page on USASpending.gov for the public to track agency disaster recovery activities and the amount of assistance expended, on a quarterly basis.

□ 1415

Federal agencies need to be accountable to the victims of disasters so that they can have peace of mind when they are at their most vulnerable.

I strongly support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1307, the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, is going to improve our oversight of Federal disaster assistance and projects.

By increasing the accountability and transparency in Federal spending following disasters, this bill is going to help ensure that funds are invested more wisely and better able to help Americans who are trying to recover and rebuild their lives.

H.R. 1307 is going to require various agencies that offer disaster assistance to publicly report data on disaster spending and obligations. It is critical, as we continue to work to reform and improve our disaster response and recovery programs, that we have the most accurate data available. That is important for our oversight, as well as for the taxpayers in holding agencies accountable.

I want to thank the Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Subcommittee Ranking Member, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. PETERS, for their work on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support and work on this bill as well.

I certainly rise today in support of this measure sponsored and introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, also from North Carolina. We know firsthand just how badly this legislation is needed.

In my district alone, which has been a victim of two major hurricanes in the last 3 years, Matthew in 2016, and Florence just this past fall, after both hurricanes, Congress appropriated disaster aid funding for rebuilding and recovery efforts. To date, very little of that money, quite honestly, has been channeled to the State.

Taxpayers in North Carolina and across the rest of the country deserve to know how the Federal Government is spending these recovery funds, or whether they are being spent at all.

More transparency means more accountability and making this disaster funding data available online to the public will help ensure that these dollars that Congress has appropriated are being spent in a timely and effective manner.

As we continue to recover from Hurricanes Matthew and Florence, and prepare for yet another hurricane season this year, it is more important than ever that we make sure we are getting the most out of every single dollar that Congress appropriates. This bill will go a long way in helping to ensure just that.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been demonstrated by the last four bills, the Transportation Committee is doing good work, and we produced four good, bipartisan bills. I am very proud of that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1307, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri. He has been a great partner in these and other ongoing efforts by the committee.

I urge the positive adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor to H.R. 1307—the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, which establishes a centralized location where Federal Agencies will publish information on disaster assistance.

This legislation requires reports every 3 months, that are available to the public regarding the total amount of assistance provided by agencies, the amount of funding that obligated, and where the funds are going, including all projects or activities that received funding.

To date, roughly 32 percent, or $13.6 billion, of all funding, $42 billion dollars, Congress has appropriated to Puerto Rico has actually been received by the communities and families who are trying to rebuild their lives on the island.

With this legislation my constituents will know exactly how much funding is still expected to come to Puerto Rico and to their communities. They will be able to see the process that agencies are making for timely dispersals of funding and holding them accountable.

Again, I want to thank Rep. PETERS and Ranking Member MEADOWS again for their work on this Disaster recovery related bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1307.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2249. An act to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator.

STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 3375) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3375

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 ''Stopping Bad Robocalls Act''.

SEC. 2. CONSUMER PROTECTION REGULATIONS RELATING TO MAKING ROBOCALLS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and as appropriate thereafter to ensure that the consumer protection and privacy purposes of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) remain effective, the Commission shall prescribe such regulations, or amend such existing regulations, regarding calls made or text messages sent using automatic telephone dialing systems and calls made using an artificial or prerecorded voice as will, in the judgment of the Commission, clarify descriptions of automatic telephone dialing systems and ensure that—

(1) the consumer protection and privacy purposes of such section are effectuated;

(2) calls made and text messages sent using automatic telephone dialing systems and calls made using an artificial or prerecorded voice are made or sent (as the case may be) with consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is exempted by paragraph (1), (2)(B), or (2)(C) of subsection (b) of such section;

(3) consumers can withdraw consent for such calls and text messages;

(4) circumvention or evasion of such section is prevented;

(5) callers maintain records to demonstrate that such callers have obtained consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is exempted by paragraph (1), (2)(B), or (2)(C) of subsection (b) of such section, for such calls and text messages, for a period of time that will permit the Commission to effectuate the consumer protection and privacy purposes of such section; and

(6) compliance with such section is facilitated.

SEC. 3. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G)(ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(I) shall ensure that any exemption under subparagraph (B) or (C) contains requirements for calls made in reliance on the exemption with respect to—

''(i) the classes of parties that may make such calls;

''(ii) the classes of parties that may be called; and

''(iii) the number of such calls that a calling party may make to a particular called party.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—In the case of any exemption issued under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission, shall, not later than 1 year after such date of enactment, prescribe such regulations, or amend such existing regulations, as necessary to ensure that such exemption contains each requirement described in subparagraph (I) of such section, as added by subsection (a). To the extent such an exemption contains such a requirement before such date of enactment, nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to require the Commission to prescribe or amend regulations relating to such requirement.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON REASSIGNED NUMBER DATABASE.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available on the website of the Commission, a report on the status of the efforts of the Commission pursuant to the Second Report and Order in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17–59; FCC 18–177; adopted on December 12, 2018).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall describe the efforts of the Commission, as described in such Second Report and Order, to ensure—

(A) the establishment of a database of telephone numbers that have been disconnected, in order to provide a person making calls subject to section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) with comprehensive and timely information to enable such person to avoid making calls without the prior express consent of the called party because the number called has been reassigned;

(B) that a person who wishes to use any safe harbor provided pursuant to such Second Report and Order with respect to making calls must demonstrate that, before making the call, the person appropriately checked the most recent update of the database and the database reported that the number had not been disconnected; and

(C) that if the person makes the demonstration described in subparagraph (B), the person will be shielded from liability under section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) should the database return an inaccurate result.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF CALLED PARTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The term 'called party' means, with respect to a call, the current subscriber or customary user of the telephone number to which the call is made, determined at the time when the call is made.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 227(d)(3)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''called party's line'' each place it appears and inserting ''telephone line called''; and

(B) by striking ''called party has hung up'' and inserting ''answering party has hung up''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply beginning on the date on which the database described in the Second Report and Order in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17–59; FCC 18–177; adopted on December 12, 2018) becomes fully operational, such that a person may check the database to determine the last date of permanent disconnection associated with a phone number. Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection shall affect the construction of the law as it applies before the effective date.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) NO CITATION REQUIRED TO SEEK FORFEITURE PENALTY.—

(1) FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NO CITATION REQUIRED TO SEEK FORFEITURE PENALTY.—Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation made with the intent to cause such violation of this subsection.''.

(2) FOR CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(e)(5)(A)(iii) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(5)(A)(iii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection.''.

(b) 4-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) 4-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 503(b), no forfeiture penalty for violation of this subsection shall be determined or imposed against any person if the violation charged occurred more than—

''(A) 3 years prior to the date of issuance of the notice required by paragraph (3) of such section or the notice of apparent liability required by paragraph (4) of such section (as the case may be); or

''(B) if the violation was made with the intent to cause such violation, 4 years prior to the date of issuance of the notice required by paragraph (3) of such section or the notice of apparent liability required by paragraph (4) of such section (as the case may be).''.

(2) FOR CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(e)(5)(A)(iv) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(5)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''2-YEAR'' and inserting ''4-YEAR''; and

(B) by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''4 years''.

(c) INCREASED PENALTY FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS WITH INTENT.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) INCREASED PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS WITH INTENT.—In the case of a forfeiture penalty for violation of this subsection that is determined or imposed under section 503(b), if such violation was made with the intent to cause such violation, the amount of such penalty shall be equal to an amount determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an additional penalty not to exceed $10,000.''.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ROBOCALLS AND TRANSMISSION OF MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

''(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Commission, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit to Congress a report regarding enforcement by the Commission of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) during the preceding calendar year.

''(2) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) The number of complaints received by the Commission during each of the preceding five calendar years, for each of the following categories:

''(i) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of subsection (b) or (c).

''(ii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of the standards prescribed under subsection (d).

''(iii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in connection with which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

''(B) The number of citations issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsection (d), and details of each such citation.

''(C) The number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), and details of each such notice including any proposed forfeiture amount.

''(D) The number of final orders imposing forfeiture penalties issued pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce such subsections, and details of each such order including the forfeiture imposed.

''(E) The amount of forfeiture penalties or criminal fines collected, during the preceding calendar year, by the Commission or the Attorney General for violations of such subsections, and details of each case in which such a forfeiture penalty or criminal fine was collected.

''(F) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

''(G) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service that discount high-volume, unlawful, short-duration calls to the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution in order to decrease the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

''(3) NO ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prepare the report required by paragraph (1) without requiring the provision of additional information from providers of telecommunications service or voice service (as defined in section 7(d) of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act).''.

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS RELATING TO EFFECTIVE CALL AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall prescribe regulations in WC Docket No. 17–97.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE CALL AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—

(A) require providers of voice service to implement, within six months after the date on which such regulations are prescribed, an effective call authentication technology; and

(B) ensure that voice service providers that have implemented the effective authentication technology attest that such provider has determined, when originating calls on behalf of a calling party, that the calling party number transmitted with such calls has been appropriately authenticated.

(2) REASSESSMENT OF REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall reassess such regulations, at least once every two years, to ensure the regulations remain effective and up to date with technological capabilities.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) BURDENS AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION.—The Commission—

(i) shall include findings on any burdens or barriers to the implementation required in paragraph (1), including—

(I) for providers of voice service to the extent the networks of such providers use time-division multiplexing; and

(II) for small providers of voice service and those in rural areas; and

(ii) in connection with such findings, may exempt from the 6-month time period described in paragraph (1)(A), for a reasonable period of time a class of providers of voice service, or type of voice calls, as necessary for that class of providers or type of calls to participate in the implementation in order to address the identified burdens and barriers.

(B) FULL PARTICIPATION.—The Commission shall take all steps necessary to address any issues in the findings and enable as promptly as possible full participation of all classes of providers of voice service and types of voice calls to receive the highest level of attestation.

(C) ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES.—The Commission shall identify or develop, in consultation with small providers of service and those in rural areas, alternative effective methodologies to protect customers from unauthenticated calls during any exemption given under subparagraph (A)(ii). Such methodologies shall be provided with no additional line item charge to customers.

(D) REVISION OF EXEMPTION.—Not less frequently than annually after the first exemption is issued under this paragraph, the Commission shall consider revising or extending any exemption made, may revise such exemption, and shall issue a public notice with regard to whether such exemption remains necessary.

(4) ACCURATE IDENTIFICATION.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall include guidelines that providers of voice service may use as part of the implementation of effective call authentication technology under paragraph (1) to take steps to ensure the calling party is accurately identified.

(5) NO ADDITIONAL COST TO CONSUMERS OR SMALL BUSINESS CUSTOMERS.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall prohibit providers of voice service from making any additional line item charges to consumer or small business customer subscribers for the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1).

(6) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), the Commission shall initiate an evaluation of the success of the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1).

(7) UNAUTHENTICATED CALLS.—The Commission shall—

(A) in the regulations required by subsection (a), consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (k) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by section 8, help protect subscribers from receiving unwanted calls from a caller using an unauthenticated number, through effective means of enabling the subscriber or provider to block such calls, with no additional line item charge to the subscriber; and

(B) take appropriate steps to ensure that calls originating from a provider of service in an area where the provider is exempt from the 6-month time period described in paragraph (1)(A) are not wrongly blocked because the calls are not able to be authenticated.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the regulations under subsection (a) are prescribed, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available on its website, a report on the implementation of subsection (b), which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the extent to which providers of a voice service have implemented the effective call authentication technology, including whether the availability of necessary equipment and equipment upgrades has impacted such implementation; and

(2) an assessment of the effective call authentication technology, as being implemented under subsection (b), in addressing all aspects of call authentication.

(d) VOICE SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''voice service''—

(1) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(2) includes—

(A) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(B) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as ''CPE'') and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 8. STOP ROBOCALLS.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING REGARDING ROBOCALL AND SPOOFING VIOLATIONS.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as amended by section 6, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to establish a process that streamlines the ways in which a private entity may voluntarily share with the Commission information relating to—

''(A) a call made or a text message sent in violation of subsection (b); or

''(B) a call or text message for which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was caused to be transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

''(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'text message' has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).''.

(b) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as amended by section 6 and subsection (a) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall take a final agency action to ensure the robocall blocking services provided on an opt-out or opt-in basis pursuant to the Declaratory Ruling of the Commission in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17–59; FCC 19–51; adopted on June 6, 2019)—

''(A) are provided with transparency and effective redress options for both—

''(i) consumers; and

''(ii) callers; and

''(B) are provided with no additional line item charge to consumers and no additional charge to callers for resolving complaints related to erroneously blocked calls.

''(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'text message' has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).''.

(c) STUDY ON INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN VOIP SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct a study regarding whether to require a provider of covered VoIP service to—

(A) provide to the Commission contact information for such provider and keep such information current; and

(B) retain records relating to each call transmitted over the covered VoIP service of such provider that are sufficient to trace such call back to the source of such call.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) COVERED VOIP SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''covered VoIP service'' means a service that—

(A) is an interconnected VoIP service (as defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)); or

(B) would be an interconnected VoIP service (as so defined) except that the service permits users to terminate calls to the public switched telephone network but does not permit users to receive calls that originate on the public switched telephone network.

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULE REGARDING DEFINITION OF TEXT MESSAGE.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (j) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by subsection (a) of this section, and paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 227, as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to subsection (e)(8) of such section 227 by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 9. PROVISION OF EVIDENCE OF CERTAIN ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau of the Commission obtains evidence that suggests a willful, knowing, and repeated robocall violation with an intent to defraud, cause harm, or wrongfully obtain anything of value, the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau shall provide such evidence to the Attorney General.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) states the number of instances during the preceding year in which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General; and

(2) contains a general summary of the types of robocall violations to which such evidence relates.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the ability of the Commission or the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau under other law—

(1) to refer a matter to the Attorney General; or

(2) to pursue or continue pursuit of an enforcement action in a matter with respect to which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General.

(d) ROBOCALL VIOLATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''robocall violation'' means a violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

SEC. 10. PROTECTION FROM ONE-RING SCAMS.

(a) INITIATION OF PROCEEDING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a proceeding to protect called parties from one-ring scams.

(b) MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.—As part of the proceeding required by subsection (a), the Commission shall consider how the Commission can—

(1) work with Federal and State law enforcement agencies to address one-ring scams;

(2) work with the governments of foreign countries to address one-ring scams;

(3) in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, better educate consumers about how to avoid one-ring scams;

(4) incentivize voice service providers to stop calls made to perpetrate one-ring scams from being received by called parties, including consideration of adding identified one-ring scam type numbers to the Commission's existing list of permissible categories for carrier-initiated blocking;

(5) work with entities that provide call-blocking services to address one-ring scams; and

(6) establish obligations on international gateway providers that are the first point of entry for these calls into the United States, including potential requirements that such providers verify with the foreign originator the nature or purpose of calls before initiating service.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the status of the proceeding required by subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ONE-RING SCAM.—The term ''one-ring scam'' means a scam in which a caller makes a call and allows the call to ring the called party for a short duration, in order to prompt the called party to return the call, thereby subjecting the called party to charges.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term ''voice service'' has the meaning given such term in section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)). This paragraph shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to such section by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 11. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Commission, shall convene an interagency working group to study the enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall—

(1) determine whether, and if so how, any Federal law, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints inhibit the enforcement of such section;

(2) identify existing and potential Federal policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination among Federal departments and agencies and States, and between States, in the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section;

(3) identify existing and potential international policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination between countries in the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section (and laws of foreign countries prohibiting similar conduct); and

(4) consider—

(A) the benefit and potential sources of additional resources for the Federal enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section;

(B) whether memoranda of understanding regarding the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section should be established between—

(i) the States;

(ii) the States and the Federal Government; and

(iii) the Federal Government and foreign governments;

(C) whether a process should be established to allow States to request Federal subpoenas from the Commission with respect to the enforcement of such section;

(D) whether increased criminal penalties for the violation of such section (including increasing the amount of fines and increasing the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed to a period greater than 2 years) are appropriate;

(E) whether regulation of any entity that enters into a business arrangement with a carrier for the specific purpose of carrying, routing, or transmitting a call that constitutes a violation of such section would assist in the successful enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section; and

(F) the extent to which the prosecution of certain violations of such section (which result in economic, physical, or emotional harm) pursuant to any Department of Justice policy may inhibit or otherwise interfere with the prosecution of other violations of such section.

(c) MEMBERS.—The interagency working group shall be composed of such representatives of Federal departments and agencies as the Attorney General considers appropriate, which may include—

(1) the Department of Commerce (including the National Telecommunications and Information Administration);

(2) the Department of State;

(3) the Department of Homeland Security;

(4) the Commission;

(5) the Federal Trade Commission; and

(6) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(d) NON-FEDERAL STAKEHOLDERS.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall consult with such non-Federal stakeholders as the Attorney General determines have relevant expertise, including the National Association of Attorneys General.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency working group shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study under subsection (a), including—

(1) any recommendations regarding the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section; and

(2) a description of what process, if any, relevant Federal departments and agencies have made in implementing the recommendations under paragraph (1).

SEC. 12. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 13. ANNUAL ROBOCALL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission

shall make publicly available on the website of the Commission, and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, a report on the status of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the participation of voice service providers in such efforts.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(1) A description of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the actions taken by the registered consortium to coordinate with the Commission.

(2) A list of voice service providers identified by the registered consortium that participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls through the registered consortium.

(3) A list of each voice service provider that received a request from the registered consortium to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls and refused to participate, as identified by the registered consortium.

(4) The reason, if any, each voice service provider identified by the registered consortium provided for not participating in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(5) A description of how the Commission may use the information provided to the Commission by voice service providers or the registered consortium that have participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the enforcement efforts by the Commission.

(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking additional information from voice service providers and the registered consortium of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls necessary for the report by the Commission required under subsection (a).

(d) REGISTRATION OF CONSORTIUM OF PRIVATE-LED EFFORTS TO TRACE BACK THE ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue rules to establish a registration process for the registration of a single consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls. The consortium shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Be a neutral third-party competent to manage the private-led effort to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the judgement of the Commission.

(B) Maintain a set of written best practices about the management of such efforts and regarding providers of voice services' participation in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consistent with section 222(d)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222(d)(2)), any private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls conducted by the third-party focus on ''fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful'' traffic.

(D) File a notice with the Commission that the consortium intends to conduct private-led efforts to trace back in advance of such registration.

(2) ANNUAL NOTICE BY THE COMMISSION SEEKING REGISTRATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking the registration described in paragraph (1).

(e) LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Commission may publish a list of voice service providers and take appropriate enforcement action based on information obtained from the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and other information the Commission may collect about service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of illegal calls.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRIVATE-LED EFFORT TO TRACE BACK.—The term ''private-led effort to trace back'' means an effort made by the registered consortium of voice service providers to establish a methodology for determining the origin of a suspected unlawful robocall.

(2) REGISTERED CONSORTIUM.—The term ''registered consortium'' means the consortium registered under subsection (d).

(3) SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALL.—The term ''suspected unlawful robocall'' means a call that the Commission or a voice service provider reasonably believes was made in violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

(4) VOICE SERVICE.—The term ''voice service''—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as ''CPE'') and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 14. HOSPITAL ROBOCALL PROTECTION GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the ''Hospital Robocall Protection Group''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Group shall be composed only of the following members:

(1) An equal number of representatives from each of the following:

(A) Voice service providers that serve hospitals.

(B) Companies that focus on mitigating unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consumer advocacy organizations.

(D) Providers of one-way voice over internet protocol services described in subsection (e)(4)(B)(ii).

(E) Hospitals.

(F) State government officials focused on combatting unlawful robocalls.

(2) One representative of the Commission.

(3) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) ISSUANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Group is established under subsection (a), the Group shall issue best practices regarding the following:

(1) How voice service providers can better combat unlawful robocalls made to hospitals.

(2) How hospitals can better protect themselves from such calls, including by using unlawful robocall mitigation techniques.

(3) How the Federal Government and State governments can help combat such calls.

(d) PROCEEDING BY FCC.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the best practices are issued by the Group under subsection (c), the Commission shall conclude a proceeding to assess the extent to which the voluntary adoption of such best practices can be facilitated to protect hospitals and other institutions.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GROUP.—The term ''Group'' means the Hospital Robocall Protection Group established under subsection (a).

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term ''voice service''—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as ''CPE'') and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 15. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. 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. 3375.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, it is bipartisan legislation that I introduced with Ranking Member WALDEN, Communications and Technology Subcommittee Chairman DOYLE, and Subcommittee Ranking Member LATTA. This legislation advanced out of our Energy and Commerce Committee last week by a unanimous vote of 48–0.

The rising tide of unlawful, unwanted robocalls started as a nuisance, but now threatens the way consumers view and use their telephones. These calls are undermining our entire phone system, and that is something we all need to take very, very seriously.

Last year, there were an estimated 47 billion robocalls made to Americans. It is no wonder that the American people have lost confidence in answering their phones. The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act will help restore that confidence, and that is very important, in my opinion.

Madam Speaker, Americans use their phones at some of the most important times of their lives. They use their phones to get help from first responders by calling 911; to hear important medical test results from their doctor; to connect with or reassure a family member or friend; to learn that school is closed tomorrow; or just to conduct daily business.

Illegal, unwanted robocalls threaten the foundational ways that we communicate with one another and, that, in my opinion is dangerous.

Each time the consumer chooses not to pick up the phone out of fear that a scam robocall is on the other end of the line, it chips away at our community and public safety. Too frequently, consumers feel their best option is to not answer their ringing phone, which may lead them to miss an important call.

It is truly unfortunate that consumers feel they must take that risk in order to proactively defend themselves against a scam call. Some studies estimate that nearly half of all calls this year will be scam calls; and these calls are not only harmful to the American people, but they are also harmful to business.

The Chief Information Security Officer of the Moffitt Cancer Center recently testified before our committee that scammers were calling his hospital, disguised as Department of Justice officials, demanding to speak with a physician about his medical license. Robocalls are dangerous to public health and to people's privacy, using this as an example.

We have heard similar stories of scammers disguised as the IRS looking to collect a debt; scammers disguised as local governments or police departments; and scammers disguised as loved ones in trouble looking for help. We are even seeing new scams, such as the one-ring-scam, where fraudsters try to trick consumers into calling back international numbers in the hopes that the consumer will rack up large charges.

All of these scams are different, and there is no silver bullet to fix them all. For that reason, this legislation takes the comprehensive approach to cut off robocalls at many different points.

For example, the bill would implement a nationwide caller authentication system, free for consumers, so they can again trust that the number they see on their caller ID is actually the person calling them.

In that same vein, consumers need more help controlling the calls they have asked not to receive. Consumers need to be in charge of their own phone numbers, and scammers or telemarketers must have a consumer's consent before making calls.

Consumers should be able to block illegal and unwanted calls. But with blocking, there needs to be transparency and effective redress so that we ensure the calls people want are actually getting through.

Madam Speaker, we need to ensure that law enforcement and the Federal Communications Commission have the tools, information, and incentives to go after robocallers that break the law.

This bill takes all these steps and more. It also includes the text of many important proposals that would help address the onslaught of robocalls that consumers face.

And I just want to mention some of the other bills that were introduced that we have tried to incorporate in this bill. One is the Ending One-Ring Scams Act; the Tracing Back and Catching Unlawful Robocallers Act; the Locking Up Robocallers Act, the Spam Calls Task Force Act; and the Protecting Patients and Doctors from Unlawful Robocalls Act. I will thank the sponsors of those more specifically later during this debate.

But ours is a strong and comprehensive bill that puts consumers first. I want to thank all of my colleagues that have shaped this bill with me, specifically, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATTA, of course. But I also want to thank all the consumer advocacy organizations and the carriers that worked hard to reach a consensus piece of legislation that will take tough and meaningful steps to protect consumers from these annoying and illegal robocalls.

Madam Speaker, the legislation now has 237 sponsors, and I am hopeful that it will garner strong bipartisan support today when we vote.

I urge all of my colleagues to put consumers first and join us in passing the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. I will speak more later of my contribution on this legislation, but I congratulate the authors of this legislation, both the majority and the minority.

The American Association of Retired Persons sent us a letter yesterday urging the adoption by stating: ''All Americans will benefit from the provisions of H.R. 3375 that promote an accurate call authentication framework and prevent consumers from being charged for blocking technology.''

The support does not end with them, but it spans the consumer and industry groups that have seen the impact of this. This bill incorporates the best of the private sector solutions, at the same time putting the call out to crack down on these illegal actors for the criminals that they are.

We are going to shut these scammers down. This legislation establishes a more rigorous enforcement structure to shut down illegal robocalls. It empowers the Federal Communications Commission with additional enforcement. It also sets the path for providers to implement new caller ID technologies, with no new line-item charges to the consumers.

The fraud committed on Americans by illegal robocallers is going to stop. This bipartisan legislation creates a robust framework designed to protect consumers from the fraud and nuisance of these calls.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their work on the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

To Chairman PALLONE, to Chairman DOYLE, to Congressman LATTA, and everybody that has been involved in this, I think we have come to a really good agreement here, and it will help stop the illegal robocalls; hopefully, all 47.8 billion. Let that number sink in.

Last year, in America, 47.8 billion calls were made to all of us, and they were mostly all illegal, and we are going to do our best to stop them.

You will be hard-pressed to find a technology that is more personal than your phone; whether it is the phone you carry in your pocket or, for some, a landline at home, and how we communicate on these devices is essential in the way that we connect to one another.

Yet that personal connection is being violated by bad actors that have compromised our country's communications networks and who hide their tracks with their own hardware and software.

These criminal parties have done significant harm to Americans, both personally and professionally. Those that engage in such illicit behavior should be treated and prosecuted for what they are, criminals.

From the outset of our legislative effort to address this problem, I stated we must make a clear distinction between parties that have ill purpose, as opposed to those who do not. After all, we don't want to shut off legitimate uses of these new technologies, such as protecting the anonymity of a women's shelter assisting at-risk individuals or alerting you to a fraudulent use of your credit card or providing you the simple convenience of interacting with your ride-share service. Those are legitimate purposes.

Our clearest and quickest path for passing legislation, along with our friends in the Senate and, ultimately, to become law, is to go after those that have malicious intent; and to go beyond that could undermine services

Americans depend on every day. So I think we have found the right balance here.

□ 1430

By taking all this into account, we can achieve the same kind of bipartisan, bicameral success as exemplified by the RAY BAUM'S Act last Congress, which, notably, provided us with the launching pad for where we are today.

Now, that law provided the FCC with more authority to go after bad actors who utilize calls and texts. Our work from then was echoed by a broad bipartisan group of attorneys general from across the United States calling for the FCC to move on updating its own rules.

Now, we know communications and technologies are constantly evolving, and, unfortunately, the bad actors' tricks have evolved beyond our Do Not Call Registry, and I am sure they will continue figuring out a way to get around this effort. However, the more friction we can create against illicit behavior, the more focused public-private partnerships we can create among industry, consumer groups, and government that will help us root out this problem, prosecute these criminals to the fullest extent of the law, and make great strides in regaining Americans' confidence in their communication devices.

Now, in the 35 townhalls I have held in my district this year and phone calls I get to my office, people ask one question. I bet they ask it of you, Madam Speaker.

What are you going to do to stop these robocalls?

I will tell you what. This is a number you can answer, 3375. That is the number of the bill. Pick it up; answer it; vote ''yes''; and we will put an end to these robocalls—at least for now.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who chairs our Health Subcommittee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the chairman of the full committee; the ranking member, Mr. WALDEN; the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. LATTA; and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DOYLE, for bringing forward this bipartisan legislation.

I hope when the vote is taken on this today by the full House that it is unanimous. And if it is—and it should be—I think we are going to hear applause from across the country, because the American people have been bombarded by robocalls every day.

Last year, as has been stated, Americans received an unfathomable 48 billion—with a B—robocalls. So this is an epidemic, and anyone with a phone knows this.

I hear it from my constituents daily. I think we all do. I have been subjected to them. All of my colleagues have been subjected to them, and their families, as well.

And these calls are not only highly annoying; they are also used to scam people and to swindle them. Last year, an estimated 43 million Americans were scammed out of $10½ billion. That is a lot of money. And I have some friends, intelligent people, who were convinced by the story at the other end of the line.

So the American people, for all the legitimate reasons, are demanding that we do something, and today I think we are delivering a victory for them. I am certainly proud to cosponsor the legislation. And, as has been said, no one bill can completely solve a complex problem, so the FCC and Congress have to remain vigilant to ensure that the statutory and the regulatory protections are sufficient to protect the consumers.

There are heavy fees for violators in this bill, so it is really going to cost them, and it is not simply paying because it is a cost of doing business.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the ranking member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today because robocalls have to stop. With the help of our phone carriers and the FCC, we have crafted solid legislation in the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. But the most important voices heard in the crafting of this bill were the men and women from our districts who have had to deal with these calls.

Illegal robocalls are annoying, disruptive, and harmful. Sadly, Madam Speaker, for many people in Ohio and across the country, these calls have also ruined lives. I hosted a workshop geared toward helping seniors avoid becoming victims of scams, including illegal robocalls, and the stories are heartbreaking.

We heard from seniors who have been manipulated into giving away their life savings to scammers, often because they were tricked into thinking someone they loved had been hurt. They told me, if there was a way for them to know that it was an illegal robocall before they answered that call, this could have possibly been prevented.

That is one of the many solutions we offer in the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. I am proud to have contributed with language from our own STOP Robocalls Act, which would make it easier for Americans to access robocall blocking technology through their phone companies on an informed opt-out basis.

Prior to this legislation and the FCC ruling, these services were available to consumers who opted in to receive them. This restriction made the number of customers using blocking technology very low. This legislation will change that.

Madam Speaker, Americans deserve peace of mind knowing that the phones that connect us to the world are being used for good and not scams.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the full committee; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Oregon, the Republican leader of the full committee for working with us on this legislation.

I also want to thank our great staffs for all the hard work that they did in making sure we got this legislation to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3375.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), who chairs our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today the House will vote on the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, legislation introduced by Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, Ranking Member LATTA, and me. This bill addresses a problem that we all have firsthand experience with: persistent, annoying, nonstop robocalls.

Americans received nearly 48 billion robocalls last year, a 60 percent increase from the year before. That number is expected to increase to 60 billion this year. In June alone, in my hometown of Pittsburgh, we received an estimated 34 million robocalls. On average, everyone in this country receives 14 of these calls every day.

This bill is a comprehensive, bipartisan solution that I believe will help seriously reduce the onslaught of illegal robocalls that Americans face.

The bill before the House today is the result of bipartisan negotiations, which included industry and public interest stakeholders. This bill was reported unanimously out of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, which I chair, as well as the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

I am also pleased that the language from the STOP Robocalls Act, which Ranking Member LATTA and I introduced, was included in this bill. These provisions allow phone carriers to automatically enable robocall blocking services by default on phone lines.

While these technologies have been available on an opt-in basis, too many of our seniors and, frankly, too many people in general just don't know about these services and how to sign up for them.

Allowing these services to be enabled by default allows all consumers to benefit from these technologies without having to go through the onerous signup process, particularly for seniors and those most vulnerable to scam calls.

These provisions also include requirements that the new opt-out robocall blocking services do not result in new consumer fees. The bill also requires all carriers to adopt call authentication technology, which would enable

people to be certain that the call they receive——

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

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. The call authentication technology would enable people to be certain that the number they see on their caller ID is really the number the call is coming from.

All too often, people get calls that look like they are coming from down the street, but they are really coming from scammers half a world away.

This legislation came about through the hard work of majority staff and minority staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I would like to thank both staffs on the majority and minority for their hard work and diligence to get this bill to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member.

Robocalls and spoofing have been a burden to Americans for years. It is very simple; it goes without saying: We must end these bad robocalls. Our constituents are fed up.

At a hearing 3 years ago, I was able to highlight a constituent who received hundreds of calls daily to his home phone. His quality of life became so poor, Madam Speaker, he had to replace his phone hardware and phone number to get the peace he deserved in his own home. The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act will help ensure that situations like this become less frequent and, eventually, nonexistent.

This bill will provide much-needed authority for the FCC to develop rules for blocking robocall violators and enhance the ability to pursue these bad actors and bring them to justice for taking advantage of the American people, especially our seniors.

I am also pleased this package includes the Ending One-Ring Scams Act, which Representative CLARKE and I introduced this year. This provision will direct the FCC to target one of the newest forms of caller scams and show that we are serious in combating all forms of illegal phone fraud, no matter the tactics used.

I strongly support the Stop Bad Robocalls Act, and I urge the Senate to pass this much-needed legislation, as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his hard work on this; the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DOYLE; the ranking member; and the staff members. Great bill here.

I rise in support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Today, Californians and Americans across the country are receiving more unwanted robocalls than ever before. This is something I often hear about from my constituents.

Nearly 48 billion robocalls were made in 2018, an increase of 17 billion calls in just 1 year. More than 40 percent of these calls are illegal scams. They are defrauding consumers; they are disruptive; and they are costing victims an average of $430 per scam.

I am worried that the real risk here is that we are making our phone system obsolete, because people just don't want to pick up their phones anymore.

Part of the problem is that our current legal framework doesn't go far enough in deterring these harmful practices. That is why I am pleased that H.R. 3375 includes an amendment that I offered with my colleague Mr. FLORES, during, our full committee markup.

Our provision will create disincentives for the most egregious violators of the law. Specifically, our provision will empower the Federal Communications Commission to assess an additional $10,000 penalty for robocall violations where the offender acted with intent to cause the violation.

Creating these disincentives is critical for protecting consumers and putting abusive practices to an end. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan, commonsense legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. These unwanted and annoying robocalls, which are increasing at an alarming rate, need to end.

I am very pleased that the House has set aside partisan differences and worked together on legislation to benefit all Americans and address this serious issue.

This important legislation would require service providers to implement new technology that ensures caller ID is authenticated and establishes additional protections for consumers receiving unwanted and sometimes fraudulent—robocalls.

I am also pleased that H.R. 3375 includes legislation that I sponsored with my colleague, Representative BUTTERFIELD, which would require the FCC to publish an annual report on the private-led efforts to trace the origin of unlawful robocalls, an important step in stopping these bad actors from reaching consumers.

This kind of illegal, annoying, and harassing activity must stop, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

□ 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), vice chair of our committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, as vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I rise today to thank the House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman FRANK PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN, and Subcommittee Chair MIKE DOYLE and Ranking Member LATTA, for their leadership on this bipartisan effort to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Today, I want to speak to the intrusive reality and damaging repercussions of robocalls and voice my support for H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

While the illegality of these calls is an issue, the insistent presence of them is causing American citizens to no longer view their phone as a legitimate form of communication, thus impacting legitimate business.

Adding to this, robocalls are actively hurting the pockets of Americans, as multitudes are scammed daily, costing the American public millions of dollars.

During committee markup, I introduced the Clarke-Bilirakis amendment based on the base bill, Ending One-Ring Scams Act of 2019, and, Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BILIRAKIS for his leadership.

This was a bipartisan effort to ensure that the American people are protected from this harmful culture of one-ring scams.

The nature of these one-ring scams may seem ridiculous. However, they have been effective in scamming the American people. With one-ring scams, the goal of the scammer is not for you to answer, but, rather, for you to make the call back.

One-ring calls may appear to be from phone numbers somewhere in the United States, including initial digits that resemble U.S. area codes. If one calls back, these citizens risk being connected to a phone number outside of the United States, thus resulting in one being charged a fee for just connecting.

Ad nauseam, the good people of Brooklyn's Ninth Congressional District have voiced their outrage with the state of their security and privacy as the threat of one-ring scams grows more prevalent.

Madam Speaker, before I conclude my remarks, I would be remiss if I did not thank my colleagues who helped lead on today's effort, Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congressman VAN DREW.

Madam Speaker, I want to say to those who are fraudulent: Today, game over.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, Montanans are bombarded with robocalls. Last year alone, Americans received over 48 billion robocalls. That is nearly 100,000 robocalls per minute.

Too many robocalls are deceptive and destructive, from bogus insurance offers to threats of legal action. Scam artists scheme to steal hardworking Montanans' private, personal, and financial information. Sometimes, they go even farther.

A young woman from Bozeman received a call from her little brother's phone number. She picked up the call, but it wasn't her brother. It was a scammer using her brother's number. Tragically, her little brother had died of a drug overdose a few months earlier. She was devastated and shaken. This is disgusting and should not happen.

Today, we are taking a big step forward. We are empowering consumers. Phone companies will provide consumers with call authentication tools and blocking services at no cost. Illegal callers will face more jail time.

Let's get robocall relief across the finish line for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership on this important legislation, and I thank the ranking member.

The American people are fed up with spam calls. They are predatory, incessant, and an invasion of privacy.

We need a comprehensive approach to root them out, and our Federal Government plays an important role in that. Whether it is the FCC, Department of Justice, Homeland Security, or FBI, these agencies should have the authorities and tools to shut down these spammers' calls, and these powers are maximized when they are coordinated.

That is why I included in this legislation the creation of the Spam Calls Task Force. The task force will coordinate the Federal response.

Madam Speaker, I also thank Representative DARREN SOTO for his help with this.

I am confident that by working together, we can all put a stop to spam calls once and for all, and Americans will no longer have to fear robocalls.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS).

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

We all agree that robocalls are annoying, and they are a nuisance. What is worse is that these calls are often scams, scams that are becoming more and more sophisticated each day. When our phone rings, we are just one answer away from being a victim of identity theft. That needs to change.

This legislation will restore trust that Americans can again answer their phones.

Madam Speaker, I have a constituent who calls my office nearly every time he receives a robocall. He has begged us to do something. After today, I look forward to sharing with him that we listened and took action to solve this problem.

Madam Speaker, on his behalf and on behalf of all those whom I have the privilege of representing in eastern Washington, I urge support of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, Congress has a terrible reputation for being too partisan, but there is one issue that has strong bipartisan agreement in this Congress and across this country, and that is: Fraudulent robocalls must be stopped.

I hear these concerns from my constituents in central Florida on a regular basis. It is one of the top issues that constituents routinely write my office about.

Americans received over 48 billion robocalls last year. Nearly half of the calls that Americans receive are robocalls, many trying to scam people out of their hard-earned money.

Floridians have received over 2.2 billion robocalls so far this year alone. My hometown of Orlando is among the most targeted cities in the country, having received nearly 350 million robocalls.

Robocalls are more than a nuisance. They pose a direct threat to consumers.

Often disguised using fake caller IDs, like hospitals and government agencies, robocallers attempt to trick people into providing personal information, preying especially on our seniors.

The American people have had enough, and they are demanding swift action from this body.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to help introduce this bill, which is a great first step to protect Americans from robocall harassment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This legislation will seek to stem a problem affecting nearly everyone I know, and that is the issue of robocalls.

Last year, we had almost 50 billion robocalls in the United States. This year, we have already had almost 30 billion robocalls, or roughly 90 robocalls per person.

It is an issue that everyone can agree is a nuisance and should be addressed. That is why I join my colleagues in supporting this legislation to end this practice and once again make it possible to answer a phone call from a phone number you don't recognize.

This bill will give the FCC the authority to move forward with changes under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and to ensure that these changes will lead to an effective effort to get rid of unwanted robocalls.

Not only will we see a greater ability to stop these, but we will see penalties that will, hopefully, deter future efforts by bad actors.

Madam Speaker, I applaud my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work on this legislation, especially since it is an issue that affects everyone. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to help us get this bill to the finish line.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE for yielding.

This issue has brought everybody together. It seems to be more popular than ice cream or even fried chicken.

It is amazing such a bill could come about, but it is important because we get these calls that take up our time.

I have a landline, and I have two cellphones. I don't even answer my landline anymore. When I come home from a trip, coming up to Washington and then going home, my service is full of automatic dialers, robocalls. Constituents who want to get through can't get through because the answering machine has been used up.

They try to take advantage of people, scam them into buying products they shouldn't. They waste our time. They ruin our opportunity to have a regular life during the day.

Madam Speaker, I thank all the sponsors. I am proud to be a supporter and a cosponsor. I look forward to voting for this. I look forward to the day when I can pick up my phone and it will be Bear Bryant or somebody looking to reach out to call his mama.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), a valuable member of the committee.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we have all gotten robocalls. They are annoying, disrupting, and actually can be dangerous.

Oftentimes, robocalls prey on our communities' most vulnerable populations in hopes of capitalizing on their personal and private information. Unfortunately, this problem is growing.

H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, is a bipartisan solution, ensuring that calls consumers receive are verified as legitimate.

I am also pleased that the legislation includes a bill that I was an original cosponsor of called the Locking Up Robocallers Act. It requires the Federal Communications Commission to report particularly malicious robocall schemes to the Justice Department so that Federal resources may continue to be properly leveraged to stop these schemes.

As a former U.S. attorney, I am really proud that the Justice Department, working with the FTC and local law enforcement, has already taken enforcement actions in over 94 cases, which has yielded blocking of more than 1 billion robocalls so far.

Madam Speaker, I am reassured that with this bill, they will be able to more efficiently and consistently pursue robocaller abusers. For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, can I inquire as to the amount of time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, 64. That is the number of robocalls that the average Illinoisan has received in 2019 alone, over 1 billion total. Nationwide, half of all calls to cellphones are robocalls.

Yesterday, in my staff meeting, our discussion of floor consideration of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act was literally interrupted by two different robocalls.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member on behalf of myself and my community in Illinois' 14th Congressional District for their hard work to bring this commonsense, bipartisan, and incredibly important bill to the floor.

Robocalls aren't just annoying; they can be dangerous. They are used by fraudsters and unscrupulous debt collectors to scare hardworking Americans to fall for their scams.

I am so proud to cosponsor the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This bill ensures that consumers can block calls they don't want, with no extra charge. It ensures that every call Illinoisans receive is verified by caller ID, and it strengthens enforcement against scammers and robocall operators.

I am especially glad the bill includes a provision to require the FCC to establish a Hospital Robocall Working Group to ensure that robocalls don't threaten hospitals' ability to provide timely, lifesaving care.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, robocalls have moved beyond a simple nuisance. Sophisticated actors are now using robocalls to trick people into providing sensitive information by posing as legitimate organizations.

When this happens to hospitals, patients have no reason to believe that there is a fraudulent actor on the other line, leading them to reveal sensitive health data and sensitive financial information. This activity threatens the integrity of real health-related phone calls and jeopardizes the relationship between the patient and their provider.

Even more challenging than explaining to consumers that the calls from your phone number are not always from your organization is the response time required.

□ 1500

According to testimony by Dave Summitt of the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center, in a 90-day period, they received over 6,600 external calls identified as a Moffitt internal phone number, requiring 65 hours of response time. This is time that could have been used to support the hospital rather than respond to fraudulent calls.

During the Energy and Commerce Committee markup, I offered an amendment with Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan to establish a hospital robocall protection group at the Federal Communications Commission. This group will issue best practices to help combat unlawful robocalls made to hospitals, as well as those made spoofing a legitimate hospital phone number.

The hospital robocall protection group will assist any hospital to combat these fraudulent robocalls so that they may focus on serving patients. A patient should not have to worry about whether they are speaking with their real doctor or their real hospital when discussing sensitive health information, and providers should not have to deal with disruptive false claims.

This amendment was adopted in committee, and I look forward to the best practices being put forward in the hospital robocall protection group.

The fraud committed on Americans by illegal robocallers is going to end. This bipartisan legislation creates a robust framework designed to protect consumers from the fraud and nuisance of these calls.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the members who were able to work together to produce this great legislation, and there are a lot.

I thank Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIM, Mrs. BROOKS, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. KUSTOFF for introducing the Locking Up Robocalls Act, which was added to this legislation in section 9.

I thank Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WALBERG for introducing the Ending One-Ring Scams Act, which was added to this legislation in section 10.

I thank Mr. CRIST for introducing his Spam Calls Task Force Act, which was added to this legislation in section 11.

I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GIANFORTE for introducing the Tracing Back and Catching Unlawful Robocalls Act, which was added in section 13.

I thank Mrs. DINGELL and Dr. BURGESS for introducing their Protecting Patients and Doctors from Unlawful Robocalls Act, which was added to the bill in section 14.

And I thank Mr. FLORES and Mr. MCNERNEY for offering their amendment to increase the financial penalties for illegal robocallers.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my partners—Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. LATTA—for working with me to introduce the bill, which included at introduction Mr. LATTA's and Mr. DOYLE's STOP Robocalls Act in section 8.

I also would like to quickly thank the staff—Alex Hoehn-Saric, AJ Brown, Jennifer Epperson, Dan Miller, Robin Colwell, Tim Kurth—for all their hard work, and, in particular, Gerry Leverich, who is here, for all his time and energy to get this bill to the floor today. I am very proud for all our members and staff for this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a few letters and statements for the RECORD: a letter from AARP on behalf of its nearly 38 million members urging a vote in favor of the bill; a letter from more than 80 organizations representing consumers throughout the U.S., including Consumer Reports and the National Consumer Law Center, among others, urging strong support by members of the bill; and a list of supportive statements from carriers and relevant associations, including USTelecom, The Broadband Association; CTIA, The Wireless Association; NCTA, The Internet & Television Association; Charter Communications, and Verizon.

AARP,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP is writing to urge a vote in favor of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, bipartisan legislation that will help fight back against illegal robocalls.

AARP has a long history of fighting for consumer protections for older Americans. Unwanted robocalls are a rich playground for scammers to deceive victims into paying money under false pretenses. Through our nationwide Fraud Watch Network initiative, we work to empower consumers to spot and avoid scams, and we provide support and guidance to victims and their families when fraud happens.

AARP is pleased that H.R. 3375 appropriately emphasizes consumer consent regarding the receipt of automatically dialed calls and expands the enforcement provisions of the Communications Act by extending the statute of limitations. The bill specifies that consumers should not face additional charges for having robocalls blocked through authentication technology and sets reasonable deadlines for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to prescribe regulations in the ongoing WC Docket No. 17–97.

AARP also supports the provisions of the bill that require the FCC to report on the implementation of the reassigned number database, which will reduce the incidence of repeated calls to innocent customers based

on the telephone number's previous owner. Likewise, we support the requirement of an annual report to Congress on the FCC's enforcement actions.

All Americans will benefit from the provisions of H.R. 3375 that promote an accurate call authentication framework and prevent consumers from being charged for blocking technology. We again urge you to enact H.R. 3375, and we look forward to working with you on a bipartisan basis to combat unwanted and abusive robocalls against older Americans. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or have your staff contact our Government Affairs staff.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy & Engagement Officer.

SUPPORT STRONG LEGISLATION TO STOP ABUSIVE ROBOCALLS

(July 23, 2019)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations representing consumers throughout the United States strongly urge your support for H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This bipartisan legislation, which the Committee on Energy and Commerce approved by a unanimous vote of 48–0, will help secure important protections against abusive robocalling.

Robocalls are an ever-increasing plague. Last year, Americans received an estimated 47.8 billion robocalls. They harass us, disrupt our peace of mind, interrupt important time with family, and interfere with important communications. Many of these annoying automated calls are to sell products or to collect debts. They also enable scams to enter our homes. Truecaller found that consumers had lost an estimated $10.5 billion to phone scams in a single 12-month period. And spoofing, in which a caller sends a false number in the caller ID, compounds the problem, impeding call-blocking services and tricking consumers into picking up the phone.

A Consumer Reports national survey released earlier this year found that 70 percent of consumers don't even answer the phone anymore if they don't recognize the number, because their phones are so overrun with unwanted robocalls.

H.R. 3375 would strengthen our laws to curb this abusive robocalling.

It would direct the FCC to issue clear regulations to better ensure that automated calls and texts cannot be made without the consumer's prior consent, by requiring that the technologies that enable unwanted calls are properly defined and consumers can stop unwanted calls by withdrawing consent, and closing off avenues for callers to seek loopholes.

It would direct the FCC to require phone companies to provide effective call authentication capability, at no charge to consumers, to better identify and stop robocalling and texting that uses deceptively ''spoofed'' phone numbers.

It would strengthen FCC powers to impose forfeiture penalties for intentional violations.

It would direct the FCC to oversee creation of a database that callers can check in order to avoid making robocalls and texts to a telephone number that has been reassigned to a different consumer who has not given consent, and would clarify that the caller must have consent from the person actually being called.

Consumers are calling on Congress to enact these reforms now.

We strongly urge your support for H.R. 3375.

Sincerely,

Allied Progress; Americans for Financial Reform; Center for Responsible Lending; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Reports; Electronic privacy Information Center (EPIC); Justice in Aging; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys; National Consumer Law Center on behalf of its low-income clients; National Consumers League; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Legal Aid & Defender Association; National Rural Social Work Caucus; Public Citizen; Public Knowledge.

Center for Digital Democracy, Alabama; The Alabama Appleseed Center for Law & Justice; Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AkPIRG); Center for Economic Integrity, Arizona; Arkansans Against Abusive Payday Lending, Arkansas; Arkansas Community Institute, Arkansas; California Low-Income Consumer Coalition; Public Law Center, California; Media Alliance, California; California Alliance for Consumer Education; Western Center on Law & Poverty, California.

Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, California; Public Good Law Center, California; Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, California; Public Counsel, California; Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco/Consumer Advocacy; Funeral Consumer Alliance of Connecticut, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; Tzedek DC, District of Columbia; Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Florida; Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection, Florida; Florida Silver haired Legislature Inc., Florida; Independent Party of Florida, Florida.

Mid-Pinellas Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Florida; Funeral Consumers Alliance of Sarasota—Manatee, Florida; Green Forest CDC, Georgia; Georgia Watch, Georgia; Woodstock Institute, Illinois; Digital Privacy Alliance, Illinois; Western Illinois Area Agency on Aging; CARPLS Legal Aid, Illinois; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Maine Center for Economic Policy; Greater Boston Legal Services, on behalf of its low-income clients, Massachusetts; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; The Midas Collaborative, Massachusetts; Center for Civil Justice, Michigan; Mississippi Center for Justice, Mississippi; Montana Organizing Project, Montana.

New Jersey Citizen Action; Legal Services of New Jersey; Empire Justice Center, New York; Public Utility Law Project of New York; Financial Protection Law Center, North Carolina; Oregon Legal Guides; Oregon Consumer League; SeniorLAW Center, Pennsylvania; The One Less Foundation, Pennsylvania; Philadelphia VIP, Pennsylvania; South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center.

Tennessee Citizen Action; Texas Appleseed; Friends for life; Texas Legal Services Center; Community Justice Program, Texas; Texas Access to Justice Commission; Texas A&M University; Family Violence Prevention Services, Texas; AAA Fair Credit Foundation, Utah; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Statewide Poverty Action Network, Washington; Mountain State Justice, Inc., West Virginia; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; WV Citizen Action Group, West Virginia; National Association of Social Workers West Virginia Chapter.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

[From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019]

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING HR 3375, THE STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

Americans for Financial Reform; Center for Responsible Lending; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Consumer Law Center on behalf of its low-income clients; Public Citizen; Public Knowledge.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT

Maureen Mahoney, policy analyst for Consumer Reports: ''Robocalls are a pervasive, persistent problem, and consumers are desperate for relief from these unsolicited messages. These calls don't just irritate consumers—they interfere with the phone service for which we pay dearly, and they subject people to scams. By one estimate, consumers lost $10.5 billion to phone scams in one single year. We commend Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden for introducing the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, which will help ensure that all consumers have effective protections from deceptively spoofed calls, including calls from scammers. The bill will also help get rid of loopholes in order to stop robocallers from skirting the law. We look forward to working with legislators to ensure that consumers get the protections they deserve.''

Margot Saunders, Senior Counsel for National Consumer Law Center: ''This bipartisan bill is an important step forward in the fight to stop unwanted and illegal robocalls. There's still more to be done and there is a lot of responsibility placed on the FCC to protect consumers. Robocalls plague voters of all political stripes so we are especially pleased to see a bipartisan effort on this bill. We hope this is the first of several positive steps that Congress will take.''

AARP: ''AARP commends Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, Chairman Doyle, and Ranking Member Latta for their bipartisan commitment to address the serious problem of illegal and unwanted robocalls. AARP shares your belief that illegal robocalls continue to place all Americans at risk of scams and fraud. New AARP Fraud Watch Network research shows that consumers are more likely to answer a call if it is coming from a familiar area code or telephone exchange, which is precisely what scammers are exploiting. Older Americans are particularly vulnerable to phone scam victimization, which can wipe out their life savings. AARP looks forward to working with you and Congress on a bipartisan basis to combat unwanted and abusive robocalls.''

Jonathan Spalter, President and CEO of USTelecom: ''Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden and the bipartisan members of the House Energy & Commerce Committee delivered a loud and clear message to illegal robocallers today: 'enough.' These legislative proposals add to the growing momentum and broad partnership among lawmakers, regulators, industry and innovators of all stripes who are closely collaborating to end the illegal robocall plague scamming and spoofing consumers.''

Kelly Cole, Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for CTIA: ''We commend Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, Chairman Doyle and Ranking Member Latta for their Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. The wireless industry is committed to combating illegal robocalls and protecting consumers, and we thank Committee Leadership for tackling this important issue. We look forward to working on getting robocall legislation enacted.''

Robert Fisher, Senior Vice President of Federal Legislative Affairs for Verizon: ''We applaud Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and the rest of the House Energy and Commerce committee co-sponsors of this bill for their continued efforts to protect consumers from disruptive and harassing robocalls. Enough is enough—it's time for Americans to hang up on abusive robocallers once and for all. Verizon has already begun

deploying the STIR-SHAKEN call authentication protocol for IP Voice services, and we welcome the continued momentum toward a bipartisan, comprehensive solution that empowers service providers, law enforcement, and most of all consumers. We commend this legislation and look forward to working with Congress to make abusive robocalls history.''

Charter Communications: ''Charter wants to see an end to robocalls and we commend Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden for introducing legislation that will help do just that. This bipartisan bill is an important step in curbing unwanted and illegal calls. As we work to implement the call authentication protocol SHAKEN/STIR by the end of the year in addition to our currently offered call blocking, screening, and identification features like the Nomorobo app, we will continue to work with Congress to hopefully stop these disruptive calls once and for all.''

NCTA—The Internet & Television Association: ''Robocalls have become a scourge on our daily lives causing many Americans to simply stop answering their phones. This is why we welcome the bipartisan leadership of Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden to introduce the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This legislation along with efforts by the FCC to combat robocalls are critical to protecting consumers from this nuisance.''

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bipartisan effort and a bicameral effort. We are not doing messaging here, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill that will become law, and the President will sign it once we get it passed in the Senate and we have a final bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3375, the "Stopping Bad Robocalls Act."

H.R. 3375 will require the Federal Communications Commission to update the definition of what qualifies as a robocall and ensure that any attempt to circumvent its rules using new or different robocall technology is outlawed.

The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act would also require telecommunications corporations to implement new technology to ensure that calls are not spam.

In addition, it will yield more efficient investigations conducted by government officials and the heightened enforcement of anti-robocall rules.

In June of 2019 4.4 billion robocalls were placed nationwide.

Texas led all 50 states, receiving over 500 million robocalls in that month.

Mr. Speaker, robocalls have become an overwhelming issue in our country and threaten to paralyze our most critical communications lines.

These callers are not only a nuisance but are also predatory.

They have begun to target crucial establishments including hospitals, cancer centers, and medical research organizations, creating conditions that can potentially lead to a health crisis.

Administrators at these institutions worry that, without intervention, the myriad of incoming robocalls could eventually outmatch their best efforts to keep hospital phone lines free during emergencies.

Robocallers have gone even further to perform scams using the spoofing tactic, in which they can appear to take on existing phone numbers.

With the aid of spoofing, scammers can take on phone numbers that are the same as or very similar to the numbers of health care providers.

Robocallers use the names and numbers of these organizations, to aid their scam of telling people that they owe money and requesting private information.

We are all aware of the difficulty millions of Americans face in attaining affordable health care.

Robocallers are maliciously taking advantage of these circumstances and seek to profit from the exacerbation of the stress that families are challenged with.

The federal government as well as multiple large telecommunications corporations are equipped with information on these robocallers and the groups whom they seek to take advantage of.

The virulent aspirations of these callers must be met with the commitment of our government to protect our citizens by placing the responsibility on these corporations to protect consumers.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 3375, the "Stopping Bad Robocalls Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELGADO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3375, 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. PALLONE. Mr. 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.

AUTISM COLLABORATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1058) to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1058

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 ''Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2019'' or the ''Autism CARES Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION, INTENSIFICATION, AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE NIH WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH ON AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER.

Section 409C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''and toxicology'' and inserting ''toxicology, and interventions to maximize outcomes for individuals with autism spectrum disorder''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''Such research shall investigate the causes (including possible environmental causes), diagnosis or ruling out, early and ongoing detection, prevention, services across the lifespan, supports, intervention, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder, including dissemination and implementation of clinical care, supports, interventions, and treatments.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking ''cause'' and all that follows through ''disorder'' and inserting ''causes, diagnosis, early and ongoing detection, prevention, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder across the lifespan''; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking ''neurobiology'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''neurobiology, genetics, genomics, psychopharmacology, developmental psychology, behavioral psychology, and clinical psychology.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) REDUCING DISPARITIES.—The Director may consider, as appropriate, the extent to which a center can demonstrate availability and access to clinical services for youth and adults from diverse racial, ethnic, geographic, or linguistic backgrounds in decisions about awarding grants to applicants which meet the scientific criteria for funding under this section.''.

SEC. 3. PROGRAMS RELATING TO AUTISM.

(a) DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SURVEILLANCE AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 399AA of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''adults on autism spectrum disorder'' and inserting ''adults with autism spectrum disorder'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''State and local public health officials'' and inserting ''State, local, and Tribal public health officials'';

(B) by striking ''or other developmental disabilities'' and inserting ''and other developmental disabilities'';

(3) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''a university, or any other educational institution'' and inserting ''a university, any other educational institution, an Indian tribe, or a tribal organization'';

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking ''relevant State and local public health officials, private sector developmental disability researchers, and advocates for individuals with developmental disabilities'' and inserting ''State, local, and Tribal public health officials, private sector developmental disability researchers, advocates for individuals with autism spectrum disorder, and advocates for individuals with other developmental disabilities'';

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

''(1) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms 'Indian tribe' and 'tribal organization' have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.''; and

(6) in subsection (e), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''.

(b) AUTISM EDUCATION, EARLY DETECTION, AND INTERVENTION.—Section 399BB of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''individuals with autism spectrum disorder or other developmental disabilities'' and inserting ''individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities''; and

(B) by striking ''children with autism spectrum disorder'' and all that follows through ''disabilities;'' and inserting ''individuals with

autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities across their lifespan;'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''individuals with'' before ''autism spectrum disorder'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (5) through (7), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) promote evidence-based screening techniques and interventions for individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities across their lifespan;'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''the needs of individuals with autism spectrum disorder or other developmental disabilities and their families'' and inserting ''the needs of individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities across their lifespan and the needs of their families''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''caregivers of individuals with an autism spectrum disorder'' and inserting ''caregivers of individuals with autism spectrum disorder or other developmental disabilities'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i)(II), by inserting ''autism spectrum disorder and'' after ''individuals with''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting ''autism spectrum disorder and'' after ''individuals with'';

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''across their lifespan'' before ''and ensure''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by inserting ''across their lifespan'' after ''other developmental disabilities'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) DEVELOPMENTAL-BEHAVIORAL PEDIATRICIAN TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In making awards under this subsection, the Secretary may prioritize awards to applicants that are developmental-behavioral pediatrician training programs located in rural or underserved areas.

''(B) DEFINITION OF UNDERSERVED AREA.—In this paragraph, the term 'underserved area' means—

''(i) a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332(a)(1)(A)); and

''(ii) an urban or rural area designated by the Secretary as an area with a shortage of personal health services (as described in section 330(b)(3)(A)).'';

(5) in subsection (f), by inserting ''across the lifespan of such individuals'' after ''other developmental disabilities''; and

(6) in subsection (g), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''.

(c) INTERAGENCY AUTISM COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 399CC of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''across the lifespan of such individuals'' before the semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''across the lifespan of such individuals'' before ''and the families'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(D), by inserting '', the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development,'' after ''Department of Education'';

(B) in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2), by striking ''at least two such members'' each place it appears and inserting ''at least three such members'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''one or more additional 4-year terms'' and inserting ''one additional 4-year term''; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 399DD of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Autism CARES Act of 2014'' and inserting ''Autism CARES Act of 2019''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A), (B), (D), and (E), by striking ''Autism CARES Act of 2014'' each place it appears and inserting ''Autism CARES Act of 2019'';

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''age of the child'' and inserting ''age of the individual'';

(iii) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '';'';

(iv) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) information on how States use home- and community-based services and other supports to ensure that individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities are living, working, and participating in their community.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''YOUNG ADULTS AND TRANSITIONING YOUTH'' and inserting ''THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF INDIVIDUALS WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER ACROSS THEIR LIFESPAN'';

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

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2019, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report concerning the health and well-being of individuals with autism spectrum disorder.''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) demographic factors associated with the health and well-being of individuals with autism spectrum disorder;'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''young adults'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting ''the health and well-being of individuals with autism spectrum disorder, including an identification of existing Federal laws, regulations, policies, research, and programs;''; and

(iii) by amending subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) to read as follows:

''(C) recommendations on establishing best practices guidelines to ensure interdisciplinary coordination between all relevant service providers receiving Federal funding;

''(D) comprehensive approaches to improving health outcomes and well-being for individuals with autism spectrum disorder, including—

''(i) community-based behavioral supports and interventions;

''(ii) nutrition, recreational, and social activities; and

''(iii) personal safety services related to public safety agencies or the criminal justice system for such individuals; and

''(E) recommendations that seek to improve health outcomes for such individuals, including across their lifespan, by addressing—

''(i) screening and diagnosis of children and adults;

''(ii) behavioral and other therapeutic approaches;

''(iii) primary and preventative care;

''(iv) communication challenges;

''(v) aggression, self-injury, elopement, and other behavioral issues;

''(vi) emergency room visits and acute care hospitalization;

''(vii) treatment for co-occurring physical and mental health conditions;

''(viii) premature mortality;

''(ix) medical practitioner training; and

''(x) caregiver mental health.''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399EE of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''$22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019'' and inserting ''$23,100,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''$48,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019'' and inserting ''$50,599,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''there is authorized to be appropriated $190,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019'' and inserting ''there are authorized to be appropriated $296,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1058.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 1058, the Autism CARES Act, which will continue critical research, surveillance, education, early detection, and intervention programs for people living with autism spectrum disorder, also known as ASD, and their families.

The number of children diagnosed with ASD has risen dramatically over recent years. While 1 in every 150 children was diagnosed with ASD in 1992, that number grew to 1 in every 59 children born in 2006.

While some of this increase may be attributed to an overall higher number of people with ASD, a significant portion is likely due to increased efforts to diagnose people to get them the treatment they need. As efforts to identify individuals with autism have improved, so has the ability to intervene and treat them. Early intervention for children with ASD is associated with a positive outcome on developmental concerns.

It is important that we continue to improve outcomes for children and all individuals with ASD, and that is what we are doing with this reauthorization of the Autism CARES program today. This bill would reauthorize funding for programs at the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Health Resources and Services Administration through 2024. The bill also expands efforts to conduct

research and intervene with better treatment options for all individuals with ASD across their lifespan, regardless of age. Additionally, the bill aims to reduce disparities among individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, geographic, or linguistic backgrounds, and directs additional care to rural and underserved areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this legislation will improve health outcomes and quality of life for millions of Americans living with ASD, as well as their families. For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 1058, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2019, also known as the Autism CARES Act.

H.R. 1058 builds upon a strong foundation that Congress laid by passing the Combating Autism Act in 2006. This legislation, in 2006, expanded research, surveillance, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder, and it has equipped our Federal agencies with enhanced resources to expand its knowledge of this complex disorder.

The number of children diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder has increased. It is even more imperative that we reauthorize this program and ensure the continuation of the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee. As families across our Nation navigate raising children with autism, the Autism CARES Act would provide hope by authorizing funding for continued research, surveillance and education at the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Health Resources and Services Administration, and it would continue this through calendar year 2024.

I thank Representatives CHRIS SMITH and MICHAEL DOYLE for their tireless work to reauthorize this program and better the lives for individuals with autism and their families.

As Dr. Amy Hewitt pointed out at our hearing, the number of autism spectrum disorder diagnoses has risen more than 600 percent in the past few decades.

In 2018, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention determined that 1 in 59 children is diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder, and that boys are four times more likely to be diagnosed with autism than are girls. As more individuals are diagnosed, it becomes even more important for Congress to ensure that there is adequate research and support services for these individuals and their families.

Early detection and intervention for individuals with autism and their families help to increase the communication and social skills, preparing children for a successful future. The Autism CARES Act reauthorizes these early detection and intervention programs, in addition to workforce programs for health professionals. The Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental and Related Disabilities, LEND, programs provide training for healthcare professionals to address intellectual disabilities, including autism.

As we continue to support research efforts at the National Institutes of Health and through the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee, we will learn more about autism and how to best address it. As we gain knowledge, our healthcare system needs to stand ready to implement the best practices obtained, which is why workforce programs are important.

It is critical that we reauthorize the Autism CARES Act on time so that the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee does not lapse, and so that our Nation's research can seamlessly continue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I hope that the Senate will swiftly take up this legislation after its passage here today.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), the Democratic sponsor of the bill.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Autism CARES Act of 2019.

My good friend and colleague, CHRIS SMITH, and I formed the Autism Caucus in 2001 to raise awareness in Congress about autism spectrum disorder, ASD for short, to advocate for greater Federal involvement in understanding ASD, and to help individuals and families get the support they need.

Nearly 20 years later, we have made significant progress, but we are still far behind where we would like to be and where individuals and families need us to be. In 2000, the CDC reported approximately 1 in 150 children with ASD. The latest report found that number had increased to 1 in 59 children.

Similarly, even though ASD can be diagnosed as early as 2 years old, most children are not diagnosed with ASD until after age 4. Children and adolescents with ASD have had average medical expenditures that were $4,000 to $6,000 higher than children without ASD.

We also don't have a reliable estimate of autism's prevalence among adults. As autism is a lifelong condition, an estimated 50,000 teens and young adults with autism age out of school-based services each year. That is why it is so important that we pass this bill: to continue to close the gaps in knowledge and services surrounding ASD.

The Autism CARES Act of 2019 increases authorized program levels to match our recent success in the Appropriations Committee: $296 million annually at NIH, $23 million at CDC, and $55 million at HRSA. This money will be used for research, surveillance, education, detection, and intervention for individuals with autism spectrum disorders of all ages, not just children.

The bill also supports training the healthcare workforce to better understand and treat individuals with autism, and it prioritizes awards to medically underserved areas.

□ 1515

It also directs HHS to submit a report to Congress on the health and well-being of individuals on the autism spectrum, an often-overlooked aspect of ASD.

The bill also adds important voices to the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee, including representatives from the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the VA.

Finally, it increases the minimum number of self-advocates included in the public membership of the committee, an important step for a community whose voices are invaluable.

I am proud of the progress that we have made over the last 20 years, but I know we have to do more. Autism CARES Act of 2019 takes important steps toward our ultimate goal to ensure that every individual has access to the treatment and support that is a right for them.

I thank Congressman SMITH, Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, Chairwoman ESHOO, and Ranking Member BURGESS, as well as Autism Speaks, Autism Society of America, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, and other stakeholders for their input and support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, reauthorization of the Autism CARES Act means a great deal to millions of Americans affected by autism spectrum disorder. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their wholehearted support and vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the principal author of this bill and the intellectual driving force behind getting this legislation reauthorized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. Speaker, the Autism CARES Act of 2019, I say to my colleagues, is a comprehensive reauthorization and strengthening of America's whole-of-government autism spectrum disorder initiative.

As the prime author of the bill, let me extend very special thanks to cosponsor MIKE DOYLE from Pennsylvania for his extraordinary leadership, his partnership, and his friendship over these many years; to Health Subcommittee Chairwoman ANNA ESHOO for expertly shepherding this bill through her subcommittee with Ranking Member Dr. BURGESS; and my deep

gratitude to the full committee Chair FRANK PALLONE and Ranking Member GREG WALDEN.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank staff, including Kelsey Griswold, Kate Werley, Rachel Fybel, Dr. Kristen Shatynski, and Stephen Holland, for their tremendous help and assistance on this legislation.

Frankly, we couldn't have done this without so many autism advocates, including and especially Stuart Spielman of Autism Speaks and Scott Badesch of the Autism Society.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation powerfully supports and pursues durable remedies and effective interventions for the approximately 1.5 million children with ASD. That is an estimated 1 in 59 children in the U.S. In my home State of New Jersey, that is 1 in 34. We do have the highest rate, according to the CDC.

This bill also helps adults with autism who were and are today often misdiagnosed, underdiagnosed, and overlooked. Language throughout the bill emphasizes that causes, diagnosis, detection, prevention, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder must be throughout the lifespan of that person.

According to Drexel University's autism center—and this is a very important number—in our last bill that the gentleman, MIKE DOYLE, and I did just 5 years ago, it pointed out that the number of young people who become adults is increasing every year. Now, it is about 50,000 to 60,000 children who age out every year, creating challenges for education, housing, employment, and access to healthcare.

This legislation also assists parents, families, and caregivers who deeply love and cherish their children and want the brightest future for them. In addition to its groundbreaking prevalence studies and crafting a whole myriad of intervention work, CDC's ''Learn the Signs. Act Early.'' program is just one more amazing tool for parents.

At its core, the bill authorizes a little over $1.8 billion over 5 years for NIH, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and HRSA.

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive Federal policy we are now reauthorizing. In September 1997, Bobbi and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey, my constituents, parents of two constituent autistic children, walked into my Ocean County office looking for help.

They believed that Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted action, especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana.

I invited the CDC, the ATSDR, and other Federal agencies to Brick for an investigation, only to learn when they did the study that prevalence rates were high in other communities as well.

Believing we had a serious spike in prevalence everywhere, I introduced the ASSURE Act, cosponsored by 199 Members, which was incorporated as title I of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

Progress, Mr. Speaker, has been made over the many years, particularly in the area of looking at risk factors, but also the overwhelming importance of early intervention.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have pointed out, this legislation reauthorizes and expands the interagency coordinating committee, or IACC, managed so effectively and professionally by Dr. Susan Daniels, the director of the Office of Autism Research Coordination.

Speaking to this, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, Dr. Joshua Gordon, said yesterday:

> The National Institutes of Health is proud to work hand-in-hand with the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee to ensure the coordination of research efforts focusing on critical topics related to autism, such as developing early detection and screening tools, understanding the genetic and biological underpinnings of autism, and developing and testing the effectiveness of services and supports to improve functional and health outcomes of individuals with autism.

As my colleague, Mr. DOYLE, said a moment ago, we have expanded IACC. The Departments of Labor, Justice, Veterans Affairs, and HUD are now part of it, and there has been an expansion from two to three members for self-advocates, parents, legal guardians, and advocates.

Let me remind Members, and I encourage them even to go online and check this out.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, IACC has a strategic plan that is updated every year, so there is no duplication of efforts. They ask several essential questions, and all the research revolves around trying to find answers to those seven questions.

HRSA is all about helping the geographically isolated and economically or medically vulnerable. There are 52 Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental and Other Related Disabilities, or LEND, training programs and 10 developmental-behavioral pediatric training programs.

They are reauthorized, and we have one at Rutgers right in my home State. They are doing an amazing job. There are 38 organizations that support this, and I hope all Members will support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, autism spectrum disorder (ASD), is ''a neurodevelopmental condition characterized by persistent impairments in social communication and social interaction, as well as restricted and repetitive patterns of behavior, leading to difficulty in developing, maintaining and understanding relationships with others.''

As Autism Speaks notes ''it is often accompanied by sensory sensitivities and medical issues such as gastrointestinal (GI) disorders, seizures or sleep disorders, as well as mental health challenges such as anxiety, depression and attention issues.''

The Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education and Support Act—or simply the Autism CARES Act of 2019—is a comprehensive reauthorization and strengthening of America's whole-of-government Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) initiative.

As prime author of the bill let me extend special thanks to cosponsor Mike Doyle of Pennsylvania for his extraordinary leadership, partnership and friendship and to the Chairwoman of the Health subcommittee Anna Eshoo for expertly shepherding this through the committee with ranking member Dr. Michael Burgess and my deep gratitude to full committee chair Frank Pallone and ranking member Greg Walden.

I also want to thank staff including Kelsey Griswold, Kate Werley, Rachel Fybel, Dr. Kristen Shatynski, and Stephen Holland for their tremendous help and assistance.

And frankly, we couldn't have done this without so many autism advocates especially Stuart Spielman of Autism Speaks and Scott Badesch of Autism Society.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan, bicameral legislation powerfully supports and pursues durable remedies and effective interventions for the approximately 1.5 million children with ASD,—that is an estimated 1 in 59 children in the United States, in my home State of New Jersey, 1 in 34 children, the highest rate in the CDC study.

This bill also helps adults with autism who were and are today often misdiagnosed, underdiagnosed and overlooked. Language throughout the bill emphasizes that causes, diagnosis, detection, prevention and treatment of autism spectrum disorder must be throughout the lifespan of a person.

According to Drexel University's AJ Drexel Autism Center, about fifty to sixty thousand children ''age out'' to adulthood each year creating challenges for education, housing, employment and access to health care. Autism CARES of 2019 continues the work on aging out begun under the Autism CARES Act of 2014.

The Autism CARES Act of 2019 assists the parents, families and caregivers who deeply love and cherish children with ASD and want the brightest future possible for them. In addition to its groundbreaking prevalence studies and early intervention work, CDC's Learn the Signs. Act Early is an amazing tool for parents.

The legislation also robustly supports the dedicated physicians, scientists and support teams who daily strive to treat, research and provide meaningful answers.

The Autism CARES Act of 2019 authorizes a little over $1.8 billion over five years for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA).

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive Federal policy we seek to reauthorize today.

In September of 1997, Bobbie and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey—parents of two small autistic children—walked into my Ocean County office looking for help.

They believed Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted

action, especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana, so I invited the CDC, ATSDR and other Federal agencies to Brick for an investigation, only to learn that prevalence rates were high not only in Brick, but in nearby communities as well.

Believing we had a serious spike in prevalence, I introduced the ASSURE Act, cosponsored by 199 members, which was incorporated as title I of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made since. Today, the evidence suggests there is no single cause of autism or type. Genetic risk, coupled with environmental factors, including advanced parental age, low birth weight, and prematurity—among other factors—may be triggers. Other studies have identified ASD risk factors including pesticides, air pollutants, dietary factors.

Early intervention is making a major positive impact in the lives of children with ASD but parents need more support. In 2016, Bobbi Gallagher wrote a book: A Brick Wall—How a Boy with No Words Spoke to the World. In this highly personal, extraordinarily moving must read account of raising two children with autism, Bobbi writes: ''This mom thing is hard.''

Mr. Speaker, Autism CARES Act of 2019 ensures that the federal government continues to help hundreds of thousands of parents like the Gallaghers—funding research and support programs and sharing best practices. The bill reauthorizes and expands the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee (IACC) managed so effectively and professionally by Dr. Susan Daniels, Director of the Office of Autism Research Coordination (OARC).

Coordination is key to maximizing outcomes. The Director of the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH) Dr. Joshua Gordon—who also serves as IACC chair said yesterday:

''The National Institutes of Health is proud to work hand-in-hand with the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee to ensure the coordination of research efforts focusing on critical topics related to autism, such as developing early detection and screening tools, understanding the genetic and biological underpinnings of autism, and developing and testing the effectiveness of services and supports to improve functional and health outcomes of individuals with autism.''

New members of IACC added by our new bill are representatives from the Departments of Labor, Justice, Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development as well as raising from two to three members who are self-advocates, parents or legal guardians and advocacy/service organizations.

IACC not only includes a cross section of knowledgeable stakeholders, but periodically develops the IACC Strategic Plan for ASD and most recently the 2018 update.

The IACC strategic plan asks the seven most essential questions and helps steer research projects and resources to find answers including: How can I recognize the signs of ASD, and why is early detection so important?; What is the biology underlying ASD?; What causes ASD, and can disabling aspects of ASD be prevented or preempted?; Which treatments and interventions will help?; What kinds of services and supports are needed to maximize quality of life for people on the Autism spectrum?; How can we meet the needs of people with ASD as they progress into and through adulthood?; and How do we continue to build, expand, and enhance the infrastructure system to meet the needs of the ASD community?

Also, each year since 2007, IACC has published a Summary of Advances in Autism Spectrum Disorder Research.

Dr. Ann Wagner does an extraordinary job as National Autism Coordinator—created by Autism CARES Act of 2014—ensuring the implementation of national autism spectrum disorder (ASD) research, services, and support activities across federal agencies.

As my colleagues know, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) is the ''primary federal agency for improving healthcare to people who are geographically isolated, economically or medically vulnerable.'' The work begun under Autism CARES Act of 2014 continues and is expanded with this legislation including the training of health care professionals ''to provide screening, diagnostic and early, evidence-based intervention services . . . ''. This includes the 52 Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental and other Related Disabilities (LEND) training programs like the one at Rutgers in my state and 10 Developmental-Behavior Pediatric (DBP) training programs.

The HHS Secretary is empowered by the new legislation to prioritize DBP grants to ''rural and underserved areas.''

According to the April 2019 Report to Congress, most children who have autism are not diagnosed until after they reach age 4 years—or later—even though many children can be identified before age 2 years. Recent studies supported by NIH have uncovered distinct differences in the brain development of children with ASD, as early as 6 months. The earlier ASD is found, the earlier interventions can begin.

Finally, not later than 2 years after enactment, the Autism CARES Act requires a comprehensive report on the demographic factors associated with the health and well-being of individuals with ASD, recommendations on establishing best practices to ensure interdisciplinary coordination, improvements for health outcomes, community based behavioral support and interventions, nutrition and recreational and social activities, personal safety and more.

Mr. Speaker, more than three dozen major organizations have helped shape this legislation and strongly support passage including: Autism Society of America, Autism Speaks, Autism New Jersey, American Academy of Neurology, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association on Health and Disability, American Psychological Association, American Therapeutic Recreation Association, Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Association of Special Children and Families, Association of University Centers on Disability, Autism Science Foundation, Children's Hospital Association, Council on Exceptional Children, Easterseals, EveryLife Foundation, Family Voices, Family Voices New Jersey, Family Voices North Dakota, Lakeshore Foundation, Madison House Autism Foundation, Maine Parent Federation, Marcus Autism Center, National Alliance on Mental Illness, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services, National Center for Learning Disabilities, National Council on Severe Autism, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Down Syndrome Society, National Fragile X Foundation, Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies, SPAN Parent Advocacy Network, TASH, The Independence Center, The Jewish Federations of North America, Thompson Center for Autism & Neurodevelopmental Disorders.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), chairwoman of our Health Subcommittee.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee. I want to acknowledge the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, Dr. BURGESS. I want to salute Mr. DOYLE and Mr. SMITH for their passion and their advocacy inside the Congress and all the advocates and their organizations outside the Congress, without whom we wouldn't be on the floor today on this bill.

I am so proud that our Health Subcommittee advanced this bipartisan legislation, sponsored by Mr. DOYLE and Mr. SMITH.

The legislation extends the Autism CARES Act for 5 years, and that is very important. The other very important bookend is that the bill funds research at the NIH to understand the biology behind autism. It will help to build the infrastructure at CDC to advance our understanding of autism, and it trains medical providers on screening, on diagnosis, and on intervention.

I think what is so important in the paragraph that I just stated is understanding the biology behind autism. There is so much that we still don't know today. This act renews the Federal Government's commitment to getting the answers.

During the hearing on the bill at our Health Subcommittee, we heard how critical the Autism CARES programs are. Researchers, physicians, parents, and patients rely on Autism CARES to fund the support services, research, training, and surveillance programs to get people the diagnoses and the services they need.

The act expands research, and it provides services to people who are autistic, with an important focus on addressing racial disparities. Black and Latino children tend to go diagnosed later than White children and are often misdiagnosed. They have less access to services, and they are underrepresented in most autism research. This 5-year renewal addresses these disparities, as well as other challenges related to autism research, education, and detection.

My congressional district benefits directly from the act. I am proud that Stanford University receives CARES funding to research how certain innovative treatments can improve social behavior. Between 2014 and 2017, California received $237 million from the NIH to study autism.

When the Federal Government invests in research, the return on investment can improve the lives of all Americans. I hope that the House votes

unanimously for this legislation. It certainly deserves it.

Those families with loved ones who do have autism, I know that their gratitude will be unending for what is built into this act. It is worthy of them, and it is worthy of our vote.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, reauthorizing the Autism CARES Act will continue the scientific development in understanding autism and support those with autism spectrum disorder.

Since its original passage in 2006, we have invested over $3 billion for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Health Resources and Services Administration to help the autism community.

We provided services through programs and grants to benefit individuals with autism. We have improved training for those working with autistic patients, including how to better deter and diagnose autism.

We have expanded prevalence monitoring to improve our understanding of our population, and we have also invested in research that transforms our understanding of autism spectrum disorder and how we were able to treat and care for that community.

In Georgia, we are able to see up close what a big impact these programs can make in our children's lives. Children's Hospital of Atlanta's Marcus Autism Center is one of the largest autism centers in the U.S. Since opening, they have treated more than 40,000 children from Georgia and across the country, and we are blessed to have them in our State.

This reauthorization builds on our good work from the past, ensuring that places like the Marcus Autism Center can continue helping our children moving forward. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank both the chairman and the ranking member of the committee and the sponsors of this important piece of legislation. I am proud to rise in support of the Autism CARES reauthorization act.

This issue is very personal to me. As an uncle of a young man with autism, my nephew, Joshua, I know how challenging this condition can be.

I also know that, unfortunately, we still don't know the causes, let alone how to cure autism. It underscores the importance of why this legislation is so important to continue to invest in research and, at best, treatments for the condition.

We do know, Mr. Speaker, that early intervention and early treatments do make a difference in the long-term outcomes.

□ 1530

So the provisions in this bill, the Autism CARES Act, are right on point. It is well thought-out and, again, encourages both research through NIH and the talented researchers who do this important work and, again, those who also treat both children and adults with autism. It is essential we pass this bill.

We also need to pay attention to the long-term care components. There are long-term care challenges that families have to contend with. We need to do our best to support them, and Mr. Speaker, I urge passage.

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

Once again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, for being the intellectual driver and providing the enthusiasm for getting this bill to the floor and getting it passed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can stress enough how important this legislation is. I do want to thank my colleague from New Jersey, the chief sponsor, and also our Democratic sponsor, Mr. DOYLE, for pushing very hard to make sure that this bill went through regular order in a timely fashion. I agree with Dr. BURGESS that, hopefully, this is something the Senate will take up and will get to the President quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support by all of our colleagues for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1058, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act, or Autism CARES Act. This important bill, led by Representatives CHRIS SMITH and MIKE DOYLE, reauthorizes the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee along with funding for research, public health surveillance, and workforce development programs that directly impact patients with autism spectrum disorder. Reauthorization of these important initiatives demonstrates our commitment to provide a coordinated federal response to the needs of individuals diagnosed with autism and related neurodevelopmental disabilities. I'd like to thank Representatives SMITH and DOYLE for their tireless work on this important legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1058, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2035) to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2035

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 ''Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE PROGRAM.

(a) DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.—Section 2904 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ii–3) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 2904. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.

''Each eligible State agency awarded a grant or cooperative agreement under section 2902 shall collect, maintain, and report such data and records at such times, in such form, and in such manner as the Secretary may require to enable the Secretary—

''(1) to monitor State administration of programs and activities funded pursuant to such grant or cooperative agreement; and

''(2) to evaluate, and to compare effectiveness on a State-by-State basis, of programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii–4) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

''(2) $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

''(3) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2022;

''(4) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2023; and

''(5) $60,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2035.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2035, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019 sponsored by my colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman LANGEVIN. I am proud to support this program because it provides much-needed respite services and educational resources to family caregivers of children and adults of all ages with special needs.

Caring for a loved one can be incredibly rewarding but also demanding work. Surveys have shown respite is among the most frequently requested services by family caregivers. However, only a small percentage of caregivers can afford respite care. By reauthorizing and growing this program, we can expand access to these services across the country.

States who receive grants under the Lifespan Respite Care program have the flexibility to support family caregivers in a variety of ways. For example, some States use funds for consumer-directed vouchers or for the training of volunteer and paid respite providers.

My home State of New Jersey received a grant in 2011 and today still offers robust scheduled and emergency respite services to family caregivers. Without this program many families cannot afford these services.

In addition to helping relieve the emotional and financial stresses associated with caregiving, respite care can also save families and the healthcare system money. Research has shown that supporting caregivers with respite services reduces the odds of hospitalization and nursing home entry.

We know that more than 43 million adults are family caregivers of an adult or child with a disability or chronic condition, and the estimated economic value of family caregiving is approximately $470 billion annually. As our population ages, the need for long-term services and supports delivered in the home will continue to increase and, as a result, so will the burden on family caregivers.

The Lifespan Respite Care program is the only Federal program that supports respite services for all ages and conditions, so I am glad that we are renewing our commitment to the program today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the passage of H.R. 2035, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 2035, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019. As many of us know from personal experience, being a caregiver for a loved one is a challenging and exhausting job, and for many Americans, it is a second full-time job. A number of those Americans are also caring for both aging parents and their own children. That is over 40 million Americans who have taken on the role of unpaid caregiver in the past year, and as our Nation's population ages, there will be an increasing number of caregivers who are struggling to balance the demands of caregiving with the rest of their lives.

The Lifespan Respite Care program aims to assist caregivers by providing them with the opportunity for a small, much-needed break from those responsibilities. H.R. 2035 would reauthorize funding for this program through fiscal year 2024, which is important because this authorization had technically expired but continued to receive appropriations. Respite care is a critical resource for our caregivers who spend much of their time helping their loved ones each day.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and his important leadership on this bill and on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2035, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019, legislation that I introduced with my good friend and colleague from Washington State, Mrs. RODGERS.

In 2002, I authored the Lifespan Respite Care Act to create a network of services and supports for family caregivers across the Nation. In the years since the bill was signed into law in 2006, the Lifespan Respite Care program has provided grants to 37 States and the District of Columbia to streamline the delivery of planned and emergency respite services, provide access to direct care services, and address the direct service worker shortage by training respite providers. I am thrilled to be here today to continue building on Lifespan Respite Care's successes and reauthorize the program.

Mr. Speaker, family caregivers are a critical part of the long-term services and supports system in the United States. Approximately 43 million family caregivers provide hundreds of billions of dollars—and yes, that is billions with a B—in uncompensated care each year. In fact, in 2013, the last time that statistics were updated, uncompensated family care totaled—if you had to put a dollar figure to it—approximately $470 billion. That is more than Medicaid spending for that year.

Respite care services provide short-term relief for family caregivers, allowing them time to account for their own health and wellness needs. Despite respite care being one of the services most often requested by caregivers, 85 percent of family members caring for adults don't receive any respite services at all.

For many older adults and people with disabilities, receiving care in the home is preferable, both from a quality of life perspective and a financial perspective. In addition to improving caregiver health, researchers also found that providing access to services such as respite care can reduce the need for admission to more costly institutional settings and allow individuals to remain in their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, the Lifespan Respite Care program is the only Federal effort that provides family caregivers access to respite care services regardless of the age or type of disability of their loved one. This is especially important for family members caring for individuals with chronic illnesses or disabilities with an early onset, such as multiple sclerosis, brain injury, spinal cord injury, or ALS. Programs that are predicated on age or a certain degree of disability can often struggle when adapting to the needs of a young person with a degenerative disease, and the Lifespan Respite Care program helps to bridge those gaps.

For example, Lifetime Respite Care funds were used in my home State of Rhode Island to establish the CareBreaks program which helps family members caring for an individual of any age access respite when they have nowhere else to turn.

Reauthorizing the Lifespan Respite Care program at $20 million in the first year and steadily increasing funding each year after will allow each State and territory to establish and maintain a respite care program. In authoring the original bill, I recognized that different States have different needs for caregivers. Expanding funding will grow additional, unique programs that directly address community needs. By taking this important step to support family caregivers, we move forward in our efforts to provide quality, community-based care for the millions of Americans with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, as an American with a disability—in fact, the first quadriplegic elected to the United States Congress—I know the immense service that caregivers provide. I am privileged enough to have paid home health aides, and I want to thank my CNAs, Dave, Valerie, Carolyn, Kelly, and many others over the years, for the vital assistance they provide me each and every day. But, injured as I was at the age of 16, I also relied on my family members; my brothers, Rick and Dave, and my sister, Joanne, and especially my mother and my late father, Richard, for their support over the decades. I would not be here before you today without their help, and I am forever grateful to them for their love and their care.

For so many families in a similar position around the Nation, this bill recognizes their sacrifice and the immense support that they provide to their loved ones while reducing the strain on our healthcare system. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, our family caregivers are truly unsung heroes.

Beyond those who helped me personally, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the many people who were instrumental in bringing this bill to the floor. In addition to the chair and the ranking member, I also want to recognize Jill Kagan with the ARCH National Respite Network for her coalition and her coalition partners for their tireless work to help families access respite care and provide technical assistance to States building respite programs.

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on my staff, I am indebted to my health and disabilities LA Katie Lee and also Todd Adams, my Chief of Staff, who has been intimately involved in these issues for more years than he probably would like to admit.

I also want to thank again Chairman PALLONE and his staff, as well as Ranking Member WALDEN, for supporting this effort through the committee.

I also must acknowledge the leadership of Senator COLLINS. I hope that our actions today will help her in her effort to get this important bill through our sister Chamber.

Finally, again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington State, my colleague, Mrs. RODGERS, for partnering with me on this bill when we first attempted to reauthorize this program in 2011 and for her continued leadership on this issue in Congress and on many others in the disability community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support family caregivers and vote in favor of the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. RODGERS).

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to first just say how much I admire and appreciate the leadership of Mr. JAMES LANGEVIN from Rhode Island on this important legislation. I am proud to have joined with him partnering to lead the legislation this year, the Lifespan Respite Care Act of 2019.

This is important legislation. I think he laid it out really well. It is supported with bipartisan support. It would authorize $200 million in funding over the next 5 years for improved respite care services for families caring for loved ones battling chronic, debilitating conditions.

Today more than 43 million people are providing long-term care for family members in America. The role these caregivers play cannot be understated. They ensure that their loved ones receive the care that they desperately need in their homes and often at a lower cost.

Respite care providers relieve their family caregivers, and it is an essential part of our comprehensive healthcare approach. This legislation will support respite care agencies so that they can support family caregivers in communities across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it. It expands services and access to care, and it will improve healthcare outcomes.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Speaker, most insurance plans do not cover the cost of respite care, but the Administration for Community Living at the Department of Health and Human Services works with the ARCH National Respite Network and Resource Center to provide respite care to caregivers across the United States of America. This legislation is vital to ensuring that we maintain our access to respite care for our caregivers and their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support H.R. 2035, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time and just urge support for this legislation. Again, this is bipartisan, and I thank everyone who worked on it.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2035, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act. This legislation, led by Representatives JAMES LANGEVIN and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, reauthorizes critical grants to states to implement coordinated systems of respite services for caregivers, provide planned and emergency respite services, recruit and train workers and volunteers, and provide information to family caregivers to help them access these critical services. Many of us have had a loved one with a caregiver—this bill provides those caregivers with the support they need and deserve. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2035, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act. I'm proud that my Subcommittee on Health advanced this bipartisan bill, authored by Representatives LANGEVIN and MCMORRIS RODGERS.

This legislation is now being extended for five years and the funding for the program is being increased. The program is administered by the Administration for Community Living and has provided grants to 37 states and Washington, D.C. since it was created in 2009.

More than 40 million Americans serve as family caregivers and this program is their lifeline. Being an unpaid caregiver for a loved one can be physically and emotionally exhausting and isolating. The average family caregiver is a woman who works full-time and is providing care to both aging parents and children living at home.

This bill allows caregivers to take a break from their caregiving responsibilities. About 85 percent of family caregivers of adults are not receiving any respite services whatsoever but through the Lifespan Respite Care Program, caregivers can receive support services from highly qualified, well-trained staff.

Grant programs through the program support day care, transportation and summer camp for Americans living with disabilities. For their caregivers, these programs give them much needed time off, time to do chores around the house or just take a breather.

These programs are critical to the many Americans, mostly women, who are taking care of their loved ones every day. I'm proud to support this important legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2035.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2035, 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.

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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 509;

Adoption of House Resolution 509, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3375.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 397, REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3239, HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 29, 2019, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 198, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—234

Adams	Bass	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Beatty	Blunt Rochester
Allred	Bera	Bonamici
Axne	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan F.
Barragán	Bishop (GA)	

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

NAYS—198

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

□ 1614

Messrs. RUTHERFORD, JOHNSON of Ohio, and KATKO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—234

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

NAYS—195

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock

McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—3

Gibbs
Turner
Westerman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1621

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 501.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 501.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks Officer Jacob Chestnut's wife, Gwenling Chestnut, for being here with us today in the Capitol, along with her son, William Chestnut, and grandson, Jacob.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police, who were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol on July 24, 1998.

STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELGADO). 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. 3375) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 3, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—429

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—3

Amash
Biggs
Massie

□ 1631

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFFIRMING THE VALIDITY OF SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED AND INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY ANY STANDING OR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PURSUANT TO AUTHORITIES DELEGATED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). Pursuant to House Resolution 509, House Resolution 507 is considered as adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 507

Whereas Congress' power to conduct oversight and investigations is firmly rooted in its legislative authority under Article I of the Constitution, which commits to the

House of Representatives alone the authority to establish its rules governing the procedures and methods for the conduct of oversight and investigations, as well as to determine the powers that it delegates to its various committees;

Whereas those powers delegated to the committees include the power to conduct oversight into and to investigate, pursuant to the legitimate legislative purposes of the respective committees, matters involving, referring, or related, directly or indirectly, to the persons, entities, and organizations specified in this resolution;

Whereas committees of the House, pursuant to the authority delegated by clause 2(m) of rule XI and clause 11(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, have undertaken investigations and issued related subpoenas seeking personal, financial, banking, and tax information related to the President, his immediate family, and his business entities and organizations, among others;

Whereas the validity of some of these investigations and subpoenas has been incorrectly challenged in Federal court on the grounds that the investigations and subpoenas were not authorized by the full House and lacked a ''clear statement'' of intent to include the President, which the President's personal attorneys have argued in Federal court is necessary before the committees may seek information related to the President; and

Whereas while these arguments are plainly incorrect as a matter of law, it is nevertheless in the interest of the institution of the House of Representatives to avoid any doubt on this matter and to unequivocally reject these challenges presented in ongoing or future litigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives ratifies and affirms all current and future investigations, as well as all subpoenas previously issued or to be issued in the future, by any standing or permanent select committee of the House, pursuant to its jurisdiction as established by the Constitution of the United States and rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, concerning or issued directly or indirectly to—

(1) the President in his personal or official capacity;

(2) his immediate family, business entities, or organizations;

(3) the Office of the President;

(4) the Executive Office of the President;

(5) the White House;

(6) any entity within the White House;

(7) any individual currently or formerly employed by or associated with the White House;

(8) any Federal or State governmental entity or current or former employee or officer thereof seeking information involving, referring, or related to any individual or entity described in paragraphs (1) through (7); or

(9) any third party seeking information involving, referring, or related to any individual or entity described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

REPORT ON H.R. 3931, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–180) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security 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. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 516

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Rooney of Florida.

Ms. CHENEY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I respectfully urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

PROMOTING RESPECT FOR INDIVIDUALS' DIGNITY AND EQUALITY ACT OF 2019

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3299) to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for income tax returns outside the statute of limitations, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that all provisions shall apply to legally married same-sex couples in the same manner as other married couples, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3299

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 ''Promoting Respect for Individuals' Dignity and Equality Act of 2019'' or as the ''PRIDE Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN LEGALLY MARRIED COUPLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual first treated as married for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by the application of the holdings of Revenue Ruling 2013–17—

(1) if such individual filed a return (other than a joint return) for a taxable year ending before September 16, 2013, for which a joint return could have been made by the individual and the individual's spouse but for the fact that such holdings were not effective at the time of filing, such return shall be treated as a separate return within the meaning of section 6013(b) of such Code and the time prescribed by section 6013(b)(2)(A) of such Code for filing a joint return after filing a separate return shall not expire before the date prescribed by law (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for the taxable year that includes the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) in the case of a joint return filed pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) the period of limitation prescribed by section 6511(a) of such Code for any such taxable year shall be extended until the date prescribed by law (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for the taxable year that includes the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) section 6511(b)(2) of such Code shall not apply to any claim of credit or refund with respect to such return.

(b) AMENDMENTS, ETC. RESTRICTED TO CHANGE IN MARITAL STATUS.—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to amendments to the return of tax, and claims for credit or refund, relating to a change in the marital status for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of the individual.

SEC. 3. RULES RELATING TO ALL LEGALLY MARRIED COUPLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in section 21(d)(2)—

(A) by striking ''HIMSELF'' in the heading and inserting ''SELF''; and

(B) by striking ''any husband and wife'' and inserting ''any married couple'';

(2) in section 22(e)(1)—

(A) by striking ''husband and wife who live'' and inserting ''married couple who lives''; and

(B) by striking ''the taxpayer and his spouse'' and inserting ''the taxpayer and the spouse of the taxpayer'';

(3) in section 38(c)(6)(A), by striking ''husband or wife who files'' and inserting ''married individual who files'';

(4) in section 42(j)(5)(C), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

''(i) MARRIED COUPLE TREATED AS 1 PARTNER.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), individuals married to one another (and their estates) shall be treated as 1 partner.'';

(5) in section 62(b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''husband and wife who lived apart'' and inserting ''married couple who lived apart''; and

(ii) by striking ''the taxpayer and his spouse'' and inserting ''the taxpayer and the spouse of the taxpayer''; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(6) in section 121—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''husband and wife who make'' and inserting ''married couple who makes''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''husband and wife make'' and inserting ''married couple makes'';

(7) in section 165(h)(4)(B), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(8) in section 179(b)(4), by striking ''a husband and wife filing'' and inserting ''individuals married to one another who file'';

(9) in section 213(d)(8), by striking ''status as husband and wife'' and inserting ''marital status'';

(10) in section 219(g)(4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''A husband and wife'' and inserting ''Married individuals'';

(11) in section 274(b)(2)(B), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(12) in section 643(f), by striking ''husband and wife'' in the second sentence and inserting ''married couple'';

(13) in section 761(f)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(14) in section 911—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY INCOME.—In applying subparagraph (A) with respect to amounts received from services performed by a married individual which are community income under community property laws applicable to such income, the aggregate amount which may be excludable from the gross income of such individual and such individual's spouse under subsection (a)(1) for any taxable year shall equal the amount which would be so excludable if such amounts did not constitute community income.''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(9)(A), by striking ''where a husband and wife each have'' and inserting ''where both spouses have'';

(15) in section 1244(b)(2), by striking ''a husband and wife filing'';

(16) in section 1272(a)(2)(D), by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(iii) TREATMENT OF A MARRIED COUPLE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, a married couple shall be treated as 1 person. The preceding sentence shall not apply where the spouses lived apart at all times during the taxable year in which the loan is made.'';

(17) in section 1313(c)(1), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''spouses'';

(18) in section 1361(c)(1)(A)(i), by striking ''a husband and wife'' and inserting ''a married couple'';

(19) in section 2040(b), by striking ''CERTAIN JOINT INTERESTS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE'' in the heading and inserting ''CERTAIN JOINT INTERESTS OF MARRIED COUPLE'';

(20) in section 2513—

(A) by striking ''**GIFT BY HUSBAND OR WIFE TO THIRD PARTY**'' in the heading and inserting ''**GIFT BY SPOUSE TO THIRD PARTY**''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A gift made by one individual to any person other than such individual's spouse shall, for the purposes of this chapter, be considered as made one-half by the individual and one-half by such individual's spouse, but only if at the time of the gift each spouse is a citizen or resident of the United States. This paragraph shall not apply with respect to a gift by an individual of an interest in property if such individual creates in the individual's spouse a general power of appointment, as defined in section 2514(c), over such interest. For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered as the spouse of another only if the individual is married to the individual's spouse at the time of the gift and does not remarry during the remainder of the calendar year.'';

(21) in section 2516—

(A) by striking ''Where a husband and wife enter'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Where a married couple enters''; and

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

''(b) SPOUSE.—For purposes of this section, if the spouses referred to are divorced, wherever appropriate to the meaning of this section, the term 'spouse' shall read 'former spouse'.'';

(22) in section 5733(d)(2), by striking ''husband or wife'' and inserting ''married individual'';

(23) in section 6013—

(A) by striking ''**JOINT RETURNS OF INCOME TAX BY HUSBAND AND WIFE**'' in the heading and inserting ''**JOINT RETURNS OF INCOME TAX BY A MARRIED COUPLE**'';

(B) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(C) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''either the husband or wife'' and inserting ''either spouse'';

(D) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''spouses''; and

(ii) by striking ''his taxable year'' and inserting ''such spouse's taxable year'';

(E) in subsection (a)(3)—

(i) by striking ''his executor or administrator'' and inserting ''the decedent's executor or administrator'';

(ii) by striking ''with respect to both himself and the decedent'' and inserting ''with respect to both the surviving spouse and the decedent''; and

(iii) by striking ''constitute his separate return'' and inserting ''constitute the survivor's separate return'';

(F) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an individual has filed a separate return for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made by the individual and the individual's spouse under subsection (a) and the time prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year has expired, such individual and such spouse may nevertheless make a joint return for such taxable year. A joint return filed under this subsection shall constitute the return of the individual and the individual's spouse for such taxable year, and all payments, credits, refunds, or other repayments made or allowed with respect to the separate return of either spouse for such taxable year shall be taken into account in determining the extent to which the tax based upon the joint return has been paid. If a joint return is made under this subsection, any election (other than the election to file a separate return) made by either spouse in a separate return for such taxable year with respect to the treatment of any income, deduction, or credit of such spouse shall not be changed in the making of the joint return where such election would have been irrevocable if the joint return had not been made. If a joint return is made under this subsection after the death of either spouse, such return with respect to the decedent can be made only by the decedent's executor or administrator.'';

(G) in subsection (c), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''spouses'';

(H) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''status as husband and wife'' and inserting ''the marital status with respect to each other'';

(I) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the spouse of the individual'';

(J) in subsection (f)(2)(B), by striking ''such individual, his spouse, and his estate shall be determined as if he were alive'' and inserting ''such individual, the individual's spouse, and the individual's estate shall be determined as if the individual were alive''; and

(K) in subsection (f)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''for which he is entitled'' and inserting ''for which such member is entitled''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''for which he is entitled'' and inserting ''for which such employee is entitled'';

(24) in section 6014(b), by striking ''husband and wife'' in the second sentence and inserting ''a married couple'';

(25) in section 6017, by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(26) in section 6096(a), by striking ''of husband and wife having'' and inserting ''reporting'';

(27) in section 6166(b)(2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) CERTAIN INTERESTS HELD BY MARRIED COUPLE.—Stock or a partnership interest which—

''(i) is community property of a married couple (or the income from which is community income) under the applicable community property law of a State, or

''(ii) is held by a married couple as joint tenants, tenants by the entirety, or tenants in common,

shall be treated as owned by 1 shareholder or 1 partner, as the case may be.'';

(28) in section 6212(b)(2)—

(A) by striking ''return filed by husband and wife'' and inserting ''return''; and

(B) by striking ''his last known address'' and inserting ''the last known address of such spouse'';

(29) in section 7428(c)(2)(A), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple'';

(30) in section 7701(a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (17); and

(B) in paragraph (38), by striking ''husband and wife'' and inserting ''married couple''; and

(31) in section 7872(f), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(7) MARRIED COUPLE TREATED AS 1 PERSON.—A married couple shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 12 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2513 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 2513. Gift by spouse to third party.''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart B of part II of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 6013 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 6013. Joint returns of income tax by a married couple.''.

SEC. 4. RULES RELATING TO THE GENDER OF SPOUSES, ETC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his spouse'' each place

it appears and inserting ''the individual's spouse'':

(1) Subsections (a)(1) and (d) of section 1.

(2) Section 2(b)(2)(A).

(3) Subsections (d)(1)(B) and (e)(3) of section 21.

(4) Section 36(c)(5).

(5) Section 179(d)(2)(A).

(6) Section 318(a)(1)(A)(i).

(7) Section 408(d)(6).

(8) Section 469(i)(5)(B)(ii).

(9) Section 507(d)(2)(B)(iii).

(10) Clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 613A(c)(8)(D).

(11) Section 672(e)(2).

(12) Section 704(e)(2).

(13) Subparagraphs (A) and (B)(ii) of section 911(c)(3).

(14) Section 1235(c)(2).

(15) Section 1563(e)(5).

(16) Section 3121(b)(3)(B).

(17) Section 4946(d).

(18) Section 4975(e)(6).

(19) Subparagraphs (A)(iv) and (B) of section 6012(a)(1).

(20) Section 7703(a).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his spouse'' each place it appears and inserting ''the taxpayer's spouse'':

(A) Section 2(a)(2)(B).

(B) Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 2(b)(2).

(C) Paragraphs (2) and (6)(A) of section 21(e).

(D) Section 36B(e)(1).

(E) Section 63(e)(3)(B).

(F) Section 86(c)(1)(C)(ii).

(G) Section 105(c)(1).

(H) Section 135(d)(3).

(I) Section 151(b).

(J) Subsections (a) and (d)(7) of section 213.

(K) Section 1233(e)(2)(C).

(L) Section 1239(b)(2).

(M) Section 6504(2).

(2) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his spouse'' each place it appears and inserting ''the employee's spouse'':

(A) Section 132(m)(1).

(B) Section 401(h)(6).

(C) Section 3402(l)(3).

(3) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his taxable year'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual's taxable year'':

(A) Section 2(b)(1).

(B) Section 7703(a)(1).

(4) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his taxable year'' each place it appears and inserting ''the taxpayer's taxable year'':

(A) Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 2(b)(2) (as amended by paragraph (1)(B)).

(B) Section 63(f)(1)(A).

(5) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''his home'' and inserting ''the individual's home'':

(A) Section 2(b)(1)(A).

(B) Section 21(e)(4)(A)(i).

(C) Section 7703(b)(1).

(6) The Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this section, is amended—

(A) in section 2(a)(1)(A), by striking ''his two taxable years'' and inserting ''the taxpayer's two taxable years'';

(B) in section 2(a)(1)(B), by striking ''his home'' and inserting ''the taxpayer's home'';

(C) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of section 63(f), by striking ''for himself if he'' both places it appears and inserting ''for the taxpayer if the taxpayer'';

(D) in section 63(f)(4), by striking ''his'' both places it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(E) in section 105(b)—

(i) by striking ''his spouse, his dependents'' and inserting ''the taxpayer's spouse, the taxpayer's dependents''; and

(ii) by striking ''by him'';

(F) in the heading of section 119(a), by striking '', HIS SPOUSE, AND HIS DEPENDENTS'' and inserting ''AND THE EMPLOYEE'S SPOUSE AND DEPENDENTS'';

(G) in section 119(a), by striking ''him, his spouse, or any of his dependents by or on behalf of his employer'' and inserting ''the employee or the employee's spouse or dependents by or on behalf of the employer of the employee'';

(H) in section 119(a)(2), by striking ''his'' both places it appears and inserting ''the employee's'';

(I) in section 119(d)(3)(B), by striking ''his spouse, and any of his dependents'' and inserting ''the employee's spouse, and any of the employee's dependents'';

(J) in section 129(b)(2), by striking ''himself'' and inserting ''the spouse's self'';

(K) in section 170(b)(1)(F)(iii)—

(i) by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the spouse of such donor''; and

(ii) by striking ''his death or after the death of his surviving spouse if she'' and inserting ''the death of the donor or after the death of the donor's surviving spouse if such surviving spouse'';

(L) in section 213(c)(1)—

(i) by striking ''his estate'' and inserting ''the estate of the taxpayer''; and

(ii) by striking ''his death'' and inserting ''the death of the taxpayer'';

(M) in section 213(d)(7), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the taxpayer'';

(N) in section 217(g)—

(i) by striking '', his spouse, or his dependents'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''or the spouse or dependents of such member'';

(ii) by striking ''his dependents'' in paragraph (3) and inserting ''dependents''; and

(iii) by striking ''his spouse'' each place it appears in paragraph (3) and inserting ''the member's spouse'';

(O) in section 217(i)(3)(A), by striking ''his'';

(P) in section 267(c), by striking ''his'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(Q) in section 318(a)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the individual's'';

(R) in section 402(l)(4)(D), by striking '', his spouse, and dependents'' and inserting ''and the spouse and dependents of such officer'';

(S) in section 415(l)(2)(B), by striking '', his spouse, or his dependents'' and inserting ''or the participant's spouse or dependents'';

(T) in section 420(f)(6)(A), by striking ''his covered spouse and dependents'' each place it appears and inserting ''the covered spouse and dependents of such retiree'';

(U) in section 424(d)(1), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the individual's'';

(V) in section 544(a)(2), by striking ''his'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(W) in section 911(c)(3), by striking ''him'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (B)(ii) and inserting ''the individual'';

(X) in section 1015(d)(3), by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the donor's spouse'';

(Y) in section 1563(e)—

(i) by striking ''his children'' both places it appears in paragraphs (5)(D) and (6)(A) and inserting ''the individual's children''; and

(ii) by striking ''his parents'' both places it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (6) and inserting ''the individual's parents'';

(Z) in section 1563(f)(2)(B), by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the individual'';

(AA) in section 2012(c), by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the decedent's spouse'';

(BB) in section 2032A(e)(10), by striking ''his surviving spouse'' and inserting ''the decedent's surviving spouse'';

(CC) in section 2035(b)—

(i) by striking ''his estate'' and inserting ''the decedent's estate''; and

(ii) by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the decedent's spouse'';

(DD) in subsections (a) and (b)(5) of section 2056, by striking ''his'';

(EE) in section 2523(b)—

(i) by striking ''(or his heirs or assigns) or such person (or his heirs or assigns)'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''(or the donor's heirs or assigns) or such person (or such person's heirs or assigns)'';

(ii) by striking ''himself'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''the donor's self'';

(iii) by striking ''he'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''the donor''; and

(iv) by striking ''him'' each place it appears in the matter following paragraph (2) and inserting ''the donor'';

(FF) in section 2523(d), by striking ''himself'' and inserting ''the donor's self'';

(GG) in section 2523(e), by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''the donor's spouse'';

(HH) in section 3121(b)(3)—

(i) by striking ''his father'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''the child's father'';

(ii) by striking ''his father'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''the individual's father''; and

(iii) by striking ''his son'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''the individual's son'';

(II) in section 3306(c)(5)—

(i) by striking ''his son'' and inserting ''the individual's son''; and

(ii) by striking ''his father'' and inserting ''the child's father'';

(JJ) in section 3402(l)—

(i) by striking ''he'' each place it appears in paragraphs (2) and (3)(A) and inserting ''the employee''; and

(ii) by striking ''his taxable year'' both places it appears in paragraph (3)(B) and inserting ''the employee's taxable year'';

(KK) in section 4905(a), by striking ''his spouse'' and inserting ''such person's spouse'';

(LL) in section 6046(c), by striking ''his'' both places it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(MM) in section 6103(e)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the individual'';

(NN) in section 7448(a)(8), by striking ''his death'' and inserting ''the individual's death'';

(OO) in subsections (d), (m), and (n) of section 7448, by striking ''his'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(PP) in subsection (m) of section 7448, as so amended, by striking ''he'' each place it appears and inserting ''such judge or special trial judge''; and

(QQ) in section 7448(q)—

(i) by striking ''his'' both places it appears and inserting ''such judge's''; and

(ii) by striking ''to bring himself'' and inserting ''to come''.

SEC. 5. INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 6651 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$330'' and inserting ''$435''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 6651(j)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''$330'' and inserting ''$435''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be filed after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 6. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of the PRIDE Act, the bill I authored with Congressman ANDY LEVIN of Michigan, to bring equality to our tax law.

Last month, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall riots, which marked the launch of a pivotal movement for gay rights in our country and across the world. Since then, the LGBT movement has fought battles on the local and Federal level to gain the equal rights that all Americans deserve. To the enormous joy of millions of American families, the Supreme Court ultimately ruled that same-sex marriages are equal.

''Love is love'' went the cry, but you would not know it by looking at our Tax Code. Today, a same-sex couple filing their taxes is still forced to contend with out-of-date references that no longer reflect what marriage looks like in this country.

Filing taxes can be unpleasant enough as it is. No family should feel excluded in this process. Most importantly, our Tax Code should not be defining families in outdated and discriminatory ways. That is what this legislation will fix.

With a simple change to gender language removing requirements for ''husband and wife,'' instead using words like ''they'' and ''married couple,'' we can put the equality promised by our Constitution into the Code.

This bill corrects a second injustice, as well.

For years, the Defense of Marriage Act prevented the Federal Government from recognizing same-sex marriage, even as States began allowing for it. That meant that married couples were being denied the Federal tax refunds they earned simply because of whom they loved. That was blatantly wrong, which is why DOMA was struck down by the Supreme Court in 2013.

But though DOMA was gone, many of the impacted families were unable to amend their tax returns because of a restriction in the Tax Code that only allows married couples to amend returns from 3 years ago. That restriction was keeping money out of the pockets of families who had earned it.

That is why my bill corrects this, to allow the IRS to provide refunds to same-sex couples who married in States that recognized same-sex marriage before DOMA was overturned. This is expected to give over $50 million back to the families who should never have had to file separately in the first place.

These are commonsense changes that recognize the reality that marriage does not just mean one man and one woman. That is a lesson already recognized by children across the country who know that no matter who their parents are, they are a family. They should not be told otherwise by an outdated Tax Code.

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

□ 1645

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

Madam Speaker, first, I rise to thank my colleague, Ms. CHU, on the other side of the aisle for her efforts on this legislation.

As we are proposing this legislation, Madam Speaker, we recognize that discrimination in any form is never acceptable and that also the PRIDE Act would remove that gender language in our Tax Code of ''husband and wife,'' consistent with that of the U.S. Supreme Court and now as recognized as the law of the land.

As we have expressed previously in some of our hearings on this matter, there are some administrative concerns that we still hold on our side of the aisle in regard to this legislation, in regard to the audit function, the look-back opportunities that are there in regard to the removal of IRS tax records after 6 years, and some issues technical in nature that deal with compliance with this legislation.

We hope that those concerns can be dealt with administratively, but at its heart, I personally stand here and join with my colleague from California in support of this legislation and look forward to the adoption of it, as I anticipate the passage of it here on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the chair of our committee who has led us in such an excellent way.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for the really extraordinary job and leadership that she offered on this legislation.

For far too long, LGBTQ Americans have been denied equal treatment under the Tax Code. Six years after the Supreme Court found it unconstitutional to deny same-sex couples the full rights and privileges of marriage, Congress has yet to rectify the consequences of the Tax Code's discrimination against LGBTQ couples.

We must live up to our duty to govern in a manner such that everyone is treated equally under the law, which is why I stand in support today of this legislation.

Last month marked the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall riots. Recognizing the deep historical importance of this event in a decades-long fight for equality, the PRIDE Act—which, by the way, passed the Ways and Means Committee unanimously—seeks to end and correct discriminatory practices in our tax system affecting LGBTQ community members.

The PRIDE Act essentially clarifies that all Federal tax provisions respecting marriage will apply to legally married same-sex couples by removing gender language related to married couples from the Tax Code.

Additionally, this bill will reconcile discriminatory Federal policies by ensuring fair tax treatment for those couples for every year of their marriage. This is the way anybody is treated in the Tax Code if they choose to take advantage of that deduction.

I take pride in hailing from Massachusetts, which was the first State to legalize same-sex marriage. While Massachusetts has issued marriage licenses to all couples since 2004, 15 years now, the Federal Government has failed to recognize the full tenure of legal married status for those couples who have been married since 2010.

The PRIDE Act extends to same-sex couples the opportunity to amend their returns to reflect their marital status and claim the ensuing tax benefits wrongfully denied to them before 2010.

So part of this is legislative, but part of this is also clarification.

The changes in the bill state loudly and clearly that the Federal Government respects the dignity and equality of all married couples, regardless of gender or sexual orientation.

For this reason, Madam Speaker, it is my sincere wish that all of our colleagues once again will join in supporting this legislation.

America's opinions have changed, and we would like the Tax Code to reflect the changes that the American people have clearly led the way on.

Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CHU. This was really complicated work that she began undertaking, but she also made it clear that this legislation moves us closer to ensuring that our laws respect the dignity of all Americans.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who does great work.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the reason I am behind the microphone is because, in the committee, we actually asked the question of staff and others who were testifying that this look-back to be able to file for the marriage deduction and benefits would not create a new avenue of audit, would not create a new channel for opening up someone's tax records for a new line of investigation.

The feedback we received as a committee was saying, no, this was very specifically just to this benefit.

Did the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) hear the same thing?

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, that was carefully tailored, yes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I just thought it is important for all of us to hear it on the RECORD that we are not opening up a new avenue of investigation because I need to be brutally honest that the language of the legislation, I don't think, is crisp enough on that point. Let's make sure it is cleanly in at least the RECORD we have produced here today.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his friendly inquiry.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is the coauthor of this bill and introduced this bill with me.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of the Promoting Respect for Individuals' Dignity and Equality, or PRIDE, Act, which I have been privileged to colead with Congresswoman CHU.

This bill is about moving our country closer to true equality and equity for the LGBTQ community. We have an opportunity today to send a message to LGBTQ married couples across America that their unions are recognized, valued, and dignified by the U.S. Government.

I am especially proud that this bill includes the text of my bill, H.R. 1244, the Equal Dignity for Married Taxpayers Act, which addresses the glaring problem that the Tax Code is replete with out-of-date references to marriage that no longer reflect the institution of legal marriage in this country.

Our Tax Code, like all of our laws, should accurately represent and include all the people to whom it applies.

Gendered language in the Tax Code represents a time when LGBTQ couples could not get married. Fortunately, those days are over, and marriage equality is the law of the land.

We need to ensure that our laws reflect the vibrant diversity of our democracy, and this legislation will remove another vestige of discrimination from our country's code of laws.

Including language that is inclusive of LGBTQ couples and families is a small change that will have a huge impact, affirming loud and clear to all of our brothers and sisters and siblings in spirit in the LGBTQ community that we love them, that they are part of our Nation.

We also have an opportunity with the PRIDE Act to correct an injustice experienced by LGBTQ couples who married in States before marriage equality was finally recognized nationwide in the Supreme Court's Obergefell v. Hodges decision.

For years, LGBTQ couples in States that recognized legal marriage were wrongfully denied Federal tax refunds. The PRIDE Act will allow those couples to amend their past tax returns and receive the corresponding benefits.

Protecting LGBTQ families is not just about the LGBTQ community. It is about our never-ending pursuit to move America closer to freedom and justice for all.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CHU for her tremendous leadership and for her partnership, and I thank Chairman NEAL for prioritizing this effort.

Madam Speaker, I also thank my predecessor and my dad, Congressman Sandy Levin, who first introduced the Equal Dignity for Married Taxpayers Act in 2015.

Madam Speaker, I urge strong support for this legislation across the aisle, both sides, and I look forward to the day when it becomes law.

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

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to recognize my colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, and his efforts on this matter, as well to recognize the service of our fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee, his father, Sandy Levin.

Sandy Levin was an individual who, even though we passionately disagreed ideologically and philosophically often, was a gentleman I enjoyed getting to know. I appreciate his commitment to this issue, as well as now his son carrying on that legacy. That, to me, is a shining example of this institution, where people can believe passionately in their ideology and still work together in order to deal in a positive way for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is the co-chair of the Equality Caucus.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Ms. CHU, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in affirming the dignity and respect for married LGBTQ couples.

H.R. 3299, the PRIDE Act, would bring parity to LGBTQ couples and the benefits afforded to heterosexual married couples in our Tax Code.

The PRIDE Act allows married same-sex couples to file claims for tax credits and refunds back to the year of their marriage. Allowing these claims to be dated back to the original marriage dates respects the spirit of the Supreme Court's Windsor decision and underscores that the IRS must recognize same-sex marriages and afford them equal protection under the law.

Equality takes many forms. It means civil, social, and financial equality. This legislation directly tackles financial inequality created by parts of our Tax Code head-on.

The PRIDE Act also modifies the Tax Code to change language used to distinguish married couples to be gender-neutral. By changing dated and limited terms such as ''husband and wife,'' our laws will become more inclusive.

Language is powerful. We must ensure that the language in our laws reflects our values and does not exclude members of the LGBTQ community from enjoying the same benefits as their heterosexual counterparts.

Congress must do everything it can to guarantee equal treatment under the law for every person, regardless of their gender identity or sexual orientation.

This bill upholds our commitment to family values by ensuring that every family, including LGBTQ families, can enjoy the same benefits in our Tax Code, and it helps us get one step closer to full equality.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would just echo as we started. I thank my colleague from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for her efforts on this issue. I thank our chairman, Mr. NEAL, who has artfully indicated his words on the RECORD in regard to this issue.

Madam Speaker, what I would encourage Members to do is to consider passage of this legislation—I know I personally will be supporting this legislation—to make sure that our Tax Code is reflective of the law of the land as it has been declared by the Supreme Court.

We recognize the administrative problems that have been raised through the hearing process and the colloquy with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and we hope that those issues can be administratively resolved.

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

□ 1700

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, it is long overdue for Congress to take action to ensure equal dignity in our Tax Code. The product will send a strong message to our LGBT brothers and sisters to say that our Tax Code should represent you, too.

I am proud that this bill is endorsed by the Human Rights Campaign and passed unanimously out of the Ways and Means Committee. I strongly urge my colleagues to continue to build on this progress and support its passage on the House floor.

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 California (Ms. JUDY CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3299, 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.

REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 509, I call up the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 509, in lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–24 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 397

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 ''Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. PENSION REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION; ESTABLISHMENT; POWERS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Treasury an agency to be known as the ''Pension Rehabilitation Administration''.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There shall be at the head of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration a Director, who shall be appointed by the President.

(2) TERM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term of office of the Director shall be 5 years.

(B) SERVICE UNTIL APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR.—An individual serving as Director at the expiration of a term may continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

(3) POWERS.—

(A) APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—The Director may appoint Deputy Directors, officers, and employees, including attorneys, in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) CONTRACTING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director may contract for financial and administrative services (including those related to budget and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) with the General Services Administration, or such other Federal agency as the Director determines appropriate, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Director and the head of the Federal agency providing the services.

(ii) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Contract authority under clause (i) shall be effective for any fiscal year only to the extent that appropriations are available for that purpose.

SEC. 3. PENSION REHABILITATION TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9512. PENSION REHABILITATION TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund' (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Fund'), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section and section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—

''(1) AMOUNTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO TREASURY BONDS.—There shall be credited to the Fund the amounts transferred under section 6 of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019.

''(2) LOAN INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration established under section 2 of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 shall deposit in the Fund any amounts received from a plan as payment of interest or principal on a loan under section 4 of such Act.

''(B) INTEREST.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'interest' includes points and other similar amounts.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts credited to or deposited in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

''(c) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund are available without further appropriation to the Pension Rehabilitation Administration—

''(1) for the purpose of making the loans described in section 4 of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019,

''(2) for the payment of principal and interest on obligations issued under section 6 of such Act, and

''(3) for administrative and operating expenses of such Administration.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9512. Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund.''.

SEC. 4. LOAN PROGRAM FOR MULTIEMPLOYER DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS.

(a) LOAN AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Pension Rehabilitation Administration established under section 2 is authorized—

(A) to make loans to multiemployer plans (as defined in section 414(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) which are defined benefit plans (as defined in section 414(j) of such Code) and which—

(i) are in critical and declining status (within the meaning of section 432(b)(6) of such Code and section 305(b)(6) of the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act) as of the date of the enactment of this section, or with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 432(e)(9) of such Code and section 305(e)(9) of such Act as of such date;

(ii) as of such date of enactment, are in critical status (within the meaning of section 432(b)(2) of such Code and section 305(b)(2) of such Act), have a modified funded percentage of less than 40 percent, and have a ratio of active to inactive participants which is less than 2 to 5; or

(iii) are insolvent for purposes of section 418E of such Code as of such date of enactment, if they became insolvent after December 16, 2014, and have not been terminated; and

(B) subject to subsection (b), to establish appropriate terms for such loans.

For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the term ''modified funded percentage'' means the percentage equal to a fraction the numerator of which is current value of plan assets (as defined in section 3(26) of such Act) and the denominator of which is current liabilities (as defined in section 431(c)(6)(D) of such Code and section 304(c)(6)(D) of such Act).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation before making any loan under paragraph (1), and shall share with such persons the application and plan information with respect to each such loan.

(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF LOAN PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A program to make the loans authorized under this section shall be established not later than September 30, 2019, with guidance regarding such program to be promulgated by the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration, in consultation with the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Labor, not later than December 31, 2019.

(B) LOANS AUTHORIZED BEFORE PROGRAM DATE.—Without regard to whether the program under subparagraph (A) has been established, a plan may apply for a loan under this section before either date described in such subparagraph, and the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall approve the application and make the loan before establishment of the program if necessary to avoid any suspension of the accrued benefits of participants.

(b) LOAN TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms of any loan made under subsection (a) shall state that—

(A) the plan shall make payments of interest on the loan for a period of 29 years beginning on the date of the loan (or 19 years in the case of a plan making the election under subsection (c)(5));

(B) final payment of interest and principal shall be due in the 30th year after the date of the loan (except as provided in an election under subsection (c)(5)); and

(C) as a condition of the loan, the plan sponsor stipulates that—

(i) except as provided in clause (ii), the plan will not increase benefits, allow any employer participating in the plan to reduce its contributions, or accept any collective bargaining agreement which provides for reduced contribution rates, during the 30-year period described in subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(ii) in the case of a plan with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 432(e)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 305(e)(9) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or under section 418E of such Code, before the loan, the plan will reinstate the suspended benefits (or will not carry out any suspension which has been approved but not yet implemented);

(iii) the plan sponsor will comply with the requirements of section 6059A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(iv) the plan will continue to pay all premiums due under section 4007 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; and

(v) the plan and plan administrator will meet such other requirements as the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration provides in the loan terms.

The terms of the loan shall not make reference to whether the plan is receiving financial assistance under section 4261(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1431(d)) or to any adjustment of the loan amount under subsection (d)(2)(A)(ii).

(2) INTEREST RATE.—Except as provided in the second sentence of this paragraph and subsection (c)(5), loans made under subsection (a) shall have as low an interest rate as is feasible. Such rate shall be determined by the Pension Rehabilitation Administration and shall—

(A) not be lower than the rate of interest on 30-year Treasury securities on the first day of the calendar year in which the loan is issued, and

(B) not exceed the greater of—

(i) a rate 0.2 percentage points higher than such rate of interest on such date, or

(ii) the rate necessary to collect revenues sufficient to administer the program under this section.

(c) LOAN APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In applying for a loan under subsection (a), the plan sponsor shall—

(A) demonstrate that, except as provided in subparagraph (C)—

(i) the loan will enable the plan to avoid insolvency for at least the 30-year period described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1) or, in the case of a plan which is already insolvent, to emerge from insolvency within and avoid insolvency for the remainder of such period; and

(ii) the plan is reasonably expected to be able to pay benefits and the interest on the loan during such period and to accumulate sufficient funds to repay the principal when due;

(B) provide the plan's most recently filed Form 5500 as of the date of application and any other information necessary to determine the loan amount under subsection (d);

(C) stipulate whether the plan is also applying for financial assistance under section 4261(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1431(d)) in combination with the loan to enable the plan to avoid insolvency and to pay benefits, or is already receiving such financial assistance as a result of a previous application;

(D) state in what manner the loan proceeds will be invested pursuant to subsection (d), the person from whom any annuity contracts under such subsection will be purchased, and the person who will be the investment manager for any portfolio implemented under such subsection; and

(E) include such other information and certifications as the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall require.

(2) STANDARD FOR ACCEPTING ACTUARIAL AND PLAN SPONSOR DETERMINATIONS AND DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE APPLICATION.—In evaluating the plan sponsor's application, the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall accept the determinations and demonstrations in the application unless the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Labor, concludes that any such determinations or demonstrations in the application (or any underlying assumptions) are unreasonable or are inconsistent with any rules issued by the Director pursuant to subsection (g).

(3) REQUIRED ACTIONS; DEEMED APPROVAL.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall approve or deny any application under this subsection within 90 days after the submission of such application. An application shall be deemed approved unless, within such 90 days, the Director notifies the plan sponsor of the denial of such application and the reasons for such denial. Any approval or denial of an application by the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall be treated as a final agency action for purposes of section 704 of title 5, United States Code. The Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall make the loan pursuant to any application promptly after the approval of such application.

(4) CERTAIN PLANS REQUIRED TO APPLY.—The plan sponsor of any plan with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 432(e)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 305(e)(9) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 or under section 418E of such Code, before the date of the enactment of this Act shall apply for a loan under this section. The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall provide for such plan sponsors to use the simplified application under subsection (d)(2)(B).

(5) INCENTIVE FOR EARLY REPAYMENT.—The plan sponsor may elect at the time of the application to repay the loan principal, along with the remaining interest, at least as rapidly as equal installments over the 10-year period beginning with the 21st year after the date of the loan. In the case of a plan making this election, the interest on the loan shall be reduced by 0.5 percentage points.

(d) LOAN AMOUNT AND USE.—

(1) AMOUNT OF LOAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2), the amount of any loan under subsection (a) shall be, as demonstrated by the plan sponsor on the application under subsection (c), the amount needed to purchase annuity contracts or to implement a portfolio described in paragraph (3)(C) (or a combination of the two) sufficient to provide benefits of participants and beneficiaries of the plan in pay status, and terminated vested benefits, at the time the loan is made.

(B) PLANS WITH SUSPENDED BENEFITS.—In the case of a plan with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 432(e)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 305(e)(9) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1085(e)(9)) or under section 418E of such Code—

(i) the suspension of benefits shall not be taken into account in applying subparagraph (A); and

(ii) the loan amount shall be the amount sufficient to provide benefits of participants and beneficiaries of the plan in pay status and terminated vested benefits at the time the loan is made, determined without regard to the suspension, including retroactive payment of benefits which would otherwise have been payable during the period of the suspension.

(2) COORDINATION WITH PBGC FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan which is also applying for financial assistance under section 4261(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1431(d))—

(i) the plan sponsor shall submit the loan application and the application for financial assistance jointly to the Pension Rehabilitation Administration and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation with the information necessary to determine the eligibility for and amount of the loan under this section and the financial assistance under section 4261(d) of such Act; and

(ii) if such financial assistance is granted, the amount of the loan under subsection (a) shall not exceed an amount equal to the excess of—

(I) the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)(ii) (whichever is applicable); over

(II) the amount of such financial assistance.

(B) PLANS ALREADY RECEIVING PBGC ASSISTANCE.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall provide for a simplified application for the loan under this section which may be used by an insolvent plan which has not been terminated and which is already receiving financial assistance (other than under section 4261(d) of such Act) from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation at the time of the application for the loan under this section.

(3) USE OF LOAN FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 432(f)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 305(f)(2)(A)(ii) of such Act, the loan received under subsection (a) shall only be used to purchase annuity contracts which meet the requirements of subparagraph (B) or to implement a portfolio described in subparagraph (C) (or a combination of the two) to provide the benefits described in paragraph (1).

(B) ANNUITY CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—The annuity contracts purchased under subparagraph (A) shall be issued by an insurance company which is licensed to do business under the laws of any State and which is rated A or better by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and the purchase of such contracts shall meet all applicable fiduciary standards under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(C) PORTFOLIO.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A portfolio described in this subparagraph is—

(I) a cash matching portfolio or duration matching portfolio consisting of investment grade (as rated by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization) fixed income investments, including United States dollar-denominated public or private debt obligations issued or guaranteed by the United States or a foreign issuer, which are tradeable in United States currency and are issued at fixed or zero coupon rates; or

(II) any other portfolio prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury in regulations which has a similar risk profile to the portfolios described in subclause (I) and is equally protective of the interests of participants and beneficiaries.

Once implemented, such a portfolio shall be maintained until all liabilities to participants and beneficiaries in pay status, and terminated vested participants, at the time of the loan are satisfied.

(ii) FIDUCIARY DUTY.—Any investment manager of a portfolio under this subparagraph shall acknowledge in writing that such person is a fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the plan.

(iii) TREATMENT OF PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—Participants and beneficiaries covered by a portfolio under this subparagraph shall continue to be treated as participants and beneficiaries of the plan, including for purposes of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(D) ACCOUNTING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented under this paragraph shall be used solely to provide the benefits described in paragraph (1) until all such benefits have been paid and shall be accounted for separately from the other assets of the plan.

(ii) OVERSIGHT OF NON-ANNUITY INVESTMENTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Any portfolio implemented under this paragraph shall be subject to oversight by the Pension Rehabilitation Administration, including a mandatory triennial review of the adequacy of the portfolio to provide the benefits described in paragraph (1) and approval (to be provided within a reasonable period of time) of any decision by the plan sponsor to change the investment manager of the portfolio.

(II) REMEDIAL ACTION.—If the oversight under subclause (I) determines an inadequacy, the plan sponsor shall take remedial action to ensure that the inadequacy will be cured within 2 years of such determination.

(E) OMBUDSPERSON.—The Participant and Plan Sponsor Advocate established under section 4004 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 shall act as ombudsperson for

participants and beneficiaries on behalf of whom annuity contracts are purchased or who are covered by a portfolio under this paragraph.

(e) COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall make every effort to collect repayment of loans under this section in accordance with section 3711 of title 31, United States Code.

(f) LOAN DEFAULT.—If a plan is unable to make any payment on a loan under this section when due, the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall negotiate with the plan sponsor revised terms for repayment (including installment payments over a reasonable period or forgiveness of a portion of the loan principal), but only to the extent necessary to avoid insolvency in the subsequent 18 months.

(g) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE RULES, ETC.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration, in consultation with the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Labor, is authorized to issue rules regarding the form, content, and process of applications for loans under this section, actuarial standards and assumptions to be used in making estimates and projections for purposes of such applications, and assumptions regarding interest rates, mortality, and distributions with respect to a portfolio described in subsection (d)(3)(C).

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON STATUS OF CERTAIN PLANS WITH LOANS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, a report identifying any plan that—

(1) has failed to make any scheduled payment on a loan under this section,

(2) has negotiated revised terms for repayment of such loan (including any installment payments or forgiveness of a portion of the loan principal), or

(3) the Director has determined is no longer reasonably expected to be able to—

(A) pay benefits and the interest on the loan, or

(B) accumulate sufficient funds to repay the principal when due.

Such report shall include the details of any such failure, revised terms, or determination, as the case may be.

(i) COORDINATION WITH TAXATION OF UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME.—Subparagraph (A) of section 514(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii)(II) and inserting '', or''; and

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

''(iii) indebtedness with respect to a multiemployer plan under a loan made by the Pension Rehabilitation Administration pursuant to section 4 of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019.''.

SEC. 5. COORDINATION WITH WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY AND FUNDING RULES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Section 432 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) SPECIAL RULES FOR PLANS RECEIVING PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.—

''(1) DETERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If any employer participating in a plan at the time the plan receives a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 withdraws from the plan before the end of the 30-year period beginning on the date of the loan, the withdrawal liability of such employer shall be determined under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974—

''(i) by applying section 4219(c)(1)(D) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as if the plan were terminating by the withdrawal of every employer from the plan, and

''(ii) by determining the value of nonforfeitable benefits under the plan at the time of the deemed termination by using the interest assumptions prescribed for purposes of section 4044 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as prescribed in the regulations under section 4281 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 in the case of such a mass withdrawal.

''(B) ANNUITY CONTRACTS AND INVESTMENT PORTFOLIOS PURCHASED WITH LOAN FUNDS.—Annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented under section 4(d)(3) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 shall not be taken into account as plan assets in determining the withdrawal liability of any employer under subparagraph (A), but the amount equal to the greater of—

''(i) the benefits provided under such contracts or portfolios to participants and beneficiaries, or

''(ii) the remaining payments due on the loan under section 4(a) of such Act,

shall be taken into account as unfunded vested benefits in determining such withdrawal liability.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.—In the case of a plan which receives a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019—

''(A) annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented under section 4(d)(3) of such Act, and the benefits provided to participants and beneficiaries under such contracts or portfolios, shall not be taken into account in determining minimum required contributions under section 412,

''(B) payments on the interest and principal under the loan, and any benefits owed in excess of those provided under such contracts or portfolios, shall be taken into account as liabilities for purposes of such section, and

''(C) if such a portfolio is projected due to unfavorable investment or actuarial experience to be unable to fully satisfy the liabilities which it covers, the amount of the liabilities projected to be unsatisfied shall be taken into account as liabilities for purposes of such section.''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Section 305 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1085) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) SPECIAL RULES FOR PLANS RECEIVING PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.—

''(1) DETERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If any employer participating in a plan at the time the plan receives a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 withdraws from the plan before the end of the 30-year period beginning on the date of the loan, the withdrawal liability of such employer shall be determined—

''(i) by applying section 4219(c)(1)(D) as if the plan were terminating by the withdrawal of every employer from the plan, and

''(ii) by determining the value of nonforfeitable benefits under the plan at the time of the deemed termination by using the interest assumptions prescribed for purposes of section 4044, as prescribed in the regulations under section 4281 in the case of such a mass withdrawal.

''(B) ANNUITY CONTRACTS AND INVESTMENT PORTFOLIOS PURCHASED WITH LOAN FUNDS.—Annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented under section 4(d)(3) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 shall not be taken into account in determining the withdrawal liability of any employer under subparagraph (A), but the amount equal to the greater of—

''(i) the benefits provided under such contracts or portfolios to participants and beneficiaries, or

''(ii) the remaining payments due on the loan under section 4(a) of such Act,

shall be taken into account as unfunded vested benefits in determining such withdrawal liability.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.—In the case of a plan which receives a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019—

''(A) annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented under section 4(d)(3) of such Act, and the benefits provided to participants and beneficiaries under such contracts or portfolios, shall not be taken into account in determining minimum required contributions under section 302,

''(B) payments on the interest and principal under the loan, and any benefits owed in excess of those provided under such contracts or portfolios, shall be taken into account as liabilities for purposes of such section, and

''(C) if such a portfolio is projected due to unfavorable investment or actuarial experience to be unable to fully satisfy the liabilities which it covers, the amount of the liabilities projected to be unsatisfied shall be taken into account as liabilities for purposes of such section.''.

SEC. 6. ISSUANCE OF TREASURY BONDS.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund established under section 9512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 such amounts as are necessary to fund the loan program under section 4 of this Act, including from proceeds from the Secretary's issuance of obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 7. REPORTS OF PLANS RECEIVING PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart E of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 6059A. REPORTS OF PLANS RECEIVING PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan receiving a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019, with respect to the first plan year beginning after the date of the loan and each of the 29 succeeding plan years, not later than the 90th day of each such plan year the plan sponsor shall file with the Secretary a report (including appropriate documentation and actuarial certifications from the plan actuary, as required by the Secretary) that contains—

''(1) the funded percentage (as defined in section 432(j)(2)) as of the first day of such plan year, and the underlying actuarial value of assets (determined with regard, and without regard, to annuity contracts purchased and portfolios implemented with proceeds of such loan) and liabilities (including any amounts due with respect to such loan) taken into account in determining such percentage,

''(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1)) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

''(3) the total value of all contributions made by employers and employees during the plan year preceding such plan year,

''(4) the total value of all benefits paid during the plan year preceding such plan year,

''(5) cash flow projections for such plan year and the 9 succeeding plan years, and the assumptions used in making such projections,

''(6) funding standard account projections for such plan year and the 9 succeeding plan years, and the assumptions relied upon in making such projections,

''(7) the total value of all investment gains or losses during the plan year preceding such plan year,

''(8) any significant reduction in the number of active participants during the plan year preceding such plan year, and the reason for such reduction,

''(9) a list of employers that withdrew from the plan in the plan year preceding such plan year, and the resulting reduction in contributions,

''(10) a list of employers that paid withdrawal liability to the plan during the plan year preceding such plan year and, for each employer, a total assessment of the withdrawal liability paid, the annual payment amount, and the number of years remaining in the payment schedule with respect to such withdrawal liability,

''(11) any material changes to benefits, accrual rates, or contribution rates during the plan year preceding such plan year, and whether such changes relate to the terms of the loan,

''(12) details regarding any funding improvement plan or rehabilitation plan and updates to such plan,

''(13) the number of participants during the plan year preceding such plan year who are active participants, the number of participants and beneficiaries in pay status, and the number of terminated vested participants and beneficiaries,

''(14) the amount of any financial assistance received under section 4261 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to pay benefits during the preceding plan year, and the total amount of such financial assistance received for all preceding years,

''(15) the information contained on the most recent annual funding notice submitted by the plan under section 101(f) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974,

''(16) the information contained on the most recent annual return under section 6058 and actuarial report under section 6059 of the plan, and

''(17) copies of the plan document and amendments, other retirement benefit or ancillary benefit plans relating to the plan and contribution obligations under such plans, a breakdown of administrative expenses of the plan, participant census data and distribution of benefits, the most recent actuarial valuation report as of the plan year, copies of collective bargaining agreements, and financial reports, and such other information as the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration, may require.

''(b) ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted electronically.

''(c) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary shall share the information in the report under subsection (a) with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

''(d) REPORT TO PARTICIPANTS, BENEFICIARIES, AND EMPLOYERS.—Each plan sponsor required to file a report under subsection (a) shall, before the expiration of the time prescribed for the filing of such report, also provide a summary (written in a manner so as to be understood by the average plan participant) of the information in such report to participants and beneficiaries in the plan and to each employer with an obligation to contribute to the plan.''.

(b) PENALTY.—Subsection (e) of section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting '', 6059A (relating to reports of plans receiving pension rehabilitation loans)'' after ''deferred compensation)'';

(2) by inserting ''($100 in the case of failures under section 6059A)'' after ''$25''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''In the case of a failure with respect to section 6059A, the amount imposed under this subsection shall not be paid from the assets of the plan.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 6059A. Reports of plans receiving pension rehabilitation loans.''.

SEC. 8. PBGC FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4261 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1431) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) The plan sponsor of a multiemployer plan—

''(A) which is in critical and declining status (within the meaning of section 305(b)(6)) as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, or with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 305(e)(9) as of such date;

''(B) which, as of such date of enactment, is in critical status (within the meaning of section 305(b)(2)), has a modified funded percentage of less than 40 percent (as defined in section 4(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019), and has a ratio of active to inactive participants which is less than 2 to 5; or

''(C) which is insolvent for purposes of section 418E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as of such date of enactment, if the plan became insolvent after December 16, 2014, and has not been terminated;

and which is applying for a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 may also apply to the corporation for financial assistance under this subsection, by jointly submitting such applications in accordance with section 4(d)(2) of such Act. The application for financial assistance under this subsection shall demonstrate, based on projections by the plan actuary, that after the receipt of the anticipated loan amount under section 4(a) of such Act, the plan will still become (or remain) insolvent within the 30-year period beginning on the date of the loan.

''(2) In reviewing an application under paragraph (1), the corporation shall review the determinations and demonstrations submitted with the loan application under section 4(c) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 and provide guidance regarding such determinations and demonstrations prior to approving any application for financial assistance under this subsection. The corporation may deny any application if any such determinations or demonstrations (or any underlying assumptions) are unreasonable, or inconsistent with rules issued by the corporation, and the plan and the corporation are unable to reach agreement on such determinations or demonstrations. The corporation shall prescribe any such rules or guidance not later than December 31, 2019.

''(3)(A) In the case of a plan described in paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B), the total financial assistance provided under this subsection shall be an amount equal to the smallest portion of the loan amount with respect to the plan under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)(ii) of section 4(d) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 (determined without regard to paragraph (2) thereof) that, if provided as financial assistance under this subsection instead of a loan, would allow the plan to avoid the projected insolvency.

''(B) Such amount shall not exceed the present value of the maximum guaranteed benefit with respect to all participants and beneficiaries of the plan under sections 4022A and 4022B. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the present value of the maximum guaranteed benefit amount shall be determined by disregarding any loan available from the Pension Rehabilitation Administration and shall be determined as if the plan were insolvent on the date of the application, and the present value of the maximum guaranteed benefit amount with respect to such participants and beneficiaries may be calculated in the aggregate, rather than by reference to the benefit of each such participant or beneficiary.

''(4) In the case of a plan described in paragraph (1)(C), the financial assistance provided pursuant to such application under this subsection shall be the present value of the amount (determined by the plan actuary and submitted on the application) that, if such amount were paid by the corporation in combination with the loan and any other assistance being provided to the plan by the corporation at the time of the application, would enable the plan to emerge from insolvency and avoid any other insolvency projected under paragraph (1).

''(5)(A)(i) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the corporation determines at the time of approval, or at the beginning of any plan year beginning thereafter, that the plan's 5-year expenditure projection (determined without regard to loan payments described in clause (iii)(III)) exceeds the fair market value of the plan's assets, the corporation shall (subject to the total amount of financial assistance approved under this subsection) provide such assistance in an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(I) the amount by which the plan's 5-year expenditure projection exceeds such fair market value, or

''(II) the plan's expected expenditures for the plan year.

''(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term '5-year expenditure projection' means, with respect to any plan for a plan year, an amount equal to 500 percent of the plan's expected expenditures for the plan year.

''(iii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'expected expenditures' means, with respect to any plan for a plan year, an amount equal to the sum of—

''(I) expected benefit payments for the plan year,

''(II) expected administrative expense payments for the plan year, plus

''(III) payments on the loan scheduled during the plan year pursuant to the terms of the loan under section 4(b) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019.

''(iv) For purposes of this subparagraph, in the case of any plan year during which a plan is approved for a loan under section 4 of such Act, but has not yet received the proceeds, such proceeds shall be included in determining the fair market value of the plan's assets for the plan year. The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of any plan that for the plan year beginning in 2015 was certified pursuant to section 305(b)(3) as being in critical and declining status, and had more than 300,000 participants.

''(B) The financial assistance under this subsection shall be provided in a lump sum if the plan sponsor demonstrates in the application, and the corporation determines, that such a lump sum payment is necessary for the plan to avoid the insolvency to which the application relates. In the case of a plan described in paragraph (1)(C), such lump sum shall be provided not later than December 31, 2020.

''(6) Subsections (b) and (c) shall apply to financial assistance under this subsection as if it were provided under subsection (a), except that the terms for repayment under subsection (b)(2) shall not require the financial assistance to be repaid before the date on which the loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 is repaid in full.

''(7) The corporation may forgo repayment of the financial assistance provided under this subsection if necessary to avoid any suspension of the accrued benefits of participants.''.

(b) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is appropriated to the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year to provide the financial assistance described in section 4261(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1431(d)) (as added by this section) (including necessary administrative and operating expenses relating to such assistance).

SEC. 9. MODIFICATION OF REQUIRED DISTRIBUTION RULES FOR DESIGNATED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) MODIFICATION OF RULES WHERE EMPLOYEE DIES BEFORE ENTIRE DISTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 401(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.—In the case of a defined contribution plan, if an employee dies before the distribution of the employee's entire interest—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except in the case of a beneficiary who is not a designated beneficiary, subparagraph (B)(ii)—

''(I) shall be applied by substituting '10 years' for '5 years', and

''(II) shall apply whether or not distributions of the employee's interests have begun in accordance with subparagraph (A).

''(ii) EXCEPTION ONLY FOR ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARIES.—Subparagraph (B)(iii) shall apply only in the case of an eligible designated beneficiary.

''(iii) RULES UPON DEATH OF ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—If an eligible designated beneficiary dies before the portion of the employee's interest to which this subparagraph applies is entirely distributed, the exception under clause (iii) shall not apply to any beneficiary of such eligible designated beneficiary and the remainder of such portion shall be distributed within 10 years after the death of such eligible designated beneficiary.

''(iv) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLANS.—For purposes of applying the provisions of this subparagraph in determining amounts required to be distributed pursuant to this paragraph, all eligible retirement plans (as defined in section 402(c)(8)(B), other than a defined benefit plan described in clause (iv) or (v) thereof or a qualified trust which is a part of a defined benefit plan) shall be treated as a defined contribution plan.''.

(2) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—Section 401(a)(9)(E) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(E) DEFINITIONS AND RULES RELATING TO DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The term 'designated beneficiary' means any individual designated as a beneficiary by the employee.

''(ii) ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The term 'eligible designated beneficiary' means, with respect to any employee, any designated beneficiary who is—

''(I) the surviving spouse of the employee,

''(II) subject to clause (iii), a child of the employee who has not reached majority (within the meaning of subparagraph (F)),

''(III) disabled (within the meaning of section 72(m)(7)),

''(IV) a chronically ill individual (within the meaning of section 7702B(c)(2), except that the requirements of subparagraph (A)(i) thereof shall only be treated as met if there is a certification that, as of such date, the period of inability described in such subparagraph with respect to the individual is an indefinite one which is reasonably expected to be lengthy in nature), or

''(V) an individual not described in any of the preceding subclauses who is not more than 10 years younger than the employee.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR CHILDREN.—Subject to subparagraph (F), an individual described in clause (ii)(II) shall cease to be an eligible designated beneficiary as of the date the individual reaches majority and any remainder of the portion of the individual's interest to which subparagraph (H)(ii) applies shall be distributed within 10 years after such date.

''(iv) TIME FOR DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The determination of whether a designated beneficiary is an eligible designated beneficiary shall be made as of the date of death of the employee.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph and paragraphs (4) and (5), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to distributions with respect to employees who die after December 31, 2019.

(B) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING EXCEPTION.—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements between employee representatives and 1 or more employers ratified before the date of enactment of this Act, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to distributions with respect to employees who die in calendar years beginning after the earlier of—

(i) the later of—

(I) the date on which the last of such collective bargaining agreements terminates (determined without regard to any extension thereof agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of this Act), or

(II) December 31, 2019, or

(ii) December 31, 2021

For purposes of clause (i)(I), any plan amendment made pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement relating to the plan which amends the plan solely to conform to any requirement added by this section shall not be treated as a termination of such collective bargaining agreement.

(C) GOVERNMENTAL PLANS.—In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting ''December 31, 2021'' for ''December 31, 2019''.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN EXISTING ANNUITY CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection shall not apply to a qualified annuity which is a binding annuity contract in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and at all times thereafter.

(B) QUALIFIED ANNUITY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''qualified annuity'' means, with respect to an employee, an annuity—

(i) which is a commercial annuity (as defined in section 3405(e)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

(ii) under which the annuity payments are made over the life of the employee or over the joint lives of such employee and a designated beneficiary (or over a period not extending beyond the life expectancy of such employee or the joint life expectancy of such employee and a designated beneficiary) in accordance with the regulations described in section 401(a)(9)(A)(ii) of such Code (as in effect before such amendments) and which meets the other requirements of section 401(a)(9) of such Code (as so in effect) with respect to such payments; and

(iii) with respect to which—

(I) annuity payments to the employee have begun before the date of enactment of this Act, and the employee has made an irrevocable election before such date as to the method and amount of the annuity payments to the employee or any designated beneficiaries; or

(II) if subclause (I) does not apply, the employee has made an irrevocable election before the date of enactment of this Act as to the method and amount of the annuity payments to the employee or any designated beneficiaries.

(5) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an employee dies before the effective date, then, in applying the amendments made by this subsection to such employee's designated beneficiary who dies after such date—

(i) such amendments shall apply to any beneficiary of such designated beneficiary; and

(ii) the designated beneficiary shall be treated as an eligible designated beneficiary for purposes of applying section 401(a)(9)(H)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect after such amendments).

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''effective date'' means the first day of the first calendar year to which the amendments made by this subsection apply to a plan with respect to employees dying on or after such date.

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If this subsection applies to any plan amendment—

(A) such plan shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in paragraph (2)(B)(i); and

(B) except as provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, such plan shall not fail to meet the requirements of section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 204(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 by reason of such amendment.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to any amendment to any plan or which is made—

(i) pursuant to any amendment made by this section or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury under this section or such amendments; and

(ii) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2021, or such later date as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

In the case of a governmental or collectively bargained plan to which subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (a)(4) applies, clause (ii) shall be applied by substituting the date which is 2 years after the date otherwise applied under such clause.

(B) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless—

(i) during the period—

(I) beginning on the date the legislative or regulatory amendment described in paragraph (1)(A) takes effect (or in the case of a plan amendment not required by such legislative or regulatory amendment, the effective date specified by the plan); and

(II) ending on the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, if earlier, the date the plan amendment is adopted),

the plan is operated as if such plan amendment were in effect; and

(ii) such plan amendment applies retroactively for such period.

SEC. 10. INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of section 6651(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by the Taxpayer First Act, is amended by striking ''$330'' and inserting ''$435''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 6651(j)(1) of such Code, as amended by such Act, is amended by striking ''$330'' and inserting ''$435''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns the due date for which (including extensions) is after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 11. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO FILE RETIREMENT PLAN RETURNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$25'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(2) by striking ''$15,000'' and inserting ''$150,000''.

(b) ANNUAL REGISTRATION STATEMENT AND NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES.—Subsection (d) of section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$1'' both places it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''$10'';

(2) by striking ''$5,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$50,000''; and

(3) by striking ''$1,000'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$10,000''.

(c) FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE.—Subsection (h) of section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$10'' and inserting ''$100''; and

(2) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$50,000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns, statements, and notifications required to be filed, and notices required to be provided, after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 12. INCREASE INFORMATION SHARING TO ADMINISTER EXCISE TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6103(o) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TAXES IMPOSED BY SECTION 4481.—Returns and return information with respect to taxes imposed by section 4481 shall be open to inspection by or disclosure to officers and employees of United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security whose official duties require such inspection or disclosure for purposes of administering such section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (4) of section 6103(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''or (o)(1)(A)'' each place it appears and inserting '', (o)(1)(A), or (o)(3)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–178, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, over the last few decades, construction workers, truck drivers, industrial bakers, coal miners, and other hardworking Americans, some of whom are here today, did everything they could to prepare themselves and their families for a secure retirement. Year after year, these workers negotiated with their employers to defer wages in return for a promise of a pension that would allow them to retire with dignity.

Now, through no fault of their own, the pensions they earned over their lifetimes and the retirement security they were promised are in jeopardy. Today, approximately 130 multiemployer pension plans, covering about 1 million participants, are in severe financial distress. Several plans are facing insolvency in the next few years, while many others are projected to fail over the next 20 years.

Making matters worse, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which insures these pension plans, is projected to run out of money by 2025 as large plans face insolvency. If multiemployer pension plans go broke and the PBGC's multiemployer program collapses, there will be catastrophic consequences to retirees, workers, businesses, and taxpayers.

The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, commonly known as the Butch Lewis Act, is a bipartisan solution to avert this financial disaster, and it will actually end up saving taxpayers billions of dollars.

According to one estimate, a multiemployer pension system collapse would cost the Federal Government at least $170 billion over 10 years, and possibly $400 billion over 30 years, due to lost tax revenue and increased reliance on social programs.

According to the CBO, to solve the problem, this bill is estimated to cost not $400 billion over 30 years, but $55 billion, total, over those 30 years. This bill will solve the problem. And that is just the cost to the Federal budget, ignoring the pain and suffering of people losing their pensions and businesses going out of business.

That is the choice we have today. We can support a bipartisan bill that saves retirees' hard-earned pensions, protect businesses from going bankrupt, and costs far less than doing nothing, or we can oppose it and end up costing the taxpayers far more in the long run.

Madam Speaker, I anticipate that my Republican colleagues will talk about structural reforms that are needed to prevent multiemployer plans from facing bankruptcy in the future. I agree.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, reforms are needed, and I am committed to working on a bipartisan basis to enact prospective reforms. But when the house is on fire, you don't debate on how the fire started or pontificate over how to prevent fires in the future; you put out the fire.

So today we are putting out the fire and protecting retirement security for more than 1 million Americans across the country and saving the taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, my colleague on the other side of the aisle said that we have a house on fire and we must do something about it. What this bill does is it gives more gasoline to the arsonist who started the fire.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 397, a risky, fiscally irresponsible, politically motivated scheme that will negatively impact hardworking Americans and retirees.

Union multiemployer pension plans are currently underfunded by $638 billion, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, PBGC, which ensures these pensions, has a $54 billion deficit. In other words, workers and retirees won't see the benefits they have been promised because of union and employer negligence.

This problem requires a serious, bipartisan response. That is why, historically, Members on both sides of the aisle have worked together on this issue. But last month, when the Education and Labor Committee marked up H.R. 397, committee Republicans were shut out of the debate and denied the opportunity to offer even a single amendment, a highly unfortunate and inappropriate decision.

For the first time ever, taxpayers will prop up failing, mismanaged, union-run pension plans. These plans, all 160 of them, can apply for a government loan. There is no limit to the loan amount, and, remarkably, the loans will be completely forgiven if they are unable to be repaid after 29 years.

The chairman of the Education and Labor Committee said: ''If you can't pay it back, you can't pay it back.'' So, by the chairman's own admission, we are giving failed union pensions a blank check. What a deal.

All the while, H.R. 397 allows plans to continue to promise new benefits, allowing their liabilities to grow.

While I strongly oppose what H.R. 397 intends to do, I am equally appalled by

what the bill fails to do. This legislation fails to include any reforms that would ensure responsible funding of future benefit promises or prevent a similar situation from recurring.

The bill also fails to address the chronic underfunding that plagues the entire union multiemployer system and passively accepts that plan trustees and actuaries may continue to underestimate pension promises—to the detriment of workers and retirees. In fact, under H.R. 397, the situation could become far worse.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, now estimates that H.R. 397 could increase the Federal budget deficit by more than $48 billion. But that estimate is based on last-minute, bogus Democrat pay-fors and covers only the bill's first 10 years. If we look at the 30-year scheme created by the bill, we will find a price tag of hundreds of billions of dollars. And remember, it is American taxpayers who are on the hook.

Madam Speaker, Congress was set up to be in this position years ago because Democrats and unions and employers knew that Members and the public would feel sorry for the union members who were not taken care of by those they trusted to take care of them. Every Member here should feel angry about being put in this position. H.R. 397 is a fiscally irresponsible and careless approach that will cause far more harm than good.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind the ranking member that CBO estimates that the 30-year cost of this bill is about $55 billion of money that will not be paid back, or we can pay up to $400 billion over 30 years. We have a choice. I would pick the $55 billion.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, as chairwoman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I rise today to urge my colleagues to unanimously pass the Butch Lewis Act of 2019.

Failure to do so will have dire consequences for at least 1.3 million Americans who did everything right. They put in decades of hard work to ensure that their retirement years would be secure, so many of them in physically grueling jobs in mining and construction and on ships and the Nation's highways.

They often sacrificed wage increases, choosing instead a contribution to their pension plans so that they could live in their golden years with dignity and peace, a life well planned. Yet, after all of that, retired people and future retirees are now living in fear of losing everything they worked so hard for, and that is a shame.

Failure to pass this legislation also will have dire consequences for tens of thousands of current workers and regional economies and could cost American taxpayers between $170 billion and $240 billion.

□ 1715

There is a huge risk, so we must act now. This is an issue on which both Democrats and Republicans should agree. This issue has no party, no race, no religion. We are all in the same boat, and we are running out of time.

Our failure to take action to protect retirees and American taxpayers, our constituents, is not an option. It is a necessity, and we must act now. There is no time to waste. Let's do the right thing and pass the Butch Lewis Act of 2019 today.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. It is funny, in this town, rehabilitation is a word we use to kindly describe a bailout. For normal people, rehabilitation is a word that would conjure up the idea that perhaps today we are attempting to fix or improve the $638 billion pension problem before us.

This bill would, more accurately, be called the bailout for multiemployer pensions act, because this bill does not contain any of the needed reforms to change the unsustainable trajectory of these plans.

What does the bill do instead? It creates a new Federal Government bureaucracy. It allows for billions of dollars of loans to be just forgiven. It provides loan terms that actually encourage not paying down the principal of these loans.

So to be clear, and to make no doubt, we do have to fix this pension problem, but real progress will only come from a careful, deliberate, and bipartisan process, and this bill was not designed to be bipartisan.

In committee, Republicans were actually blocked from offering amendments that would have improved this bill. So here we are today, taking up floor time for a one-sided bill that does not fix the problem and that will not become law.

When the majority wants to make real progress, I will be here, ready to fix the problem, ready to roll up my sleeves, ready to invest the bipartisan effort needed to make meaningful reforms. Until then, I will vote ''no'' on the bailout.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both Chairman SCOTT and Chairman NEAL for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 397, the Butch Lewis Act. This is a historic moment for working men and women in this country, and it has been a long time coming because people have been working on this for a long time.

Today, we are telling millions of Americans who worked a lifetime for their pensions that are now in jeopardy, through no fault of their own, that we are standing with you. We are listening. We are taking action.

For too long, these working men and women have worked in fear, not knowing what was going to happen. They have given up pay raises. They played by the rules. They thought they would have a safe and secure retirement. By passing the Butch Lewis Act, we are sending a loud message that we hear them and are taking steps to ensure that their retirement that they worked for, for a lifetime, will be there when they need it.

This is money hardworking men and women earned and counted on to retire safely, to afford to stay in their homes, to afford food on their table, and to afford their medicine. American workers have done their part. The House will soon do its part.

I hope the Senate will also act quickly because I know the men and women, they have come to my door at 7 a.m., they have threatened suicide. They are scared.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters in support of this legislation. One is from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and one is from UNITE HERE.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
July 18, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House of Representatives will soon have the opportunity to ensure that more than a million retirees and workers who have played by the rules will receive the pension benefits they have earned through years of hard work. On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, its retirees and working families, I ask for a yes vote on H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act (often referred to as The Butch Lewis Act). As you know, this legislation is of the highest priority for the Teamsters Union.

The multiemployer pension system has for many decades been an essential foundation for providing financial security in retirement for millions of Americans and their families. Now, through no fault of their own, the earned pension benefits of millions of retirees are being threatened due to the ''critical and declining'' (financial) status and the impending insolvency of a number of multiemployer pension plans. No doubt you have heard from retirees and families who live with this uncertainty and whose lives have been turned upside down. H.R. 397 will ensure that we meet our obligations to current retirees and workers for years to come and to do so without retiree benefit cuts. It will strengthen these plans and provide a path forward for financial stability and solvency. It will provide improved retirement security for both workers and retirees. And, it will lessen the financial pressure on the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation (PBGC) which also faces insolvency.

The bill creates a Pension Rehabilitation Administration (PRA) which would sell

Treasury-issued bonds on the open market and then loan money from the bond sale to these critical and declining multiemployer pension plans. Plans borrowing from the PRA must set aside the money in separate investments that match pension payments for retirees. Retirees and their families are guaranteed their promised benefits. It will also free up remaining assets and future contributions to protect the benefits for active workers.

PRA loans will not be sufficient to help all financially troubled multiemployer pension plans. Some will need additional help. For such plans, the bill proposes that the PBGC provide such help. In doing so, the cost to the Federal government and the U.S. economy will be far less than allowing Plans and the PBGC to fail. Unlike the current federal pension insurance program, H.R. 397 protects benefits before plan failure.

The financial distress many of these plans face were and are beyond the control of these retirees and workers. Multiemployer pension plans have been buffeted by economic turbulence over the decades—from deregulation to financial melt downs to recessions.

Pension statutes and legislation are extraordinarily complex, none more so than multiemployer and Taft–Hartley pension plans. They are both unique in their structure, and the challenges they have faced. If these plans fail, it will not only impact the retirees receiving the benefit, there will be a broader impact on their communities and the economy—adverse effects on economic growth and tax losses to state, local and federal governments.

H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act provides a mechanism for ''critical and declining'' multiemployer pension plans to address their serious underfunding problem. It will strengthen these plans and provide a path forward for financial stability and solvency. Importantly, the bill does this while avoiding retiree benefit cuts.

I hope that I can report to our retirees and members in your district that you stood with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters family to enact this critically important legislation. Vote to protect retirement benefits. Vote yes on H.R. 397.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

UNITEHERE!,
Las Vegas, NV, July 17, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 300,000 members of UNITE HERE and their families, we strongly urge your support for H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multi-Employer Pensions Act.

At a time when hard working American's are already anxious about an economy where one job should be enough but often isn't to make ends meet, we should also be very concerned about the retirement security of millions of Americans.

H.R. 397, also known as the ''Butch-Lewis Act'', includes a modest, common sense approach to bringing stability and reassurance to the retirement pensions of over a million Americans. Only a small number of multiemployer plans are facing financial difficulty, but that does not ease the pain and potential devastation for the millions who honorably worked hard for themselves and their families. We are talking about auto workers, truck drivers, iron workers and other impacted workers who live, work and retire in our communities.

If we do not offer the means to see those impacted plans through to solvency, we will all feel the pain of their distress during their retirement years—a time they have worked hard to attain.

On behalf of our members, I again urge you to support H.R. 397 and stand up for millions of middle-class Americans who should be able to retire in dignity.

D. TAYLOR,
International President.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Chairman NEAL for their leadership and taking a lot of words and putting it into real action.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Michigan is correct. The union members are not at fault. The union bosses are at fault, and hardworking, nonunion taxpayers should not be bailing out the union bosses for their mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 397 because it is nothing more than a huge step backwards in our work to save failing multiemployer pensions.

It is the government picking retiree winners and retiree losers. Our work in Congress, until now, has been bipartisan with both sides realizing that workers' retirement security is too important of an issue to play politics with. I and others have been willing to work across the aisle for a bipartisan solution that works for retirees and for taxpayers. That offer is still open.

The idea that Congress should bail out union-negotiated pension plans, but not the retirement plans of millions of other Americans who have seen their companies go under and had their benefits reduced as a result, is the most unfair proposal that I have ever seen on the House floor.

The Democrats are telling hardworking Americans that they should not only get stiffed in their retirement, but that their taxpayer dollars should be used to bail out someone else's retirement. To make matters worse, the bill itself is deeply flawed. It requires no fundamental changes to pension plans in poor financial shape, and no reforms to ensure that troubled plans and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation don't wind up in the same situation.

Again, instead, the bill gives these plans a so-called loan, and then allows the loan principal to be forgiven if the plan cannot repay the loan. Simply put, this is not a loan. It is a taxpayer-funded gift. Why would anybody pay it back? This doesn't have to be partisan.

In 2014, as chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee, I worked with the full committee chair, Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and the Obama administration to develop a bipartisan solution to save these plans. Our plan, the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act gave plans the tools they needed to avoid insolvency and continue offering benefits to retirees.

If we passed such a good bipartisan bill, why are we here today? Unfortunately, the Obama administration made a political decision and refused to approve an application from the country's largest troubled plan, Central States. And while many supporters of today's bill cheered that decision, the Obama administration virtually ensured Central States retirees will receive far less in their retirement than they would have or could have, all because the Obama administration preferred politics over policy.

I still have hope that the Senate will act in a more responsible manner. The concept of the multiemployer pension plan is a good one and an idea worth saving, but I would say this to supporters of this bill: By choosing to act in a largely partisan manner, you are further jeopardizing retiree benefits.

Literally, every day these plans fail to act, is a step closer to bankruptcy. Today's action may be the final nail in the coffin for Central States, whose plan is in such dire straits they cannot wait another 18 months for a fix.

Outside of Central States, there are many other pension plans in crisis, but all assuring that the PBGC multiemployer plan will be insolvent by the end of FY 2025.

We have less than 6 years to solve this problem before retirees receive pennies on the dollar for what they have earned. I recommend voting against this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding.

In Oregon and across the country, people have worked hard to provide themselves and their families with a secure retirement by contributing a portion of their income to pensions.

But now, through no fault of their own, too many of these hardworking Americans find that their pension plans are struggling, and without intervention, these plans will become insolvent, putting the retirement security of about 1.3 million people at risk.

The bipartisan Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, the Butch Lewis Act, will help protect retirees, workers, and employers by creating the Pension Rehabilitation Administration to issue bonds to finance loans for critical and declining status multiemployer pension plans. Importantly, this bill does not cut benefits for workers and retirees, benefits they have earned.

Workers, families, businesses, and retirees are counting on Congress to address the growing retirement security crisis in our country and protect the benefits workers have earned over their lifetime. This bipartisan bill is one important piece of the solution to address the multiemployer pension crisis, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

I thank Chairman SCOTT and Chairman NEAL for their leadership on this issue.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I have a great deal of sympathy for the people we are trying to help in H.R. 397, and that is one of the reasons why I feel we need a real solution to this.

Obviously, the pension plans are in such horrible shape that to continue with the current system and to continue with this bill would be a very expensive bailout for the taxpayer.

Unlike some of my colleagues, I realize that the taxpayer will ultimately have to put something in these plans. And the reason I say that is the multiemployer pension plan system was set up by Congress in the 1950s, and my guess is, the way it was set up, it is not surprising that it will fail. While the Congressmen who are at fault for this have long since retired and left us, we as a successor Congress, are supposed to do something.

However, first of all, I don't think this is a sincere proposal. If it was a sincere proposal, it would have been passed when President Obama was President, and when the Democratic Party was in total control around here, about 10 years ago.

We are going to have to, as part of this plan, change things in the future so we don't begin to run up more debt immediately. We are probably going to have to have the taxpayer do something to make up for the damage that has been done in the past, but to pass this bill will only delay that, in that it is really, quite frankly, just a political move.

I strongly recommend that we get together, put together a new committee of four or eight people, and begin to do something. We know something has got to be done eventually, because not only do we have these workers hanging out there, but the way this multiemployer pension plan is set up, a lot of businesses are going to go under too unless something is done.

But I am saddened today that the bill before us, I don't believe is a bill that, for all their talking, people really believe is a serious solution. Because if it was a serious solution, they would have passed that bill 10 years ago.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Chairman NEAL and Chairman SCOTT for bringing this bill to the floor, and my colleague, DEBBIE DINGELL, and Dr. ROE who sat on the supercommittee last time to address this.

The Butch Lewis Act is a bill that makes sure that those Americans receive the wages that they earned. This is not a handout. These are deferred dreams, deferred wages that they said they will put aside during their active career so that they can live out the American Dream; those golden years, those pension years. They are deferred wages.

I know firsthand. Over 3 years ago, my very first speech on the House floor was right here talking about pensions. For 37 years, I have been a member of a multiemployer plan, as a rank-and-file worker, and as a negotiator. I understand how they work.

But the cost of doing nothing to the taxpayers is far greater than the loans we are giving out now. We bailed out the banks, gave them billions of dollars, but the people who earn these, who did nothing wrong, you are saying no to. We cannot screw the people who earned the wages. It is important for us to pass this because they did nothing wrong. They played by the rules. That is what we do in America.

□ 1730

This is not a grand conspiracy. This is about doing the right thing for the right people, for America.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 397. You can call it, Madam Speaker, whatever you want to call it, but the taxpayers are going to bail out an underwater multiemployer pension plan. It is just that simple, based on this legislation.

Since my time in Congress, my colleagues and I on the House Education and Labor Committee have held numerous hearings on multiemployer pension plans. I have learned a few things. These plans currently are underfunded by $638 billion.

How in the world did that happen? The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, PBGC, multiemployer insurance program has a $54 billion deficit and is expected to become insolvent by the end of fiscal year 2025. According to the PBGC data, 75 percent of multiemployer participants are in plans that are less than 50 percent funded.

I think we can all agree that the system has failed, and these retirees, I agree, deserve better.

How were they so misled to believe their contributions would cover their retirement? In fact, this is just another example of unions overpromising and underdelivering. The union says, hey, if you pay this, you are going to get this retirement.

As the owner of a small business, I like to think of myself as coming to the table, negotiating, and solving the problem. However, both parties must be willing to find a reasonable solution that works for everyone.

The Democratic solution on the multiemployer pension program is shortsighted and partisan. In the business world, we don't call that problem-solving. We call that another massive taxpayer giveaway.

Taxpayers are not going to stand for this. Not to my surprise, the Democratic solution is Big Government and billions of dollars in new costs. Again, this bailout is an unserious policy. It has a zero chance in the Senate, and I recommend a ''no'' vote.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise as to how much time is still available on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS). The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, the crisis facing multiemployer pensions is not some faraway event, and it is not about politics or ideology. It is about people's lives and whether they will be able to retire in dignity after a lifetime of hard work—American people.

By 2025, the Central States Pension Fund and the PBGC will be insolvent. That means over a million American employees' and retirees' earned benefits could disappear if we don't act right now.

This crisis doesn't just affect those enrolled in multiemployer pension plans. If we don't act, the consequences will be detrimental for our local businesses, economies, and residents, ultimately affecting everyone, including millions of American families.

Participants nationwide, including thousands in my district, could lose everything they have earned if we don't act. These folks who came to watch the proceedings today never wanted a bailout, as my colleague across the aisle termed it. They just want and deserve what they have earned. They deserve it.

We need to pass this bill. We must pass this bill for them and for our country.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 397. The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act is nothing more than a false promise to American workers, retirees, and their families. House Democrats, instead of working together with us as they have done historically, moved this bill through committee without one single hearing or considering one single amendment.

The result? A bill that makes no structural reforms to prevent or shore up future pension plan insolvencies. In fact, it incentivizes pension plan managers to offer generous underfunded benefits while taking risky bets at the cost of the American worker and retiree, knowing full well they have a forgivable taxpayer-funded loan to fall back on.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to abandon this bill and instead work with us so we can achieve forward-looking solutions to protect workers and prevent future insolvencies.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that retirees and workers in multiemployer union pension plans deserve better than a political statement disguised as a legislative proposal.

Advancing this highly flawed bill, which has no chance of being passed in the Senate, will only result in delays rather than solutions for workers and retirees who are so rightfully concerned about the state of their pensions.

Mr. Speaker, the individuals in the unions did trust those in charge. They are not at fault for what has happened, but I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 397, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following five letters in support: AARP, AFL–CIO, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Service Employees International Union, and the United Steelworkers.

AARP,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members nationwide and all Americans age 50 and older, AARP is pleased to urge House passage of H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. This bipartisan legislation would help enable eligible multiemployer pension plans to continue to pay earned pensions to retirees and fund their long-term pension commitments.

Over ten million workers, retirees, and their families are counting on these earned retirement benefits for their retirement security. As part of the FY 2015 Omnibus Appropriations Act, with almost no debate, Congress permitted underfunded multiemployer pension plans to cut the earned pensions of current retirees. Congress' action broke forty years of settled pension law and put hundreds of thousands of retirees at risk of having their retirement benefits and financial security undermined. Instead of cutting earned pensions, Congress should instead enact reasonable solutions to help enable multiemployer pension plans to pay earned benefits and fully fund their pension plans over time.

We commend the bipartisan group of sponsors on their bill's proposed creation of a Pension Rehabilitation Administration, within the Treasury Department, to provide low-cost loans to qualified underfunded multiemployer pension plans. Plans would have up to thirty years to pay earned retiree benefits, prudently invest the loan proceeds, and re-pay the loan. During the loan period, employers may not reduce contributions and the plan may not increase promised benefits. The plan must also demonstrate that receipt of the loan will enable the plan to avoid insolvency, pay benefits and loan interest, and accumulate sufficient funds to repay the loan principal when due.

AARP urges passage of the Rehabilitation of Multiemployer Pensions Act to protect the hardearned pensions of retirees. We look forward to working with Congress to enact this important bill, as well as additional legislation to adequately fund all earned multiemployer retiree pensions and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy and Engagement Officer.

AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL–CIO is pleased that the ''Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act'' (H.R. 397) will be on the House floor this week. We urge you to support this bill, as it is the first step towards enactment of legislation to address our nation's looming pension crisis.

Absent federal action, the retirement income security of over one million American workers, retirees, and their spouses across the country will be in jeopardy because of the impending failure of their multiemployer pension plans. By establishing a federal loan program for troubled plans meeting certain criteria, H.R. 397 reflects the fact that allowing these plans to fail will have a devastating impact not only on individual retirees and their families, but also on their communities and their employers.

The working men and women whose retirement income security is at risk have not forgotten the 2008 record-setting federal rescue of Wall Street. Multiemployer pension plan participants and retirees are no less worthy than the financial services firms who were the beneficiaries of the $700 billion Troubled Asset Relief Program. Moreover, unlike the Wall Street banks, they played no part in either the industry deregulation or financial crisis that weakened many multiemployer pension plans.

Congress has the ability to avert the impending retirement security crisis if it acts expeditiously. The ''Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act'' is an important bill because it is the only legislation that, thus far, offers a solution to that crisis. On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS,
July 22, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM), I strongly urge you to vote ''Yes'' on H.R. 397, The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019. Commonly referred to as the ''Butch Lewis Act'', this highly important and innovative legislation would help save those multiemployer pension plans which are financially-troubled while protecting the earned and vested benefits of current and future retirees.

The multiemployer pension system is on the brink of a real and disastrous crisis. While the majority of multi employer pension plans are financially sound, the PBGC estimates that over 100 multiemployer pension plans, covering more than a million participants, are in ''critical and declining status'' and will become insolvent within the next twenty years. Currently, the only Federal assistance offered to these troubled plans comes from the PBGC and only after the plan has already failed. Given the number of plans on the brink of failure, the PBGC' s multiemployer insurance program is projected to become insolvent by 2025.

The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 offers a real, proactive solution which rehabilitates failing plans, bolsters the PBGC, and protects the earned benefits of millions of retirees, workers, and their families. This innovative legislation would allow the Treasury to provide low-cost loans to qualified underfunded multiemployer pension plans. Under the legislation, the troubled plans would have up to thirty years to prudently invest the loaned funds and would use the investment earnings to pay retiree benefits, improve the plan's financial position, and pay interest on the loan to the Treasury. At the end of the thirty year period, the plan would pay back the loan in full. In order to be eligible for the loan, the plan would have to demonstrate that the loan would enable the plan to remain solvent, pay all retiree benefits and loan interest, and repay the loan principle when due. During the loan period, contributing employers would have to maintain their contribution levels and the plan would not be allowed to make any increases to retiree benefits.

In the wake of the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014, a brutal scheme to steal the pension promises made to retirees, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act provides a much needed correction and remedy. This legislation will work to lift troubled multiemployer plans out of their financial hole, while maintaining the financial integrity of the PBGC. Most importantly, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act provides a pathway to accomplishing these venerable goals without stealing from retirees, workers, and their families.

The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act is the only solution put forth to date which appropriately and adequately addresses the multiemployer pension crisis by providing a lifeline to plans in critical financial status while maintaining the integrity of healthy multiemployer plans and the PBGC without cutting the earned benefit promises made to our nation's retirees and working families.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this vitally important legislation and vote ''Yes'' on H.R. 397, The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019.

Thank you,

ROBERT MARTINEZ, Jr.,
International President.

SEIU,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I write to urge you to support H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. Improving the solvency of troubled multiemployer pension plans and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (''PBGC'') are the two critical issues that need to be addressed, and this legislation will accomplish that without jeopardizing plans that are already solvent.

SEIU and its Locals sponsor 19 multiemployer pension plans covering over 800,000 retired and active participants and their beneficiaries. The health of the multiemployer retirement community is very important to our union, our members, and the employers from the health and service industries which participate in these funds. We support a resilient multiemployer pension system that provides continued retirement security to millions of American workers and their families.

Fortunately, none of SEIU's plans are classified as ''critical and declining.'' Nevertheless we have followed closely developments in plans that are facing possible insolvency as we believe that such a development would cause serious harm to thousands of workers and retirees, to employers, to the economy and to the multiemployer pension system as a whole.

The loan program which the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act would establish should maximize the chances that troubled plans avoid insolvency. Thousands of workers and retirees in these plans will be able to avoid devastating benefit cuts. Also, the legislation would dramatically reduce the expected liabilities of the PBGC and can save the PBGC's insurance program for all multiemployer plans.

We thank you for your support for workers and their retirement security.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,
Pittsburgh, PA, July 24, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.2 million active and retired members of the United Steelworkers, I urge you to pass H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. Otherwise known to most as the ''Butch-Lewis Act'' scheduled for the floor this week. The legislation will reassert our nation's commitment to millions of retirees in the multi-employer pension system, and ensure that they receive the benefits they have earned without needless cuts to pensioner incomes.

Pensions are one of the most secure forms of long-term retirement if government, industry and workers operate in a cooperative manner to ensure long-term sustainability. Unfortunately, small subsets of plans, battered by federal deregulation, changing industries, and unfair trade, have fallen into decline. After a decade of effort by these pension plans to recover since the Great Recession, the damage done by inadequate federal policy could cause almost 1.5 million to lose their retirement and impact all of the 10 million participants who are enrolled in multiemployer pension plans.

Representative Neal's bipartisan legislation is the guidepost to ensuring millions of retired Americans receive the benefits they are promised. The legislation will create a Pension Rehabilitation Administration under the Department of Treasury and permit the sale of bonds to finance long-term, low-interest loans to troubled pension plans. By shoring up critical and declining status pension plans, millions of retirees will be assured of a continued secure retirement without forcing cuts to retiree benefits.

During the loan period, employers may not reduce contributions and the plan may not increase promised benefits. The plan must demonstrate that receipt of the loan will enable the plan to avoid insolvency, pay benefits and loan interest, and accumulate sufficient funds to repay the loan principal when due. Providing federal oversight and access to capital, multi-employer pension funds will be able to manage the long-term commitments to retirees which in turn will reduce long-term government risk of default at the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation (PBGC).

For these reasons, I urge you to pass H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. CONWAY,
International President.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the multiemployer crisis, the most expensive and harmful thing the Congress can do is nothing. Over the course of 4 years and multiple hearings, including five hearings of a joint select committee, we have repeatedly heard the need to address this issue.

We have also heard about process. Let me tell you about the process. We had 1 year of a select committee—no plan from the Republicans. This bill was introduced in January—no plan. We had a hearing in March—no plan. We had a markup in June—no plan or amendment until shortly before the markup occurred. Then, instead of seriously considering those amendments, they required us to read the whole bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice to make. Members of Congress can continue to wring our hands and listen to complaints while the catastrophe continues to unfold and unnecessarily adds hundreds of billions of dollars in costs to the Federal budget, or we can act on this bipartisan solution.

The only bipartisan solution pending in Congress today is the Butch Lewis Act. This bill addresses the immediate crisis, protects hard-earned pensions, protects many businesses from bankruptcy, avoids misery, and saves the taxpayers money.

In fact, according to the CBO, this bill, over 30 years, will cost less than $60 billion. Doing nothing over 30 years will cost $300 billion to over $400 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the solution. I urge my colleagues to do the same to ensure that all workers can retire with stability and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, commonly referred to as the Butch Lewis Act.

Contrary to what you have heard, Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill. It has Republican sponsors. PETER KING is about to speak next. At different intervals, there have been up to 20 Republicans who have signed on to this legislation.

This addresses a real problem that, for 2 years, Congress has talked about and not moved on. For 2 years, we have worked on this. I sat on the special commission for 2 years. It became a debating society rather than an opportunity to act on a measured response to a crisis that is now pending that could be averted by the work that we undertake today. There are 200 bipartisan sponsors of this legislation in this House.

Ten million Americans participate in multiemployer plans, and about 1.3 million of them are in plans that are quickly running out of money. And, yes, we have a plan.

These are American workers who planned for their retirement. Now, after working for 30-plus years, they are facing financial uncertainty at a time when they are often unable to return to the workforce.

It is worth noting that we have not arrived here because of malfeasance or corruption. These are forces of the marketplace that have caused this distortion.

When I heard the gentleman from South Dakota say earlier that this is a bailout, this is not a bailout. This is a backstop.

Do you know what a bailout is? It is the savings and loan crisis. That is a bailout.

Do you know what a bailout is? Wall Street. That is a bailout.

Do you know what a bailout is? When Enron made sure that the people at the top of the corporation kept their money and that the people at the bottom lost their pensions. That is a bailout.

We are talking about a sensible plan. As I have noted, I have worked for almost 2 years to build within the Department of the Treasury an opportunity for a super-administrator to help to nurse these plans back to good health.

Rita Lewis is in this gallery today, and she is a beneficiary of the Central States Pension Plan, which is the largest of the underfunded multiemployer pension plans.

She and Butch Lewis did nothing wrong. They played by the rules, precisely as we would ask people to do.

So then we hear that this is about union bosses. Then we hear that this is about malfeasance. This is entirely about people who have been circumspect in the manner in which they have treated their pension plans.

She is looking at a significant cut in her pension after years of hard work and when retirement is finally in sight. Many workers and retirees have stories very similar to Mrs. Lewis'. These are real people with a very real problem if Congress doesn't act.

The American people sent us here to address problems like multiemployer pension plans, and the legislation before us today, despite what anybody and everybody says, accomplishes that. It would give millions of workers and retirees like those who have joined Mrs. Lewis in the gallery today the security and the retirement that they have worked and planned for in their golden years.

The Butch Lewis Act would allow pension plans to borrow money they need to remain solvent—borrow, emphasis on ''borrow''—and continue to provide retirement security for retirees and workers for decades to come while the plan is nursed back to health.

Let me remind my colleagues: Plans that receive loans under this bill are subject to numerous requirements and ample oversight. They are not permitted to increase benefits or to reduce contributions, and loan proceeds must be invested in conservative investments, grade-A instruments. This is not a bailout. This is a loan program. It is a commonsense solution. It is the

private sector coming together with public-sector opportunities to address this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say about it when I close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 397, which is truly unfortunate because I know the authors' goals here are very well-intended.

I have worked as a meatpacker; I have worked as a sheet metal worker; and I have worked construction. I know how hard these union families work, both for their wages and for their retirement.

It is why Republicans and Democrats agree we are in a multiemployer pension crisis. When there are over 1.3 million workers covered by these union-managed plans whose pensions are set to be drained entirely over the next decade, that is a crisis. These figures only scratch the surface. If we are to look at the bigger picture of every union-managed pension, less than half the promises made by trustees to these union workers are actually funded—less than half.

To put it simply, there is $638 billion promised to workers' retirement that is absolutely imaginary. That is wrong.

This bill, I think, doubles down on the worst aspects of the pension system that have these workers in a pickle today.

□ 1745

Congress has tried to kick the can down the road before. In 2006, Congress waived the required contributions for plans that said: We just can't make the contributions.

And what happened? Things got worse for the workers.

2007, plans were $193 billion underfunded. A couple years ago, it had tripled. They were three times worse off.

PBGC—they are the Federal insurer of these plans—went from a deficit of $739 million; their deficit increased seventyfold. That is even worse for the workers.

So rather than continuing the status quo in today's partisan exercise—and just be honest. Having nine Republicans does not make this a bipartisan bill. And we already know, unfortunately, because it is one party, this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate. Democrats acknowledge it. Republicans do. Even some of the unions do.

That is why I think a solution needs to happen this year, getting it to the President's desk so we say: Let's find a bipartisan solution to offer certainty, stability, and accountability and save these union-managed plans.

We ought to be working together to ensure that the plans can make good on their promises to our union workers. This means eliminating the various gimmicks some of these plans are allowed to use.

Plans have to accurately measure their pension promises in a way similar to insurance companies making those same promises. For example, I don't understand: Why are promises to unions worth only one-third of the pension promises made to workers who are working for a single company? Aren't union workers just as important, and aren't those promises just as important for them as other workers?

Equally important, we have folks on accountability. A promise is a promise, and companies need to be on the hook for every pension promise they made to their workers. And so, by the way, do the trustees.

Why do we allow the same people to operate the same way and leave the same union workers behind? What sense does that make?

And, finally, one of the reasons we oppose this bill is we need to prevent the severely underfunded plans from digging themselves even deeper in the hole under the guise of protecting workers. We have to wall off the contributions that fund these new promises that we know will be broken instead of perpetuating what now is sort of a Ponzi scheme: Retirees are paid out of the contributions that are supposed to fund benefits to younger workers. That is double counting, and that is what gets people in trouble.

I believe our union workers deserve better. The companies in these plans deserve better.

This bill doesn't make these plans more stable. It doesn't end underfunding. It doesn't make them secure for the long term. And our biggest worry as Republicans, it doesn't solve the problem. So these same workers, years down the road, are going to be in the same problem. We haven't helped them.

I think our workers deserve better, which is why I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

I give my commitment for the Ways and Means Republicans to work with you, Mr. Chairman, to find a real solution. Our workers really do deserve this.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), and I believe he is a Republican demonstrating that this is a bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I address this to my Republican and Democratic friends.

I am the lead Republican sponsor of this bill and I am proud to be because, as far as I am concerned, this bill protects and helps the men and women that we Republicans claim to care about: hardworking, middle-income people who play by the rules.

They are not looking for welfare. They are not looking for a free ride. They have played by the rules. They are the backbone of our communities.

They are Democrats. They are Republicans. They are Black. They are White. They are people we rely on all the time. They have done everything they have been asked to do.

Now, they are not high-paid CEOs. They are not big bankers. They are ordinary, day-to-day Americans, the people we claim to represent. And to allow them not to be taken care of, not to be protected, that this ''not be done to me'' just flies in the face of our oath of office.

We have an obligation to these men and women who have done so much for their country, and there is no example of malfeasance. We are not talking about that. We are talking about changing economic conditions that have affected these multiemployer pension plans. That is the reality. Our economy is moving fast, so there are people getting ahead. There are also people being left behind.

It is our duty to make sure that everyone gets the opportunity to go forward, that those who are entering their golden years, who planned, did everything they had to do, were asked to do, were expected to do, that they not be left out.

It is easy to look at some actuarial chart and put on the green eyeshade and say: Well, this may cause this; this may cause that.

In fact, even if we do that, to me, the economic loss by not protecting these workers is far worse than whatever the cost may be. And as Congressman NEAL said, this is not a bailout. It is a backstop. It is doing what has to be done.

And, again, they are not high-priced CEOs. They are not looking for a free ride. They are not trying to get a tax reduction for their jet or anything like that. They just want to get what they are entitled to, what they have earned, and what they played by the rules to get.

So, again, as a Republican, I am proud to stand for this and, also, for all Republicans in my district who are proud Teamsters, proud union members, as I was a union member.

Again, we should not be setting class against class, not talking about union bosses and union corruption. That stuff should have gone out in the 1930s.

We are all Americans. They are hardworking Americans. They deserve to receive the protection that we, as Members of the Congress, can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of this bill.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), one of the key members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for yielding.

I may come to the microphone with a slightly different message, having been on the bipartisan multiemployer pension commission, having hundreds of staff-hours into digging into the numbers and desperately trying to come up

with an honest, holistic, complete solution.

I fear we are about to do a level of violence here financially that we don't mean to. A previous Democrat speaker in the previous testimony actually spoke about we need to do a lifeboat.

If you do the math here, we are not doing a lifeboat. We are putting a little life preserver out when we need a big lifeboat. And the math—let's be honest about the math. If we actually come here, and I know this chart is too small to read, but I brought it up because we have all seen the actuarial report that makes it very clear.

If we actually use anything even close to what a union worker for a single employer plan—the protection, the rate of return, the net present value calculations they get—if we do that to these multiemployers, the vast majority of the multiemployer plans are in the red.

And we are, right now, about to fix an offer—whether you want to call it a bailout, whether you want to call it a subsidy, it is really expensive, and we are only taking care of a small portion of the problem.

What are we about to do to all the others, saying: Well, you were close to the cutoff; you are on your own?

Is that the type of cruelty you are actually about to pass, telling everyone we took care of the problem when the vast majority of the workers in these plans are on the other side of the cliff?

I beg of you, come back. We were so close in the commission work, and it was painful. Everyone was going to be mad at us, and it got a little too politically difficult.

But there is a mathematical way to get there. And for once, can we use our calculators to actually solve the problem and be honest rather than the political rhetoric that is absolutely vacuous on the scale of this problem.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Butch Lewis Act.

Passage of this bill is vital to millions of Americans who have worked hard and played by the rules. That includes tens of thousands of workers and retirees who live in Florida and hundreds of workers and retirees who reside in my Orlando area district.

I want to highlight section 4(h) of the bill, which was added at my request between committee markup and floor consideration. This provision requires the Pension Rehabilitation Administration to provide an annual report to Congress on pension plans that have received a loan under this bill and that are at risk of failing to repay interest or principal on that loan. Such a failure would require Federal taxpayers to absorb the cost of the loan.

This provision to increase congressional oversight will maximize the number of plans that repay their loans and minimize the financial burden on Federal taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NEAL for working with me to make this important change, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee, a businessperson, and who funds retirements and know how hard these workers work.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Listen, I share the same concerns. I don't think there is anybody I agree with, probably, on 99 percent of what we talk about than Mr. NEAL; and I have been, for the last couple years, trying to figure out how to fix this.

If this would actually fix it, that would be great. We look at this like it is some type of a government program that hasn't been run right; and Lord knows, there is enough of those out there. This is a private plan.

We keep talking about union members, and I have to tell you, I live in a union town. I grew up with union members. I work with people. My dad was the first Kelly to wear a white shirt to work for crying out loud.

But the question isn't about union members being irresponsible. It is about union plans that just didn't function the way they are supposed to.

If I knew going out of here today and voting for this legislation would fix the problem, I would do it in a minute. But we know it is not going to. And then we will have people who will clap and say, yes, they passed it. Well, we are going in the right direction. And we know it is not going any further than the floor of the House.

Fixing the plan is paramount. Let's quit figuring out who we are going to put the blame on and figure out how we are going to fix it.

I am not saying it is anybody's fault on their own. But, collectively, you have got to look at, if I am a member of a union, I am saying: So all those things that I won at the bargaining table, all that compensation I passed up, all those things that I could have asked for but didn't because I was planning for the future, I found out that the people who I entrusted my future to weren't capable of running the program the right way.

The program that we have at my small business is okay. We are going to be able to meet our obligations. We have got to stop using taxpayer money to fix irresponsible decisions or actions by people who didn't—maybe they knew what they were doing; maybe they didn't know what they were doing. I am not blaming anybody. But the real problem sits on our doorstep right now today.

And believe me, there is nothing easier than loaning other people's money to somebody who needs it. I get that. But the truth of the matter is every single penny we talk about comes out of hardworking American taxpayers' pockets. They had no role to play in this, and what we are saying is you are going to have to bail them out.

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to fix this. I want to see it fixed, and I want to see everybody in labor feel that all those generational gains, all of that negotiation actually meant something.

I think it is a shame when they look at, well, why isn't it functioning the way we were told it was functioning when we signed that contract? It wasn't their fault. It certainly wasn't the rest of America's taxpayers. Something failed, probably a lot more than one instance's worth.

But today, we aren't fixing this. We are putting it across something that isn't going to get through the Senate, and we are giving people false hope, which I think is the worst thing we can do. Let's not make promises we can't keep.

Chairman NEAL, I would be glad to work with you any amount of time. However we have to do it to get this fixed, it has to get fixed.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), and I appreciate his laser-like focus on this issue.

We are hearing people in an alternative universe. The problems that we are facing financially are not an issue of mismanagement. It is the near collapse of the economy that plunged it into a downward spiral and the fact that the deregulation by the Congress in the trucking industry meant that there were many, many jobs that disappeared. Many plans were no longer sustainable.

But I find it rich to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about fiscal conservatism and protecting the taxpayer's money. These are the folks who passed a tax bill, without the benefit of a hearing, that added $2.3 trillion to the deficit. And they are ignoring the fact that, if we allow these plans to go over the edge, it will cost five, six, eight times as much money.

Let's get real here.

I appreciate the commitment that we have, Mr. Chairman, to a bipartisan solution. There are people on the other side of the aisle who want to work on that. This isn't the last word. We have things to do, but this is, however, the first step to get us there.

□ 1800

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), one of the leaders of our Tax Policy Subcommittee efforts.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I agree we have a serious problem with multiemployer pensions which needs to be addressed. However, this bill, I believe, will actually set us back.

It does nothing to address the underlying structural issues of these plans. It actually does nothing to protect younger workers, who will be asked to keep paying into a system which remains troubled. And it saddles taxpayers with liabilities which are unlikely to be paid back, at a massive cost to taxpayers.

Let me provide just one alarming example of how flawed this proposal is, which I also highlighted in our committee markup.

Under this legislation, if a pension plan applies for a loan and the newly created Pension Rehabilitation Administration cannot make a determination on that plan's ability to repay in order to approve or deny the loan within 90 days, the loan would be automatically deemed approved.

Taxpayers deserve timely responses from Treasury, but no reputable financial institution would rubberstamp loans like this.

Pensioners and taxpayers both deserve better. Let's work together to deliver a real solution.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge opposition to this bill so that we can, together, focus on a better solution.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the always erudite Congressman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, for years, multiemployer pension plans offered working-class Americans something almost priceless: a nest egg for their retirement. This security was provided through collective bargaining benefit plans. Workers put in their own hard-earned dollars—they did not fall down on their obligations—for the promise of a safe and secure retirement.

Workers entered into a contract. You know what a contract is?

Industry deregulation, the decrease in the unionized workforce after decades of concerted political attacks, and the devastating—the other side had the House of Representatives for so many years in the last 20 years; they never even introduced a labor bill. What are they talking about—bipartisan?

This means almost 200 multiemployer plans are projected to fail. Some of them are going to be in your district, in your district. Plans are projected to fail, many within the next 10 years. Mr. Speaker, 1.3 million are at risk.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. At the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans hearing last year, my constituent Carol Podesta-Smallen said that her monthly benefits were on the verge of being cut by 61 percent—read that—from $2,600 to $1,022. Imagine that loss.

''My biggest fear,'' she told the committee, ''is losing my home'' and ''ending up in a shelter.''

Thanks to the Butch Lewis Act, which creates a unique public-private partnership, 1.3 million working Americans might not have to fear any longer.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a member of the Ways and Means Committee who, as a State treasurer, has worked with these public pension programs.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 397.

Protecting pensions and retirement security for all Americans should be one area where Republicans and Democrats can agree. It should be a top priority in Congress.

As the gentleman from Virginia indicated earlier, these plans need structural reform. Sadly, this bill does not include any.

H.R. 397 falls short of making any meaningful structural reforms to address the problems of underfunding or provide a method to pay back the loans. Instead, H.R. 397 provides taxpayer-subsidized loans to multiemployer pension plans that are insolvent or in danger of becoming insolvent.

This only throws out more taxpayer dollars while kicking the can down the road. This is unacceptable. We can and should do better.

However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have rushed this partisan legislation to the House floor with almost zero Republican feedback or amendments.

Instead of a partisan bill with no chance of going anywhere, I believe we should work together on serious bipartisan solutions to make the needed reforms so that we don't get right back in this situation again.

As Kansas State treasurer, we reformed the public pension system. We should do that with this system as well.

As Kansas State Treasurer, I helped reform the Kansas public pension program when it was facing a financial crisis and set it on a path to being solvent.

In fact, when I was sworn-in as state treasurer, Kansas had the second worst funded pension in the nation. But thanks to reforms we enacted, KPERS is now funded at 67% and ranked 29th in the country.

This was a big turnaround and is also the same kind of leadership and action we need now to preserve and protect pensions across the country. Pension plans can be reformed even after 2008 stockmarket decline.

Unfortunately, today's bill does nothing to keep pensions solvent in the future.

American workers and families deserve better and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Butch Lewis Act, and I do so because we are not talking about bailing out savings and loans. We are not talking about giving tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent.

We are talking about protecting the benefits of hardworking men and women who have worked for decades: truck drivers, bakers, grocery clerks, coal miners, people who have given their all to make sure that our communities continue to live and thrive.

I commend Chairman NEAL and Chairman SCOTT, the Democratic leadership, for bringing this bill to the floor. I urge that everybody vote for it.

Vote for the men and women who have kept America strong.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this Congress saved the American economy by extending Federally secured low- or no-interest loans to the banking and insurance industries and the American automakers. In many cases, it was the reckless activity of those industries that caused the economic crisis.

And nothing for hardworking American families.

In 2017, this Congress passed a 14 percent corporate tax cut, creating a $2 trillion debt, to many of the same industries that almost destroyed the American economy.

And, again, nothing for America's working families.

Today, more than 200 pension plans covering 1.5 million Americans are seriously in danger of failing. Working families from Buffalo to Boston are threatened with their pensions and their retirement savings being ripped away from them.

Mr. Speaker, the Butch Lewis Act, brought to the floor today under the leadership of Chairman RICHARD NEAL and BOBBY SCOTT, will provide stability and retirement security for millions of humble, hardworking Americans, and I urge its passage.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support of the Butch Lewis Act.

This bill would ensure that multiemployer pension plans can continue to provide security to millions of retired workers, everybody from the Teamsters to the United Food and Commercial Workers.

This is particularly important for my district in Los Angeles County, which is home to thousands of actors, musicians, and so many more creative professionals.

But the American Federation of Musicians and Employers' Pension Fund is

set to run out of money within 20 years, putting their 50,000 members in danger. In fact, it is tragic that this fund has been put in the position of applying to the U.S. Treasury for a reduction in benefits, the benefits that these workers put in a lifetime of hard work to earn.

Instead, the Butch Lewis Act would give pension funds like this loans for 30 years to help build up their funds, ensuring that workers can keep the full benefits that they earned and counted on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the Butch Lewis Act.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, every Democrat and every Republican in this House believes, or at least should believe, that if you are willing to go to work every single day, you are willing to work 40 or 50 hours a week, you are willing to work 48 or 50 weeks a year, you should have a decent life in America.

That is the American Dream: If you work hard, you make enough money so you can find a place to live, you can educate your children, you can retire one day without being scared.

And, right now, 1.3 million Americans are scared that they are going to lose the retirement benefits that they negotiated for.

We have got to work together to try and solve this problem on their behalf.

Chairman NEAL has stated he has been working on this for the past 2 years. People say, ''Oh, we have got to work together. We have got to work together.''

Let's do it already. This is your opportunity to try and move together to help hardworking people in America, to save the American Dream for people that have put the time in, that have done the hard work, that have negotiated for their benefits.

It is time to protect these people. And it is time to stop saying we are going to work together; it is time to work together now and pass the Butch Lewis Act.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard repeatedly during the course of this conversation and debate that somehow this is a bailout.

I even heard one speaker reference public pension plans. What has that got to do with this?

The subject in front of us today is the multiemployer pension plan system that is under duress through no fault of the individuals who were supposed to receive the derived benefit on a date certain based upon the contribution that they made.

Instead, we find ourselves in a position where the argument has become that somehow this is a bailout of special interests.

This is a backstop of hardworking men and women who have set aside prescribed numbers of dollars for the purpose of enjoying a period of time in their lives that they have carefully planned for.

Now, let me draw attention to the following. For 2 years we have worked on this legislation, and I know there are men and women of goodwill on both sides who would like to find a solution.

But the truth is, this is the only plan in town. This is the only plan that has been submitted, formally or informally, after 2 years of planning and work and an exhaustive 1 year of a special commission that came up with no solution to the multiemployer pension plan problem.

So, instead, we constructed, through a careful process, an opportunity where everybody on the Ways and Means Committee was heard.

I have been around long enough to have a special regard for the minority in a legislative institution. They get to be heard. They get to offer amendments.

They offered those amendments. Now, I was prepared to accept a couple of those amendments that I thought were actually pretty good, the provision being that I attached to that, to accept the amendment, they would have to vote for the legislation.

So I hope—and despite what we are hearing, by the way, that this doesn't have a chance in the Senate——

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

The idea that we are hearing that this has no chance in the Senate, I disagree with that. I disagree with that profoundly.

There is an opportunity, once this moves to the Senate, to at least have something to negotiate with, the Butch Lewis Act.

And I think that there are men and women, again, in the Senate who are prepared to act on this problem, largely because the contagion from this plan will eventually make its way and leach into the PBGC.

The head of the PBGC, while not endorsing this specific plan, said to me: Mr. Chairman, I am glad you are doing what you are doing because you are going to invite further opportunities to address this problem, short of, in the end, having to bail out the PBGC, which will happen if we don't formally address the measure that is in front of us today.

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

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

Look, it is not enough to do something. We have to do the right thing. We know the Senate isn't going to consider this bill. They have told everyone. There is no one in the Senate predicting this bill will be taken up.

The White House certainly won't support it in its current form. But, like us, they believe we need to find a solution.

When all is said and done, I know this bill is well intended. I know the author and leader is well intended because I know him.

I think this will actually delay Congress from making the progress we really need to on this issue.

So, today, after what will be a largely partisan vote, we are going to be forced to start over at step one.

I just think union workers and their families, who work incredibly hard every day, that promises to them ought to be kept. And they demand better from us.

□ 1815

To solve this issue, we have to work together to get to the root cause, which is that there are lower standards and less accountability for these union-managed plans. That is why the promises to union workers are worth a third what the promises are to workers in other plans. That isn't right.

This bill doesn't take any steps to make these failing plans more stable. It won't end underfunding. It doesn't make them more solvent over time for their children, who are working, by the way, in these same companies.

Families of these union workers are counting on these plans, and these workers have put their trust in these trustees to make good on their promises. Too many failed, and too many are still failing.

The truth is, we are in this crisis today because not all managers, by the way, did a bad job, but too many did. They dramatically overpromised and underdelivered. Will we rely on the same people who created this mess to do the same thing to the same workers they have already let down?

It is the workers we worry about the most. I have been on the factory floors with these men and women. They are good people. They care deeply about providing for themselves and their families. They just want their promises kept.

What our union workers need is for Congress to come up with a long-term, bipartisan solution now. We will need to start over, Republicans and Democrats working together to develop serious bipartisan reforms.

Again, I pledge to our chairman that Republicans are eager to engage, if asked, to try to find this solution—for the first time, if we are asked, to find a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to the bill from Heritage Action for America, Americans for Tax Reform, and National Taxpayers Union.

HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA,
July 23, 2019.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Ranking Member, House Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER BRADY: This week, the House is expected to consider H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act (previously known as the Butch-Lewis Act). The bill would essentially bail out over $600 billion in pension liabilities at taxpayer expense without making any reforms to ensure future shortfalls will be

avoided. This bill would also set a dangerous precedent for other insolvent pensions, including the $6 trillion in unfunded pension liabilities currently held by state and local governments.

Politically, this is not an easy issue for many offices. Every member wants to assure their constituents that he or she is doing everything possible to protect their retirement security. But there are four important considerations representatives should take into account before voting on this bill: 1) Existing policies have allowed pensions shortfalls to grow uncontrollably and must be fixed before any other actions are taken; 2) Private sector workers were promised their pensions by their employers and their unions, not by fellow taxpayers or the government; 3) There are alternative ways to ensure workers receive most or all of their pensions without a taxpayer bailout if action is taken quickly; 4) bailouts set dangerous precedents, create moral hazard, and shield bad actors.

Rather than bailing out multiemployer pensions plans through costly loans that will never be paid back, lawmakers should make them solvent by applying some of the tighter rules that govern single-employer pensions (which were 79% funded in 2015 vs. 43% for multiemployer), increasing PBGC premiums, placing reasonable restrictions on growth assumptions, and giving workers a buyout option.

Allowing taxpayer dollars to flow to private pensions without even addressing the underlying causes of the shortfall is an irresponsible non-solution to a growing national problem. Heritage Action opposes this legislation and urges all members of Congress to oppose it.

All the best,

GARRETT BESS,
Director of Government Relations,
Heritage Action for America.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2018.

Re Multiemployer Pension Solvency.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans. U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Co-Chairman, Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CO-CHAIRMEN HATCH AND BROWN: As the Joint Select Committee on Multiemployer Pension Solvency considers proposals to address the multiemployer pension crisis we urge Congress to enact meaningful reform aimed at preventing the situation from reoccurring and protecting taxpayers from future burden. This crisis has created uncertainty for millions of American workers planning their retirement and we appreciate the committee's attention to this issue.

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) currently estimates that there are 100 multiemployer pension plans in danger of insolvency if benefits are not reduced. The Heritage Foundation assesses that multiemployer pensions hold roughly $638 billion in unfunded pension promises with only 7 years before plans begin collapsing. Insolvency on this widespread scale would likely bankrupt the PBGC, itself underfunded, as it is required by law to insure retirees' benefits up to $12,870 per year.

While promises were made to participants in multiemployer plans, they were made by private labor unions, not the government and certainly not taxpayers. While the enormity of the problem may make government intervention a political inevitability, taxpayers have no direct responsibility to intervene. Any action considered by the committee should therefore focus on minimizing taxpayers' burden and enacting serious reform to prevent a future crisis from occurring again.

Any proposal seeking to provide federal assistance to multiemployer pensions should include the following reforms:

1. Improved Solvency of the PBGC. The first priority should be ensuring the PBGC is capable of providing its intended level of insured benefits to retirees. While the PBGC is not taxpayer funded, it is still an entity of the government and has failed to meet its obligations. Efforts at properly funding the PBGC should focus upon raising standard multiemployer premiums significantly to increase PBGC revenues, requiring termination plans for insolvent plans and introducing a standard PBGC eligibility age for new individuals receiving PBGC benefits. An underfunded PBGC has contributed to this crisis and increases the burden placed on taxpayers, this problem must be addressed.

2. Accrual of new benefits should freeze while switching employees to 401(k) plans. It is standard practice for single-employer pension funds to immediately freeze accrual of new benefits and switch employees to 401(k) plans when seeking assistance from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. Multiemployer pensions must be held to the same standard. Despite approaching insolvency, multiemployer pension plans continue to promise benefits several times more generous than the typical employer contribution to 401(k)s. Almost two-thirds of contributions made by multiemployer plans simply cover newly earned benefits, an irrational amount for plans approaching insolvency and seeking taxpayer aid. Halting accruals will free up funds to pay current benefits while new benefits will be more appropriately funded through both employer and employee contributions.

3. Multiemployer plans must be held to appropriate funding standards. Taxpayers should not be on the hook for pensions taking on greater risk. Multiemployer pensions have been granted special funding rules that allow them to set lower employer contribution levels and rely on higher returns than comparative single-employer plans. For example, while single-employer plans are expected to resume full funding in seven years, multiemployer employer plans are given thirty years to payoff unfunded liabilities. Allowing multiemployer plans this substantially larger time period has allowed the funding shortage to snowball. As several participating employers went bankrupt or withdrew over time, the remaining employers were on the hook for guaranteeing the same investment returns to participants of these ''orphaned plans.''

4. Beneficiaries should be protected within reason. Retirees should be granted protection to their benefits, but that protection must be given within fiscally responsible limits. 401(k) holders don't receive a bailout if their account drops, despite plans being funded by the employees themselves. Retirees under single-employee pensions don't receive unlimited PCGC protection despite more stringent funding rules. Beneficiaries of multiemployer plans shouldn't receive special treatment from the government simply because their union representatives overpromised on returns. Perhaps most importantly, having taxpayers fully cover the loss for retirees will be a signal to employees that their union representatives successfully advocated to protect them, when in reality union leadership overpromised and underfunded their pensions. To avoid a repeat scenario, this situation must be recognized as a pension crisis, not business as usual with a taxpayer safety net.

As the Joint Committee continues to consider a potential solution, Americans for Tax Reform hopes that the committee will work to lessen the burden on taxpayers and will pursue a solution that prevents a similar pension crisis from happening again.

Thank you for your consideration.

Onward,

GROVER G. NORQUIST,
President, Americans for Tax Reform.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2019.

National Taxpayers Union urges all Representatives to vote ''NO'' on H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. This legislation would bail out failing private pension plans with few guardrails for taxpayers and cost at least $67 billion over the next decade. Congress should instead pursue legislation that tackles the multiemployer pension plan (MPP) crisis in a prudent, determined, patient and gradual way.

NTU has noted before that the MPP crisis, which affects 1.5 million Americans, deserves attention from Congress. However, H.R. 397 is a flawed piece of legislation. We wrote last month and in 2018 that, when it comes to MPPs, ''[i]nfusions of cash from the Treasury with few restrictions tend to characterize overreaction rather than corrective action.'' Unfortunately, this is exactly what H.R. 397 does, by providing 30–year loans to failing MPPs with few guardrails for taxpayer dollars. We believe that H.R. 397 will hurt workers in the long run, by allowing plan sponsors to double down on unrealistic promises and assumptions.

H.R. 397 will also exacerbate the troubled state of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), which is scheduled to reach insolvency during fiscal year (FY) 2025. Portions of PBGC's operations have appeared on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk List for over a decade, and H.R. 397 fails to introduce real reforms to PBGC.

Finally, we are alarmed by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report that pegged the cost of H.R. 397 at more than $67 billion over the next decade. NTU must add, though, that even this troubling CBO score fails to account for the 30-year timeframe on the repayment of loans issued to failing MPPs. It is reasonable to assume that the 30-year costs to taxpayers will be at least tens of billions of dollars more, and even greater if MPPs fail to pay back the full principal and interest on Treasury Department loans.

We have outlined more prudent reforms before: require PBGC to more fully embrace risk pricing and other management tools to safeguard against liability surprises in the future; include a uniform, significant benefit reduction to show good faith in, the reform effort; and require that loans be collateralized with real-world assets that ensure the loans will be entirely repaid over a term measured in years rather than decades. We believe any of these reforms would present far better options to solving the MPP crisis than H.R. 397.

NTU strongly urges Representatives to oppose H.R. 397, and instead work towards prudent, determined, patient and gradual solutions to the MPP crisis that avoid putting taxpayers on the hook for multibillion-dollar bailouts.

Roll call votes on H.R. 397 will be included in our annual Rating of Congress and a ''no'' vote will be considered the pro-taxpayer position.

Mr. BRADY. I am convinced we can find a solution. This isn't the right thing for our workers, but there is a right way to help them. We are serious about making that happen.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been edifying. There has been an opportunity here for a full discussion about this impending problem that threatens the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. This is an acknowledgment of the threat that is before us.

There is one thing that we have in common today. Nobody doubts the gravity of the situation that is in front of us. Nobody doubts just how serious this is for financial markets going forward if we don't address this issue, given the contagion that I referenced earlier that is likely to occur in other pension plans across the country if we don't address this issue forthwith.

When I hear people say we want to do this in a spirit of bipartisanship, when? For 2 years, we talked about this, and finally, there is a plan that the House is about to vote on in the next few minutes. I am ever so hopeful and optimistic that we, in fact, are going to be able to see the opportunity to pass this legislation and get it over to the Senate.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bipartisan bill H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act. This bill would allow pension plans to get back on their feet and ensure retirees receive their promised benefits.

We must act quickly to ensure that Americans who contributed to their multiemployer pension plans will not have their financial security at risk. That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 397. This bill provides financial assistance to financially troubled multiemployer defined benefit pension plans covering about 10 million, mostly working-class, Americans across the country.

The financial assistance provide by the bill consists of loans with a 30-year repayment term. Multiemployer pension plans are collectively bargained pension plans covering employees with two or more employers. Retirees, workers and their families, who rely on these plans are losing benefits earned over a lifetime of work through no fault of their own.

As an example, the Central States Pension Fund in my district has 10 employers covering more than 1,500 participants. Some of the top employers using Central States Pension Fund are YRC Inc., ABF Freights Systems, Penske Truck Leasing Co., DHL Express, and Air Express International. Without this financial assistance, pensions of truck drivers, electricians, ironworkers, bakers, and many more would continue to be cut significantly—putting their families' financial security and future at risk.

Mr. Speaker, the growing number of families in our country relying on their pension plans is growing and can no longer go unnoticed. We now have an opportunity to help these families protect their financial security.

Mr. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I rise in support of strong, bipartisan passage of the Butch Lewis Act.

The Butch Lewis Act will provide the economic security this body ripped out from under millions of hardworking Americans.

Across our country, 1.3 million workers and retirees face serious and significant threat of cuts to their hard earned multiemployer pension plans, through no fault of their own. Several of these plans are large enough to take down the entire Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, threatening the guaranteed security of 10 million Americans.

I have heard the message time and again from retirees in my district and across this nation: they worked for decades to earn these pensions. Now they are too old, or their health too unstable, to return to the workforce. The stress and anxiety are sapping their will. Some have taken their own lives.

The Butch Lewis Act will provide much needed and long-overdue relief.

The Butch Lewis Act keeps the promises made to retirees. It guarantees pension benefits they have earned into the future. It does so by allowing troubled pension plans to borrow the money needed to remain solvent in 30-year, low interest loans. The plan will repay.

Pensions-have afforded millions of middle-class Americans the opportunity to enjoy their golden years with economic peace of mind. Let us restore this peace with swift and just passage of the Butch Lewis Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAVID P. ROE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 4(b)(2) to read as follows:

(2) INTEREST RATE.—Loans made under subsection (a) shall have an interest rate of 5 percent for each of the first 5 years and 9 percent thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 509, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One talking point that I have heard a lot from my friends across the aisle in support of this bill is that Congress has already bailed out our Nation's financial institutions so we should bail out the pension plans.

While I don't agree with that sentiment, if that is the argument, then we should treat these bailouts the same. Using this logic, my amendment would set the loan interest rates in the bill at 5 percent for the first 5 years and 9 percent after that, the same rate given to banks under the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

While I wasn't in Congress at the time TARP was passed, the situation we are in today, considering a union pension bailout, is the best evidence of why we shouldn't have interfered with a bailout of our private financial institutions. Nevertheless, that decision was made, and now one bailout is being used to justify another. If we believe Congress should be in the business of bailing out privately negotiated, collectively bargained benefit arrangements of private employers, we should do so using the same terms as TARP.

A key feature of TARP was the Capital Purchase Program, which provided capital to finance institutions by purchasing senior preferred shares. My amendment would set the interest rate of loans authorized under this bill to the same rate that senior preferred stock dividends paid under TARP's Capital Purchase Program. If these terms were good enough for the TARP bailout, they should be good enough for the bailout offered by this bill.

The majority refuses to accept the outrageous risk associated with making loans in these plans. Instead, this bill offers low-interest loans to massively underfunded, failing pension plans and allows loan principal forgiveness if the plans can't be repaid. This is unbelievable. This proves the majority has no belief that the loans will ever be repaid and is simply looking to gift hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer funds to these failing pension plans.

What about the retirement plans affected during the same time? What are we going to bail out next? Are we going to continue having the Federal Government come along and throw money at badly managed investments?

If we do make these loans, the government shouldn't just throw the money at a problem without some guardrails. With TARP, banks were not given low-interest loans over 30 years and told it really doesn't matter if they repay them or not, that we will forgive them anyway. In fact, those loans were repaid, and the government made money doing that.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I served as chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pension Subcommittee for 6 years. I worked on the bill with Chairman Kline and Ranking Member MILLER to help solve this problem. It is a huge problem.

My father was a union member who lost his job 30 years after World War II, so I have been down that road with my own family.

I am willing to work across the aisle. As Mr. NEAL stated, I was on that committee that didn't do anything. I am willing now to work on this.

This bill, I disagree with him, is not going anywhere. The PBGC chairman today said that we should work in a bipartisan way, and I am sitting here today telling the gentleman that I am willing to do that. I have been willing to for the past 6 years. We did pass that bill back about 4 years ago, which will help with the plans, so I am willing to do that. This plan is not it.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership on behalf of America's working families, and I thank him for his role in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I thank Chairman NEAL as well for his chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee, so essential in our being able today to come to respect the work of America's workers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation and in opposition to the amendment. Again, this is about the financial security and future of America's workers.

Our House Democratic majority was elected to fight for the people. Today, as we pass the Butch Lewis bill that is bipartisan, that has bipartisan support, that is exactly what we are doing.

The Butch Lewis Act delivers justice for 1.3 million workers and retirees facing devastating cuts to pensions earned over a lifetime of work. It protects the financial security of families, ensuring workers have the benefits they have earned and need to provide for spouses, children, and grandchildren. It honors the sacred pension promise in America, that if you work hard, you deserve the dignity of a secure retirement.

Sadly, years of relentless special interest agendas have put that promise in peril. Unchecked recklessness on Wall Street ignited a financial meltdown that dealt a devastating blow to multiemployer pension plans while dangerous deregulation and relentless attacks against unions have eaten away at these plans' health.

If we do not act, the pensions of many workers and retirees will be cut to the bone, and the financial security and futures of their families and communities will be thrown into jeopardy.

Workers are the backbone of our Nation, and we cannot accept a single penny to be cut from their pensions. Congress has a responsibility to do right by hardworking Americans.

We have a responsibility to Americans like Sam, a retired coal miner from southwest Virginia who has second-stage black lung and relies on a $475 a month pension to pay for his healthcare because he has been denied Federal black lung benefits.

We have a responsibility to Americans like Kenneth from Wisconsin, who needs his pension to provide for his five children, nine grandkids, and, until recently, his beloved wife, Beverly, who he just lost to cancer. Yet, his pension faces a 55 percent cut.

We have a responsibility to Americans like Rita Lewis, who is here with us today, wife to Butch Lewis, this bill's namesake, who so heroically fought until his death to protect pensions, including Rita's survivor benefits.

As Rita testified before Congress: ''This pension was not a gift. He worked hard for every penny of that pension. He gave up wages and vacation pay and other benefits . . . so I would be taken care of if something happened to him.''

Now that pension risks being slashed to the core.

Workers, retirees, and survivors like Sam, Kenneth, and Rita are forgoing much-needed medicines, or working into their eighties for more income, and are being robbed of their benefits that they need to help out their families.

Not Rita. She is not working into her eighties.

We must act now. We will swiftly pass this bill to honor workers' dignity, support their families, and protect their futures.

We must always remember that the middle class is the backbone of our democracy, and our workers are the strength of that middle class. In fact, I do believe that the middle class has a union label on it.

In the coming months, the House will continue to build on this progress, passing future legislation on behalf of working families. Our majority is for the people, and we will work relentlessly to restore a government that works for the people's interest, not the special interests.

I urge a strong bipartisan vote to protect the pensions of workers and retirees, and I urge Senator MCCONNELL to immediately take up this bill so that we can send it to the President's desk and give comfort to so many families in America.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The intent of this bill is to keep loan interest rates as low as possible for two reasons, to get financially distressed plans back on their feet and to maximize the chance of full repayment of the loan.

CBO estimates that, under the provisions of the bill, the cost of the loans, after some defaults, will cost less than $60 billion over 30 years, much less than the hundreds of billions of dollars if we do nothing.

This bill specifies an interest rate to be around the 30-year U.S. Treasury securities rate with a 20 basis-point increase to cover costs of administration. For those plans that elect to repay the loan principal on an accelerated schedule, there is an incentive of a 50 basis-point reduction in the interest rate.

The bottom line here is that this is not a program from which the Federal Government intends to make a profit.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Business Roundtable, and many employer organizations have not endorsed the bill. However, they did send a letter last year that said: ''The financial and demographic circumstances of certain plans will not allow them to survive without responsible financial assistance. Consequently, we recommend long-term, low-interest loans that will protect taxpayers from financial liability.''

These business groups recognize that doing nothing is more expensive to taxpayers than the provisions of this bill and a low-interest loan.

□ 1830

The amendment before us mandates the interest rate to be 5 percent for the first 5 years and 9 percent thereafter. This is not a low-interest loan in today's environment where a 30-year Treasury security rate is 2.6 percent.

Raising the interest rates to the levels prescribed by my friend from Tennessee would entirely subvert the loan program. Nobody would apply, and those who did apply would have to represent an earnings rate that would not be realistic.

This amendment would increase loan defaults, and its effect, whether intended or not, would doom the loan program before it starts. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that we reject the amendment.

Before I yield back, I want to say that the gentleman from Tennessee and I disagree on this amendment and the underlying bill, but I appreciate his leadership and expertise. We served on the Joint Select Committee last year, and we agree that something needs to be done because we have a crisis. So I look forward to working with him and his colleague from Tennessee, the Chair of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Mr. ALEXANDER, as this process moves forward.

Now, I want to remind everybody, if we do nothing, over a million hardworking Americans will lose their pensions, businesses will go bankrupt, and the Federal Government will unnecessarily spend hundreds of billions of dollars.

This amendment will not help. It will actually make matters worse, and, therefore, we should defeat the amendment and then pass the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 509 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3239.

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

□ 1836

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARBAJAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act, a bill that will address an important piece of the humanitarian crisis at the border, ensuring the delivery of basic standards of care for individuals who are detained in CBP custody.

Many of us, including myself, have traveled to our southern border over the past couple of months and witnessed firsthand the effects of the situation that continues to unfold. No one who has made that journey has not been deeply moved by the severe overcrowding and inhumane conditions at some CBP facilities.

If you have not observed these conditions in person, you have undoubtedly seen pictures or read the latest DHS inspector general report and know how serious this situation is:

Families, children, and single adults housed outside or in severely overcrowded cells;

Lack of access to showers, functioning toilets, and basic personal hygiene products;

Flu outbreaks, lice infestations, and other conditions that threaten the health and safety of everyone who is exposed to them.

Mr. Chairman, I will include in the RECORD a copy of the report submitted by the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security on the situation at the border.

The situation is so dire that no less than three children and seven other individuals have died in CBP custody so far this fiscal year. By comparison, not a single child died in CBP custody in the previous decade.

Although the administration asserts that these conditions are the inevitable result of the increase in the number of people seeking protection at our border, it is not just the numbers that are the problem. It is the administration's mission to deter migration through heavy-handed enforcement and its steadfast refusal to address the crisis competently that has gotten us where we are today.

H.R. 3239 will literally save lives by restoring order and basic standards in the processing of immigrants at the border.

H.R. 3239 requires CBP to ensure that all individuals arriving at our border receive a basic health screening, and the bill also requires other emergency care professionals to be available at least by phone so that, if a life-threatening situation arises, it can be addressed quickly instead of hours later when it is too late.

H.R. 3239 would also prohibit overcrowding and requires migrants to have access to showers, basic hygiene products, and clean clothing so they are not forced to sit in clothing soiled from dirt and sweat for weeks and days at a time. Detainees would have access to water and standard age-appropriate diets comprised of food that follows applicable safety standards.

My colleagues across the aisle have claimed that H.R. 3239 is unworkable because CBP lacks the funding to implement it, but just a few weeks ago Congress passed a $4.6 billion spending measure to send emergency funding to the border. The Trump administration has yet to prove that it can put this money to good use and treat arriving migrants competently. H.R. 3239 would do just that.

I would like to commend our colleague, Representative and Dr. RAUL RUIZ, for his efforts in moving this bill forward and for his commitment to ensuring the dignity and safety of those seeking protection in our country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Custody Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in opposition to the bill.

Despite months of opportunities for Congress to intervene in the border crisis and actually fix our laws, the Democrat majority has done nothing except stand by, at first denying that there was a crisis, and then watching as a chaotic and dangerous situation developed.

The administration repeatedly warned us that the unprecedented migrant flow was overwhelming the government's ability to adequately respond and that the facilities were overcrowded because they were not designed as long-term holding facilities. Yet the Democrat majority brought forth no legislation to fix the problems. Instead, they passed the Dream Act, a bill which will only incentivize more illegal immigration.

So, aside from the Dream Act, what is the majority's next idea? H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act, a bill that will not solve the border crisis and, in fact, will make the crisis worse.

H.R. 3239 does nothing to address the root causes of this crisis:

It does nothing to address the push-and-pull factors that drive illegal immigration, including loopholes in our own laws;

It does nothing to fix the Flores settlement agreement's guarantee of catch and release for almost all family units;

It does nothing to fix the provision in the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act that prevents the safe repatriation of children from noncontiguous countries;

It does not introduce reasonable reforms to our asylum laws. Instead, it imposes onerous and burdensome requirements on the hundreds of CBP facilities at a time when the government is already overwhelmed.

Of course, CBP should always strive to comply with their custodial care standards, and I know that the men and women of CBP are treating migrants with respect. But H.R. 3239 does not address the root causes of the conditions at CBP facilities: that ICE and HHS do not have enough space available to take custody of these individuals.

The bill does not increase funding for ICE detention beds to ensure single adults do not have to be in CBP custody beyond 72 hours. It does not fund additional permanent HHS shelter capacity for unaccompanied children.

Instead, in the midst of a chaotic situation, H.R. 3239 imposes extensive medical screening, medical care, and facilities requirements on to CBP that are, in many cases, simply unworkable.

This bill's onerous requirements significantly impact CBP's mission and ignore the reality that CBP is confronting an influx of migrants that has overwhelmed the system and caused a crisis.

□ 1845

H.R. 3239 requires a fully documented medical screening of each and every

person entering CBP custody, to include a full physical exam, risk assessment, interview, medical intake questionnaire, and taking of all vital signs.

In addition, the bill requires CBP to require additional follow-up medical care, including psychological and mental health care.

The bill even requires that CBP shall have onsite, to the extent practicable, in addition to the medical professionals employed to conduct the initial medical screenings, '' . . . licensed emergency care professionals, specialty physicians (including physicians specializing in pediatrics, family medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, geriatric medicine, internal medicine, and infectious diseases), nurse practitioners, other nurses, physician assistants, licensed social workers, mental health professionals, public health professionals, dieticians, interpreters, and chaperones.'' If it is impracticable to have them onsite, CBP must have them on call.

May I remind you that our own veterans do not have access to the same list of healthcare specialists at an initial request at their clinics.

I offered an amendment that was not made in order that stated that this bill would not go into effect until the VA confirms that medical care that meets the standards listed in this bill for detainees is made available to every veteran seeking medical care at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

CBP personnel should be interdicting narcotics, preventing illegal immigration, stopping child trafficking, and facilitating lawful trade and travel, yet H.R. 3239 would have them, instead, setting up full-service hospitals at hundreds of facilities.

The requirements of H.R. 3239 apply not only to border patrol stations, but also to ports of entry, including land, sea, and air ports of entry, checkpoints, forward operating bases, and secondary inspection areas.

As if the current crisis weren't enough of a challenge, the bill requires updates to hundreds of CBP facilities, requisition of personnel and equipment, and training for all CBP personnel at covered facilities, all at an immense cost.

May I mention again, I offered an amendment that would require the DHS Secretary to also report on the cost of implementation of this legislation.

My amendment would have also delayed the 6-month implementation requirement if Congress does not appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the requirements of this bill, yet H.R. 3239 does not authorize any appropriations.

The requirements apply to facilities no matter the size, the location, or even the amount of traffic. So it applies equally to a very busy airport, processing millions of passengers a year, just as it would to an extremely remote port of entry or to an isolated checkpoint.

Under this bill, there could be more medical personnel working at the facility than aliens on any given day.

H.R. 3239 will also weaken border security at a time when we should be enhancing CBP's ability to respond to the surge.

The bill would limit CBP's ability to house migrants that come during a surge, while simultaneously limiting the number of people that could be housed in existing CBP processing facilities, yet CBP cannot simply process those individuals out to ICE custody, because, again, H.R. 3239 does not fund any additional ICE detention beds.

The practical effects of H.R. 3239 are simply more catch-and-release.

The majority has made no secret that CBP will be forced to release even more people into the United States. This is not a design flaw; it is a feature of the bill.

H.R. 3239 also increases the incentive to exploit children to gain entry into the United States. Smugglers know migrants will be released into the U.S. interior if they bring a child, because of a legal loophole created by the Flores settlement agreement preventing those family units from being detained for a sufficient amount of time to complete their immigrant court proceedings.

DHS continues to see adults fraudulently posing as a parent. This loophole is exploited by smugglers and human traffickers on a daily basis, as children are being rented and purchased like chattel.

H.R. 3239 broadens this loophole even further, extending it beyond parents to any adult relative of a child. The incentive to bring a child will be even greater, and human traffickers would now be able to pose as a child's distant relative to evade detection and take advantage of the Flores loophole.

CBP is already confronting a crisis that is worsening by Congressional inaction to fix the loopholes in our laws that fuel illegal immigration. Congress shouldn't make the crisis worse by passing H.R. 3239.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), my colleague and the author of the bill.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chair, I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership on addressing the humanitarian crisis at our border.

I rise in support of H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.

My legislation is meant to prevent children from dying at the border, and promote a professional, humane way to treat children and families under the custody, and therefore, the responsibility of CBP. But before I explain my bill's American-values-based, humanitarian, public health approach, I want to refute a few myths.

First, the myth that this bill costs too much.

My bill will not raise the deficit one penny and does not require any increase in mandatory spending. Instead, it provides the blueprint for how CBP should use its current budget and the $4.6 billion in emergency funding we recently passed to address the humanitarian crisis.

Second, the myth that my bill will make it more difficult for CBP to prevent human trafficking.

My bill specifically allows for CBP to separate a child from an adult if '' . . . such an arrangement poses safety or security concerns . . . '', such as in instances of suspected human trafficking.

Furthermore, my bill requires CBP personnel to receive training on indicators of child sexual exploitation and abuse.

Third, the myth that my bill requires medical specialists onsite at all times.

That is simply not true. It is simply false.

My bill only requires a licensed health provider like a nurse, a physician assistant, an EMT, or paramedic to conduct health screenings, and it empowers CBP to call an emergency care provider to help with emergency triage decisions. That is it. And those emergency care providers can include those specialists, but it doesn't require them, all of them, to be on call at all times or to be onsite.

Finally, the myth that my bill is too cumbersome for CBP and will distract agents from safety and security concerns.

One, CBP agents want the assistance in my bill because it provides them with humanitarian and health assistance to free up their time to focus on safety and security issues; therefore, my bill will make our country safer.

And, two—look, I was an early responder after the Haiti earthquake and medical director for the largest internally-displaced camp in Haiti.

If nonprofits can meet the humanitarian standards in this bill in the worst circumstances in the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, then we can meet them in the greatest country known to man.

So here is what my bill actually does. It creates a simple health triage system and basic humanitarian public health standards.

It ensures that every individual in CBP custody receives a health screening to triage for acute conditions and high-risk vulnerability, something that is easy to do. And, no, you don't need a full physical exam. You are just triaging. You need vital signs and a cursory physical exam. In fact, for most people, it would take less than 5 minutes to perform.

It ensures that every individual in CBP custody receives a health screening to triage for acute conditions and high-risk vulnerabilities so people don't die under the responsibility of CBP.

It ensures that an emergency care provider is on call to pick up the phone and help make triage decisions for life-threatening medical emergencies. That is it. That is all we are asking for.

My bill also prioritizes high-risk populations, the most vulnerable to severe illnesses and dying, to receive a health screening within 6 hours, including children, pregnant women, and the elderly.

My bill requires very basic and necessary things like toothbrushes and diapers.

It includes nutrition standards to make sure that infants have formula and babies have baby food. How hard is that?

In terms of shelter, my bill will ensure that people are no longer packed and piled on top of each other; that the temperature is not too cold, weakening a child's immune system; and that toddlers don't have to sleep on a cold concrete floor.

Finally, my bill addresses the challenges of surge capacity, adds training, and requires reporting.

The straightforward reforms in my bill are essential to protecting the health and safety of agents and the children and families in their custody.

Let me repeat myself. Let me reiterate. This is not just for asylum-seeking children and families. This bill will help CBP agents.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chair, it will empower CBP to meet the basic provisions for human dignity.

Mr. Chair, I sincerely urge my fellow representatives to listen to their better angels, do the right thing, and vote for H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Custody Act, to prevent another child from dying in the custody of CBP and to promote a professional, humane approach to addressing the humanitarian challenges at our border and create the basic conditions for human dignity.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to bring attention to page 8 of the bill, line 16. I am going to read it verbatim: ''The Commissioner or the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that each location to which detainees are first transported after an initial encounter has onsite at least one licensed medical professional to conduct health screenings. Other personnel that are or may be necessary for carrying out the functions described in subsection (e), such as licensed emergency care professionals, specialty physicians (including physicians specializing in pediatrics, family medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, geriatric medicine, internal medicine, and infectious diseases), nurse practitioners, other nurses, physician assistants, licensed social workers, mental health professionals, public health professionals, dieticians, interpreters, and chaperones, shall be located onsite, to the extent practicable, or if not practicable, shall be available on call.''

In the medical field, ''on call'' means 30 minutes or closer.

So this bill absolutely requires that all of these specialty physicians are available either onsite or within 30 minutes or closer to being able to be at the location, any of these CBP locations, and they have to be provided this healthcare within 12 hours of manifesting themselves at these facilities.

Right now our veterans don't have access to this healthcare that is ensured in this bill for illegal immigrants coming into our country. If you go to a clinic at a VA facility, they don't have specialty physicians. You have to wait 30 to 60, maybe 90 days to get an appointment with a specialty physician in order to get the care that that veteran wants or needs, not 12 hours.

So we are providing through this bill better healthcare opportunities for illegal immigrants showing up at the border than we are for our veterans who have served our country, who have raised their right hand to swear an oath to our Constitution, who have service-connected disability, and have the ability to use Veterans Affairs facilities. They only get 30 to 60 days to get those medical needs taken care of; illegal immigrants get it in 12 hours, according to this bill.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I just would note that we went through this in committee during the markup. All of the specialty positions listed need not be available at the site, as is mentioned on line 23.

As we mentioned, if you took a picture of a rash on a child, you could text that picture to a pediatrician, say, ''Is this a communicable disease or is this a small rash?'' and that would meet the requirements of this.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3239, a bill introduced by my friend and colleague from California, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, and which I proudly cosponsor.

The humanitarian crisis at the southern border is greatly worsened by understaffed, unprepared, and underequipped CBP facilities.

I know this. I have seen them firsthand in visits that I have made to some of these facilities not only in Texas, but also in New Mexico.

This bill will alleviate these problems by requiring CBP facilities to maintain the personnel and equipment necessary to screen all individuals in custody and provide emergency care as needed.

□ 1900

Our American values, moral conscience, and the Constitution require that we treat all individuals on American soil humanely and respectfully. For this purpose, border agents must have the equipment, resources, and training necessary to carry out this mission and save lives.

Congress must continue working to solve the immigration issue and finally end the humanitarian crisis at the southern border.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3239.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my colleague.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3239, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.

I thank Dr. RAUL RUIZ for bringing his medical expertise to this body and introducing this bill to bring some humane treatment to families and children seeking refuge in the United States.

This critical bill creates basic standards for humanitarian care of all detainees within CBP facilities. By establishing health screenings, emergency medical care, appropriate access to water, nutrition, and shelter, these critical standards are a step in the right direction.

Last year, when I traveled to Brownsville and McAllen, Texas, I saw the horrors of the Trump administration's family detention jails. I saw children sleeping on concrete floors. It is cruel and inhumane. And I, quite frankly, wrote a letter to the United Nations asking the secretary general to send observers to report on the conditions and treatment of these children and adults.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD my letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.

His Excellency Mr. ANTONIO GUTERRES,
Secretary General United Nations Headquarters, New York, NY.

DEAR SECRETARY-GENERAL GUTERRES: I write today to request your urgent assistance in the ongoing crisis our country is facing at our Southern Border with Mexico.

As the Democratic Congressional Representative to the United Nations (UN), I am formally requesting UN observers travel to the United States to report on the conditions of detention facilities and treatment of children, based on relevant international law and human rights principles.

I am appalled by the reports and images from detention facilities in Texas and other states along the border, where more than 2,300 children have been separated from their parents by border patrol agents.

This weekend, I will be traveling to the border myself, to witness first-hand the conditions adults and children are facing while in detention.

I urge you to send experts from relevant UN agencies to observe conditions in both Department of Homeland Security (OHS) and Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) facilities both at the border and throughout the more than 17 states around the country that are now housing children who have been separated from their families.

As a mother, a grandmother, and as a psychiatric social worker, I am most concerned for the physical and mental well being of children separated from their parents at their most vulnerable time. The American

Academy of Pediatrics has warned that this practice of family separation can cause irreparable harm to lifelong development by disrupting a child's brain architecture.''

You recently said in a statement, ''As a matter of principle, the Secretary-General believes that refugees and migrants should always be treated with respect and dignity, and in accordance with existing international law.'' And you added, ''children must not be traumatized by being separated from their parents. Family unity must be preserved.''

I sincerely hope that you will consider this urgent humanitarian request in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

BARBARA LEE,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, it is really our responsibility to protect the health and safety of individuals in CBP custody and, yes, we have failed.

By passing this bill today, we are putting critical protocol and protections in place for individuals and making sure that their well-being and health are a priority. We can no longer allow individuals to suffer, be abused, or die under CBP. Our values demand that we take this action. It is past time for us to protect adults and children fleeing violence, seeking a safe haven in America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this vital bill. And I thank Dr. RUIZ for giving us a chance to do the right thing.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support and the Hispanic Caucus stands in support of H.R. 3239.

We had an opportunity, not too long ago, to visit rural New Mexico and Antelope Wells, a forward operating base, and another Border Patrol station. It became very clear to Dr. RUIZ, and to all of us, that the Border Patrol is not prepared for medical emergencies that migrants may encounter or that their own agents may encounter.

Something must be done. These folks are not livestock. They are not animals. They shouldn't be treated in a subhuman way.

Mr. Chairman, this bill establishes minimum standards for humane care, and I, wholeheartedly, support it.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I will make this very quick and to the point. If this bill were to become law, illegal immigrants illegally crossing our border will have better access to healthcare at government expense than our veterans with service-connected disabilities. And not just better healthcare access to specialty doctors and psychiatric care, not just that, but within a timeframe 30 to 60 days faster than veterans can get appointments for medical care at a VA facility.

The requirements in this bill show that, depending on the scenario, CBP has 6 to 12 hours to provide care to the immigrant. A veteran under the MISSION Act that was passed by Congress last session, has 30 to 60 days to get an appointment. So we are treating an illegal immigrant within a day, a requirement by law, where veterans have to wait 30 to 60 days just to get an appointment.

And let's discuss the cost. Oh, that is right, we don't know the cost because the majority didn't consult CBP or Homeland Security, and we have absolutely no idea how much this is going to cost. We are going to put this unfunded mandate on CBP when they are already taxed and already tolled with the crisis that we have on the border and not know how much it is going to cost them to implement all of these medical requirements that are in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an important step forward to make sure that we have minimal standards at CBP facilities. It is simply incorrect to assert that the minimum standards provided for in this bill are extravagant extensions of healthcare to people seeking assistance.

If you have a medical emergency, you should call for an ambulance. If you are having a heart attack, you should go to a hospital and be treated. If you have a medical emergency, you have to be dealt with under the section on page 4. If there is an indication of a problem, you have to have the ability to reach out to an expert by phone, if necessary, or to get some guidance on what to do. This is just common sense.

We have relied on Dr. RUIZ, who saw this very system work in one of the hemisphere's poorest nations—Haiti—after an earthquake where they had no infrastructure. The nonprofits working there could do this. I have no doubt that the richest nation on Earth and the Department of Homeland Security could do as well as nonprofits in Haiti after the earthquake. And to suggest that they couldn't, I think is really a problem.

I would like to note that if we said that veterans are going to get the care outlined in this bill, it would be a dramatic reduction in the care provided to veterans because this is a minimal standard. We want to do better for our veterans always, but to suggest that they should get this, would be a huge reduction in what we owe the veterans of this country.

I thank Dr. RUIZ for the work that he put into this bill. As an emergency physician and a public health expert, checking with the American Pediatric Association, he came up with a structure that is doable and will save the lives of children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can adopt this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in support of the H.R. 3239, a the ''Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act.''

I support H.R. 3239, because it would require CBP to perform an initial health screening on all individuals in CBP custody and ensure that everyone in custody has access to water, sanitation and hygiene, food and nutrition, and safe shelter, among other provisions.

I have also offered two amendments that I truly believe keeps the CBP staff and detainees safe under the current conditions.

My first amendment to H.R. 3239 requires retention of video monitoring and certification that the video is on at all times.

CBP is considered ''at capacity'' when detainee levels reach 4,000.

However, between May 14 and June 13, 2019, CBP detained more than 14,000 people per day—and sometimes as many as 18,000.

A cell with a maximum capacity of 12 held 76 detainees; a cell with a maximum capacity of 8 held 41 detainees, and a cell with a maximum capacity of 35 held 155 detainees.

Individuals were standing on toilets in the cells to make room and gain breathing space, thus limiting access to the toilets.

There is limited access to showers and clean clothing, and individuals have been wearing soiled clothing for days or weeks.

While DHS concurred with the recommendation made to alleviate overcrowding at the Del Norte Processing Center, it identified November 30, 2020 as the date on which the situation would be corrected.

There have been reports of agitation and frustration from the CBP staff and the detainees.

This legislation provides some of the transparency, accountability and oversight that protects the detainees and the CBP employees and contractors.

My second amendment to H.R. 3239 requires that the Commissioner shall ensure that language-appropriate ''Detainee Bill of Rights,'' including indigenous languages, are posted in all areas where detainees are located.

The ''Detainee Bill of Rights'' shall include all rights afforded to the detainee under this bill.

In July, Border Patrol was holding about 8,000 detainees in custody at the time of the DHS OIG visit, with 3,400 held longer than the 72 hours generally permitted under the Transport, Escort, Detention, and Search (TEDS) standards.

Of those 3,400 detainees, Border Patrol held 1,500 for more than 10 days.

Border Patrol data indicated that 826 (31 percent) of the 2,669 children at these facilities had been held longer than the 72 hours generally permitted under the TEDS standards and the Flores Agreement.

The estimated completion date is November 30, 2020 which is too far in the future for the pressing issue we are having today.

Border Patrol agents has said that some single adults had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks. Border Patrol management on site said there is an ongoing concern that rising.

Currently, there are no regulations to guide CBP on medical evaluation or sanitation within the short-term detention facilities.

It is very concerning that CBP has reported the deaths of four children and six adults in CBP custody.

The posting of the Detainee Bill of Rights allows the detainees to understand what screenings will be done during their intake, and what help is afforded to them during custody.

The posting will also help the detainees communicate with the CBP employees about what needs may not be met under the provisions of this legislation.

I truly believe this will ease some of the tensions and frustrations at the detention facilities.

I applaud Rep. RAUL RUIZ for introducing the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act and my colleagues for working together to ease tensions in a difficult situation.

I believe that the adoption of the Jackson Lee amendments strengthen H.R. 3239 by continuing to provide transparency, accountability and oversight.

I also believe that the Jackson Lee amendment that provided transparency for duties that are outsourced to private contractors to be subject to FOIA through CBP would have strengthened the bill more and is also needed to keep all parties safe.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–26 modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 116–178. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3239

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Initial health screening protocol.
Sec. 3. Water, sanitation and hygiene.
Sec. 4. Food and nutrition.
Sec. 5. Shelter.
Sec. 6. Coordination and Surge capacity.
Sec. 7. Training.
Sec. 8. Interfacility transfer of care.
Sec. 9. Planning and initial implementation.
Sec. 10. Contractor compliance.
Sec. 11. Inspections.
Sec. 12. GAO report.
Sec. 13. Rule of construction.
Sec. 14. Definitions.

SEC. 2. INITIAL HEALTH SCREENING PROTOCOL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this Act as the ''Commissioner''), in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, and nongovernmental experts in the delivery of health care in humanitarian crises and in the delivery of health care to children, shall develop guidelines and protocols for the provision of health screenings and appropriate medical care for individuals in the custody of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this Act as ''CBP''), as required under this section.

(b) INITIAL SCREENING AND MEDICAL ASSESSMENT.—The Commissioner shall ensure that any individual who is detained in the custody of CBP (referred to in this Act as a ''detainee'') receives an initial in-person screening by a licensed medical professional in accordance with the standards described in subsection (c)—

(1) to assess and identify any illness, condition, or age-appropriate mental or physical symptoms that may have resulted from distressing or traumatic experiences;

(2) to identify acute conditions and high-risk vulnerabilities; and

(3) to ensure that appropriate healthcare is provided to individuals as needed, including pediatric, obstetric, and geriatric care.

(c) STANDARDIZATION OF INITIAL SCREENING AND MEDICAL ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The initial screening and medical assessment shall include—

(A) an interview and the use of a standardized medical intake questionnaire or the equivalent;

(B) screening of vital signs, including pulse rate, body temperature, blood pressure, oxygen saturation, and respiration rate;

(C) screening for blood glucose for known or suspected diabetics;

(D) weight assessment of detainees under 12 years of age;

(E) a physical examination; and

(F) a risk-assessment and the development of a plan for monitoring and care, when appropriate.

(2) PRESCRIPTION MEDICATION.—The medical professional shall review any prescribed medication that is in the detainee's possession or that was confiscated by CBP upon arrival and determine if the medication may be kept by the detainee for use during detention, properly stored by CBP with appropriate access for use during detention, or maintained with the detained individual's personal property. A detainee may not be denied the use of necessary and appropriate medication for the management of the detainee's illness.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as requiring detainees to disclose their medical status or history.

(d) TIMING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the initial screening and medical assessment described in subsections (b) and (c) shall take place as soon as practicable, but not later than 12 hours after a detainee's arrival at a CBP facility.

(2) HIGH PRIORITY INDIVIDUALS.—The initial screening and medical assessment described in subsections (b) and (c) shall take place as soon as practicable, but not later than 6 hours after a detainee's arrival at a CBP facility if the individual reasonably self-identifies as having a medical condition that requires prompt medical attention or is—

(A) exhibiting signs of acute or potentially severe physical or mental illness, or otherwise has an acute or chronic physical or mental disability or illness;

(B) pregnant;

(C) a child (with priority given, as appropriate, to the youngest children); or

(D) elderly.

(e) FURTHER CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, as a result of the initial health screening and medical assessment, the licensed medical professional conducting the screening or assessment determines that one or more of the detainee's vital sign measurements are significantly outside normal ranges in accordance with the National Emergency Services Education Standards, or if the detainee is identified as high-risk or in need of medical intervention, the detainee shall be provided, as expeditiously as possible, with an in-person or technology-facilitated medical consultation with a licensed emergency care professional.

(2) RE-EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Detainees described in paragraph (1) shall be re-evaluated within 24 hours and monitored thereafter as determined by an emergency care professional (and in the care of a consultation provided to a child, with a licensed emergency care professional with a background in pediatric care).

(B) REEVALUATION PRIOR TO TRANSPORTATION.—In addition to the re-evaluations under subparagraph (A), detainees shall have all vital signs re-evaluated and be cleared as safe to travel by a medical professional prior to transportation.

(3) PYSCHOLOGICAL AND MENTAL CARE.—The Commissioner shall ensure that detainees who have experienced physical or sexual violence or who have experienced events that may cause severe trauma or toxic stress, are provided access to basic, humane, and supportive psychological assistance.

(f) INTERPRETERS.—To ensure that health screenings and medical care required under this section are carried out in the best interests of the detainee, the Commissioner shall ensure that language-appropriate interpretation services, including indigenous languages, are provided to each detainee and that each detainee is informed of the availability of interpretation services.

(g) CHAPERONES.—To ensure that health screenings and medical care required under this section are carried out in the best interests of the detainee—

(1) the Commissioner shall establish guidelines for and ensure the presence of chaperones for all detainees during medical screenings and examinations consistent with relevant guidelines in the American Medical Association Code of Medical Ethics, and recommendations of the American Academy of Pediatrics; and

(2) to the extent practicable, the physical examination of a child shall always be performed in the presence of a parent or legal guardian or in the presence of the detainee's closest present adult relative if a parent or legal guardian is unavailable.

(h) DOCUMENTATION.—The Commissioner shall ensure that the health screenings and medical care required under this section, along with any other medical evaluations and interventions for detainees, are documented in accordance with commonly accepted standards in the United States for medical record documentation. Such documentation shall be provided to any individual who received a health screening and subsequent medical treatment upon release from CBP custody.

(i) INFRASTRUCTURE AND EQUIPMENT.—The Commissioner or the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that each location to which detainees are first transported after an initial encounter with an agent or officer of CBP has the following:

(1) A private space that provides a comfortable and considerate atmosphere for the patient and that ensures the patient's dignity and right to privacy during the health screening and medical assessment and any necessary follow-up care.

(2) All necessary and appropriate medical equipment and facilities to conduct the health screenings and follow-up care required under this section, to treat trauma, to provide emergency care, including resuscitation of individuals of all ages, and to prevent the spread of communicable diseases.

(3) Basic over-the-counter medications appropriate for all age groups.

(4) Appropriate transportation to medical facilities in the case of a medical emergency, or an on-call service with the ability to arrive at the CBP facility within 30 minutes.

(j) PERSONNEL.—The Commissioner or the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that each location to which detainees are first transported after an initial encounter has onsite at least one licensed medical professional to conduct health screenings. Other personnel that are or may be necessary for carrying out the functions described in subsection (e), such as licensed emergency care professionals, specialty physicians (including physicians specializing in pediatrics, family medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, geriatric medicine, internal medicine, and infectious diseases), nurse practitioners, other nurses, physician assistants. licensed social workers, mental health professionals, public health professionals, dieticians, interpreters, and chaperones, shall be located on site to the extent practicable, or if not practicable, shall be available on call.

(k) ETHICAL GUIDELINES.—The Commissioner shall ensure that all medical assessments and procedures conducted pursuant to this section are conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines in the applicable medical field, and respect human dignity.

SEC. 3. WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE.

The Commissioner shall ensure that detainees have access to—

(1) not less than one gallon of drinking water per person per day, and age-appropriate fluids as needed;

(2) a private, safe, clean, and reliable permanent or portable toilet with proper waste disposal and a hand washing station, with not less than one toilet available for every 12 male detainees, and 1 toilet for every 8 female detainees;

(3) a clean diaper changing facility, which includes proper waste disposal, a hand washing station, and unrestricted access to diapers;

(4) the opportunity to bathe daily in a permanent or portable shower that is private and secure; and

(5) products for individuals of all age groups and with disabilities to maintain basic personal hygiene, including soap, a toothbrush, toothpaste, adult diapers, and feminine hygiene products, as well as receptacles for the proper storage and disposal of such products.

SEC. 4. FOOD AND NUTRITION.

The Commissioner shall ensure that detainees have access to—

(1) three meals per day including—

(A) in the case of an individual age 12 or older, a diet that contains not less than 2,000 calories per day; and

(B) in the case of a child who is under the age of 12, a diet that contains an appropriate number of calories per day based on the child's age and weight;

(2) accommodations for any dietary needs or restrictions; and

(3) access to food in a manner that follows applicable food safety standards.

SEC. 5. SHELTER.

The Commissioner shall ensure that each facility at which a detainee is detained meets the following requirements:

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), males and females shall be detained separately.

(2) In the case of a minor child arriving in the United States with an adult relative or legal guardian, such child shall be detained with such relative or legal guardian unless such an arrangement poses safety or security concerns. In no case shall a minor who is detained apart from an adult relative or legal guardian as a result of such safety or security concerns be detained with other adults.

(3) In the case of an unaccompanied minor arriving in the United States without an adult relative or legal guardian, such child shall be detained in an age-appropriate facility and shall not be detained with adults.

(4) A detainee with a temporary or permanent disability shall be held in an accessible location and in a manner that provides for his or her safety, comfort, and security, with accommodations provided as needed.

(5) No detainee shall be placed in a room for any period of time if the detainee's placement would exceed the maximum occupancy level as determined by the appropriate building code, fire marshal, or other authority.

(6) Each detainee shall be provided with temperature appropriate clothing and bedding.

(7) The facility shall be well lit and well ventilated, with the humidity and temperature kept at comfortable levels (between 68 and 74 degrees Fahrenheit).

(8) Detainees who are in custody for more than 48 hours shall have access to the outdoors for not less than 1 hour during the daylight hours during each 24-hour period.

(9) Detainees shall have the ability to practice their religion or not to practice a religion, as applicable.

(10) Detainees shall have access to lighting and noise levels that are safe and conducive for sleeping throughout the night between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

(11) Officers, employees, and contracted personnel of CBP shall—

(A) follow medical standards for the isolation and prevention of communicable diseases; and

(B) ensure the physical and mental safety of detainees who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex.

(12) The facility shall have video-monitoring to provide for the safety of the detained population and to prevent sexual abuse and physical harm of vulnerable detainees.

(13) The Commissioner shall ensure that language-appropriate ''Detainee Bill of Rights'', including indigenous languages, are posted or otherwise made available in all areas where detainees are located. The ''Detainee Bill of Rights'' shall include all rights afforded to the detainee under this Act.

(14) Video from video-monitoring must be preserved for 90 days and the detention facility must maintain certified records that the video-monitoring is properly working at all times.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION AND SURGE CAPACITY.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into memoranda of understanding with appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, and applicable emergency government relief services, as well as contracts with health care, public health, social work, and transportation professionals, for purposes of addressing surge capacity and ensuring compliance with this Act.

SEC. 7. TRAINING.

The Commissioner shall ensure that CBP personnel assigned to each short-term custodial facility are professionally trained, including continuing education as the Commissioner deems appropriate, in all subjects necessary to ensure compliance with this Act, including—

(1) humanitarian response protocols and standards;

(2) indicators of physical and mental illness, and medical distress in children and adults;

(3) indicators of child sexual exploitation and effective responses to missing migrant children; and

(4) procedures to report incidents of suspected child sexual abuse and exploitation directly to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

SEC. 8. INTERFACILITY TRANSFER OF CARE.

(a) TRANSFER.—When a detainee is discharged from a medical facility or emergency department, the Commissioner shall ensure that responsibility of care is transferred from the medical facility or emergency department to an accepting licensed health care provider of CBP.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACCEPTING PROVIDERS.—Such accepting licensed health care provider shall review the medical facility or emergency department's evaluation, diagnosis, treatment, management, and discharge care instructions to assess the safety of the discharge and transfer and to provide necessary follow-up care.

SEC. 9. PLANNING AND INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) PLANNING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a detailed plan delineating the timeline, process, and challenges of carrying out the requirements of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the requirements of this Act are implemented not later than 6 months after the date of enactment.

SEC. 10. CONTRACTOR COMPLIANCE.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all personnel contracted to carry out this Act do so in accordance with the requirements of this Act.

SEC. 11. INSPECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

(1) conduct unannounced inspections of ports of entry, border patrol stations, and detention facilities administered by CBP or contractors of CBP; and

(2) submit to Congress, reports on the results of such inspections as well as other reports of the Inspector General related to custody operations.

(b) PARTICULAR ATTENTION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall pay particular attention to—

(1) the degree of compliance by CBP with the requirements of this Act;

(2) remedial actions taken by CBP; and

(3) the health needs of detainees.

(c) ACCESS TO FACILITIES.—The Commissioner may not deny a Member of Congress entrance to any facility or building used, owned, or operated by CBP.

SEC. 12. GAO REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, commence a study on implementation of, and compliance with, this Act; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report to Congress on the results of such study.

(b) ISSUES TO BE STUDIED.—The study required by subsection (a) shall examine the management and oversight by CBP of ports of entry, border patrol stations, and other detention facilities, including the extent to which CBP and the Department of Homeland Security have effective processes in place to comply with this Act. The study shall also examine the extent to which CBP personnel, in carrying out this Act, make abusive, derisive, profane, or harassing statements or gestures, or engage in any other conduct evidencing hatred or invidious prejudice to or about one person or group on account of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, or disability, including on social media.

SEC. 13. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) as authorizing CBP to detain individuals for longer than 72 hours;

(2) as contradicting the March 7, 2014, Department of Homeland Security rule adopting Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities, which includes a zero tolerance policy prohibiting all forms of sexual abuse and assault of individuals in U.S. Customs and Border Protection custody, including in holding facilities, during transport, and during processing;

(3) as contradicting current protocols related to Department background checks in the hiring process;

(4) as restricting the Department from denying employment to or terminating the employment of any individual who would be or is involved with the handling or processing at holding facilities, during transport, or during processing, or care of detainees, including the care of children, and has been convicted of a sex crime or other offense involving a child victim; or

(5) as affecting the obligation to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including being subject to any penalties, fines, or other sanctions

SEC. 14. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) INTERPRETATION SERVICES.—The term ''interpretation services'' includes translation services that are performed either in-person or through a telephone or video service.

(2) CHILD.—The term ''child'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)).

(3) U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION FACILITY.—The term ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection Facility'' includes—

(A) U.S. Border Patrol stations;

(B) ports of entry;

(C) checkpoints;

(D) forward operating bases;

(E) secondary inspection areas; and

(F) short-term custody facilities.

(4) FORWARD OPERATING BASE.—The term ''forward operating base'' means a permanent facility established by CBP in forward or remote locations, and designated as such by CBP.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 116–178. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116–178.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 9, strike ''and''.

Page 16, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 16, insert after line 10 the following:

(4) the degree of compliance with part 115 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ''Standards To Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities'').

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 509, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, migrants in Customs and Border Protection holding facilities deserve to be treated with compassion and respect. Unfortunately, due to the misguided policies of the Trump administration, many migrants have found themselves stuck living in inhumane conditions.

Earlier this month, I visited one of those facilities in McAllen, Texas, and I was disturbed by what I saw.

I am proud of my colleague, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, and the Judiciary Committee and the leadership of Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN for putting together a comprehensive piece of legislation that will alleviate the suffering of some of these migrants.

My amendment is very simple. It directs the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General to pay particular attention to whether CBP facilities comply with the Department of Homeland Security's sexual abuse prevention policies while inspecting detention facilities.

Many provisions in DHS' standards to prevent, detect, and respond to sexual abuse and assault are very well intentioned. These include requiring sexual abuse prevention training for staff, limiting cross-gender searches, ensuring there are plans in place to respond to sexual violence, and providing survivors of sexual abuse with access to sexual assault nurse examiners.

These policies should help reduce the prevalence of sexual violence, enable victims to report abuse, and provide support for survivors after experiencing trauma. But I am concerned that Customs and Border Protection is not meeting DHS' own standards.

An Office of Inspector General report from 2016 recommended that DHS identify which facilities qualify for routine auditing and ensure that these facilities are audited by July 2018, as required by DHS' own policies.

Today, nearly 1 year after CBP was supposed to complete these audits, they have not finished the job. If Customs and Border Protection is not taking this basic step of auditing facilities, we cannot be sure they have properly implemented more onerous, yet crucial, policies. The best plans to prevent sexual violence are worthless if they are not followed.

This amendment, which I thank my colleagues, Representative MOORE and Representative CISNEROS for cosponsoring, will help provide clarity about whether CBP is taking steps to prevent and respond to sexual violence.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment; however, I do not oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would direct the DHS Office of Inspector General to investigate CBP's compliance with Federal regulations promulgated to prevent, detect, and respond to sexual abuse in CBP facilities.

I have no objection to the amendment insofar as the inspector general is already directed by statute to conduct audits to ensure compliance with Federal regulations, and I have no doubt that the men and women of CBP are effectively carrying out the mandates of regulations, implementing a zero tolerance for sexual abuse policy.

CBP is currently bound by duly published regulation at 6 CFR 115 that the agency mandate ''zero tolerance toward all forms of sexual abuse.'' The regulation contains extensive and detailed requirements implemented to prevent sexual assault. Those requirements detail the steps CBP must take relating to prevention planning; responsive planning in the case of an allegation; training and education; risk assessments; reporting mechanisms; the official response following a detainee report; investigations; disciplinary sanctions for staff, contractors, and volunteers; medical and mental care; data collection and review; and audits for compliance. These regulations are designed to ensure the safety of not only those in custody, but also of CBP personnel and staff in CBP facilities.

The Inspector General Act already requires the DHS Office of Inspector General ''to conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations'' of the DHS. And the inspector general routinely conducts audits of DHS programs and facilities to ensure compliance with Federal regulations.

I have no objection to the amendment, which directs the OIG to do what it already does under the Inspector General Act, which is to conduct audits to ensure compliance with regulations promulgated by the DHS to ensure the safety of CBP personnel and those in custody.

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for agreeing to the amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman, and I want to personally thank her for her constant and needed fight for women's rights and, particularly, protecting these women against sexual assault and sexual abuse.

I cannot tell you how many stories that we have heard at the border of young women who have come either by coyotes, or even when they get here to this country, the fear that they have of sexual assault and sexual abuse. It is a long walk and a long journey from the

Northern Triangle, and I want to thank the gentlewoman again for recognizing that.

So, I rise to support the Kuster amendment, and I rise to support the underlying bill, H.R. 3239.

I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership, and I thank my good friend Dr. RAUL RUIZ. We have talked about this. The gentleman has talked about this. I have heard the gentleman on many occasions speaking to us as Members of Congress, not Democrats, but Democrats and Republicans and Independents who would listen.

In his conversation, we did not hear anything that would suggest that we would undermine, in any way, our friends or veterans who are in need of great medical care. We stand ready, as we have done over the past, to continue to try to push dollars to help them.

This bill in particular deals with CBP to perform an initial health screening on all individuals in CBP custody, and ensures that everyone in custody has access to water, sanitation, hygiene, food, nutrition, and safe shelter.

But having been to the border, I will say that they are still in cages. They are still in small areas where they only have standing room.

This is to protect both contractors, employees, and those human beings who came because they are desperate and fleeing violence. The stories tell you of their fathers being murdered, their husband's being murdered, and their sons being taken away.

This underlying bill, its purpose is to ensure that the American people are protected so that epidemics don't start, so that little babies don't die—like the seven who have died on the watch of the Trump administration.

I am delighted that my amendment was included, which requires retention of video monitoring and certification that the video is on at all times. It will enhance the amendment of Ms. KUSTER.

The other amendment I want to appreciate is the Detainee Bill of Rights. I support the amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 116–178.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, insert after line 10 the following:

(5) PUBLICATION OF DATA ON COMPLAINTS OF SEXUAL ABUSE AT CBP FACILITIES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting in coordination with the Office of Inspector General and Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, shall publicly release aggregate data on complaints of sexual abuse at CBP facilities on its website on a quarterly basis, excluding any personally identifiable information that may compromise the confidentiality of individuals who reported abuse.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 509, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Brave survivors have begun to come forward detailing chilling assaults by Border Protection agents. Some of the survivors are only in their teens.

Despite these heartbreaking stories, there is a stunning lack of transparency about sexual abuse at Customs and Border Protection facilities.

According to the agency's most recent report on assessing sexual abuse at holding facilities, in fiscal year 2017, CBP processed more than 534,000 individuals in its holding facilities, and yet the agency itself only received seven claims of sexual abuse.

Ten months after FY18, CBP has yet to release its report on abuse last year. From my own experience working on sexual violence prevention on college campuses and in the military, I have learned that the absence of formal complaints of sexual abuse does not reflect the absence of sexual violence but, rather, signals a culture that prevents people from reporting violence.

According to a Freedom of Information Act request, between January of 2010 and July of 2016, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General received 624 complaints about sexual abuse at Customs and Border Protection facilities.

Considering this information, CBP's failure to promptly publish its own sexual abuse data, and the stories of survivors who have come forward, there is a clear need to improve transparency about sexual abuse at CBP.

My amendment, which I was proud to introduce with Representatives MOORE and CISNEROS, directs the Secretary of Homeland Security, working with the DHS office that typically receives complaints of sexual abuse, to release all complaints of sexual abuse at CBP once per quarter, removing any information that would compromise the anonymity of survivors.

This is an amendment that all Members should be able to support. Releasing more data in a timely manner will help lawmakers grasp the scope of this problem. Knowing that they are not alone may also encourage other survivors to step forward.

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

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, this amendment is in keeping with the clear hostility with which the majority views the men and women of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including the Border Patrol agents who have put their lives on the line to effectuate over 3,800 migrant rescues so far this fiscal year and the officers of field operations who are in peril each day when they search vehicles and pedestrians for dangerous and deadly narcotics like fentanyl.

The amendment requires quarterly publication of complaints of sexual abuse in CBP facilities. Of course, preventing sexual abuse in any government facility is an extremely important endeavor, but this amendment does not do that. Instead, it requires premature publication of mere allegations without any context. The effect is the maligning of the men and women who serve on our border and at our ports of entry without doing anything to actually prevent such abuse.

This amendment requires all complaints to be aggregated and published quarterly, regardless of whether an investigation is complete, regardless of whether the complaint was substantiated, and regardless of whether the victim was a CBP employee, contractor, or detainee.

We will not know whether those complaints were ever substantiated or unsubstantiated pursuant to an investigation.

We will not know whether those complaints were against CBP personnel, contracted staff, or against other aliens in the facility.

We will not know whether the victims were CBP personnel, contracted staff, or an alien in the facility.

I am also concerned that the amendment requires CBP to exclude personally identifiable information of the individual who reported the abuse, but it is silent as to the personally identifiable information of the accused. It would be inappropriate to publish a complaint against an individual without any context, especially if an investigation later determines that the complaint is unsubstantiated.

The Judiciary Committee already went through a similar situation with Health and Human Services, where one member of the majority claimed that hundreds of sexual abuse allegations were made against HHS employees when, in fact, the allegations by unaccompanied alien children were against contractors and other UACs.

The requirements of this amendment will simply give the appearance, regardless of the facts or ultimate outcome of the investigation into the complaints, that CBP facilities are rife with sexual abuse. And the further implication is that CBP personnel condone sexual violence. Such a characterization is offensive to the hardworking men and women of CBP who follow existing regulations and policies to prevent sexual abuse in their facilities.

In fact, CBP is bound by a duly published regulation at 6 CFR 115, that the agency mandate ''zero tolerance toward all forms of sexual abuse.'' And ''zero tolerance'' isn't a mere buzzword. The regulation contains extensive and detailed requirements implemented to prevent sexual assault. Those requirements detail the steps CBP must take relating to prevention planning; responsive planning in the case of an allegation; training and education; risk assessments; reporting mechanisms; the official response following a detainee report; investigations; disciplinary sanctions for staff, contractors, and volunteers; medical and mental care; data collection and review; and audits for compliance.

The manager's amendment to the bill already makes clear that the bill does not abrogate existing policies designed to prevent, detect, and respond to sexual abuse. In fact, it acknowledges that CBP has a zero-tolerance policy for sexual abuse.

Furthermore, the DHS OIG is already directed to conduct unannounced inspections of CBP facilities in the bill, and CBP's own existing regulations require periodic audits based on the risk assessment of the facility.

CBP is already confronting a crisis that is worsened by congressional inaction to fix the loopholes in our laws that fuel illegal immigration. The men and women who protect our border have been given an enormous task made more difficult by offensive rhetoric. Congress shouldn't make their job more difficult by requiring premature publication of complaints without context, which will have the effect of wrongfully painting the civil servants as sexual predators.

I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, contrary to the allegations by my colleague disparaging our view of Customs and Border Protection agencies, I was actually very impressed by the professionalism of many of the Border Patrol agents that we met and had the opportunity to tour the facilities in McAllen and Brownsville with.

I share the gentleman's commitment to a zero-tolerance policy. Frankly, one incident of sexual assault is far too much. This data will provide more transparency for Congress and for survivors and, frankly, more transparency for those members of the Border Patrol who are doing their job with respect to migrants.

Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. Chair, I am happy to work with my colleagues to ensure that Customs and Border Protection has the resources to comply with this provision, but we need more transparency for survivors.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

□ 1930

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, let us salute Congressman RUIZ, Chairman NADLER, Chairwoman LOFGREN, Chairwoman UNDERWOOD, Chairwoman SLOTKIN, and Members. I thank my colleague, Congresswoman KUSTER, for yielding me time.

These Members have followed the facts, gone to the border, and raised a drumbeat on behalf of the children.

I want to add to that Congresswoman ESCOBAR, who has been so great on all of this.

The humanitarian situation at the border challenges the conscience of our country, yet the Trump administration has chosen to approach the situation with cruelty instead of compassion. Children sleeping on concrete floors, children eating frozen and inedible food, and children denied basic sanitation.

As the Gospel of Matthew said, ''When the Son of Man comes in all His glory,'' He will speak to the nations gathered before Him.

You all know the Gospel of Matthew, ''When I was hungry.''

The American Medical Association writes, ''It is well known that childhood trauma and adverse childhood experiences created by inhumane treatment often create negative health impacts that can last an individual's entire lifespan.''

The American Academy of Pediatrics led a joint letter, writing, ''The tragic deaths of children in CBP custody are evidence for why timely, appropriate medical and mental health screening and care is so crucial.''

With Congressman RUIZ's Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act, we are taking a strong step to safeguard children and respect their families.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit most of my statement for the RECORD, in the interest of time. I know you have heard it over and over again, Mr. Chairman. There is no use to just keep talking. We have to act.

We have sent the money. We have paid attention. Now, we have to set the standards that must be met for humanitarian, hygiene, food, clothing, healthcare, and the rest.

I thank Mr. RUIZ for bringing his experience as a public health doctor, as someone who has dealt with these crises in other parts of the world. We are blessed to have his service in the Congress, especially at this time, for the good of the children.

Mr. Chair, let us salute Congressman RUIZ, Chairman NADLER, Chairwoman LOFGREN, Congresswoman UNDERWOOD, Chairwoman SLOTKIN and Members who have followed the facts, gone to the border and raised a drumbeat on behalf of the children.

The humanitarian situation at the border challenges the conscience of our country. Yet, the Trump Administration has chosen to approach this situation with cruelty, instead of compassion.

The appalling conditions facing children and families are an affront to our values and our humanity:

Children sleeping on concrete floors, in freezing temperatures with constant light exposure;

Children eating frozen or inedible food, and having insufficient or unclean water to drink;

Children denied basic sanitation, forced to use open toilets and deprived of showers and handwashing stations.

The Gospel of Matthew says, ''When the Son of Man comes in all his glory,'' he will speak to the nations gathered before him and say:

''For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.''

The Administration's treatment of little children abandons that teaching, ignores the ''least of these'' and endangers lives.

As the American Medical Association writes: ''Conditions in CBP facilities, including open toilets, constant light exposure, insufficient food and water, extreme temperatures, and forcing pregnant women and children to sleep on cement floors, are traumatizing.

''It is well known that childhood trauma and adverse childhood experiences created by inhumane treatment often create negative health impacts that can last an individual's entire lifespan.''

This week, the American Academy of Pediatrics led a joint letter with other medical experts to urge action, writing: ''The tragic deaths of children in CBP custody are evidence for why timely, appropriate medical and mental health screening and care is so crucial.''

The deaths of children at the border are unconscionable; a profound violation of the moral responsibility we all have to ensure all children of God are treated with compassion and decency.

Today, with Congressman RUIZ's ''Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act'', we are taking a strong step to safeguard children and respect their spark of divinity.

This bill protects children and families' health: requiring the CBP to provide timely, appropriate and standards-based health screenings by licensed medical professionals.

It creates water, sanitation, and hygiene standards: requiring the CBP to provide sufficient drinking water; private, safe and clean toilets; a handwashing station; and basic personal hygiene products.

It sets out nutrition standards: requiring that detainees receive three meals per day, with age-appropriate caloric intake, and special diets for babies, pregnant & breastfeeding women, the elderly & ill.

And it establishes standards for shelters: specifying space requirements, temperature ranges and bedding standards, and also protecting religious freedom, family unity and the safety of unaccompanied minors and LGBTQ persons.

Once we pass this bill—and our other legislation for the children—we will call on Senator MCCONNELL to immediately take them up.

Sadly, some in the Republican Leadership have not demonstrated a concern for the children. The obstruction of the House-passed border bill dishonored our values, denigrated our immigrant heritage, and endangered little children.

Every day that Senator MCCONNELL delays this bill—and every vote against it—is a stain on the collective conscience of the Congress.

I urge a strong, bipartisan vote of conscience for this legislation.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HAALAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARBAJAL, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 509, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3239 is postponed.

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:

Adopting the amendment to H.R. 397 offered by Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee;

A motion to recommit on H.R. 397, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 397, if ordered.

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

REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAVID P. ROE OF TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of amendment No. 1 to H.R. 397, printed in part A of House Report 116–178, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) on which a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 245, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—186

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

NOES—245

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

NOT VOTING—1

Moulton

□ 2003

Ms. SHALALA, Messrs. MCEACHIN, BRINDISI, STAUBER, Mses. HERRERA BEUTLER, CLARKE of New York, and WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GREEN of Tennessee, MEADOWS, NORMAN, and HARRIS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AGUILAR). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAST. In its current form, absolutely.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mast moves to recommit the bill H.R. 397 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 4(b)(1)(C), strike ''and'' at the end of clause (iv), redesignate clause (v) as clause (vi), and insert after clause (iv) the following:

(v) the plan will not knowingly engage in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity in the course of interstate or international commerce that is intended to undermine the existence of, penalize, inflict economic harm on, or otherwise limit commercial relations with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or Israeli-controlled territories for purposes of coercing political action by, or imposing policy positions on, the Government of Israel; and

Mr. MAST (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is very simple. It would prohibit pension plans receiving loans under this bill from engaging in the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement against Israel.

Understanding this MTR does not take a lot of words.

Mr. Speaker, I hear colleagues who must believe that BDS is a 1-day event occurring, so that is why it makes it even more important for us to speak about this MTR.

Now, understanding this MTR takes very few words. Let me be very blunt about this. Yesterday, as was aptly pointed out, this Chamber passed a bipartisan resolution—398 in support, 17 opposing—which opposed any efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel, condemning the BDS movement as dangerous and anti-Semitic.

Today, let's simply continue that progress, understanding that BDS equals anti-Semitism. While anti-Semitism may be a political investment by some, it has no place in managing retirement pensions, and BDS has no place in this House.

Let us say simply, let us agree, let us plant our bipartisan flag that anti-Semitism and BDS will have no home here in Congress and no home in this bill.

It is simple. If you are one of the 398 Members who voted last night to condemn the BDS movement, then you should support this MTR, stand with our ally Israel, and continue to combat this anti-Semitic movement.

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the motion to recommit offered by my Republican colleagues.

I oppose the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement, full stop. It is a movement that denies the Jewish people's connection to the land of Israel, refuses to accept the basic idea of a Jewish state, and seeks to delegitimize Israel in international forums, on college campuses, and in global commerce.

Yesterday, this body voted overwhelmingly to condemn the global BDS movement. Mr. Speaker, 398 votes in favor—189 Republicans and 209 Democrats—united together to affirm the vital relationship between the United States and Israel, our most important ally and closest strategic partner in a difficult region in the world.

We expressed our strong, bipartisan support for a negotiated two-state solution as the best way to justly resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and ensure a future for two peoples living side by side in peace, security, and prosperity.

As the lead sponsor of that resolution, I believe I speak with credibility when I say this motion to recommit, in the context both of last night's vote and today's critically important legislation, would not, in any way, help the fight against the global BDS movement or strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Yesterday's bipartisan vote sent a clear, united message. Today, my Republican colleagues are undercutting this achievement with a cynical, partisan gimmick, continuing a dangerous effort to make Israel a wedge issue. It must stop.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation is too important for this political ploy. We have an opportunity to pass legislation addressing a national emergency, the multiemployer pension crisis that threatens the financial security of Americans across the Nation and leaves the taxpayers on the hook for more than $100 billion over the 10-year budget window.

Let me remind my colleagues that these retirees did everything right. They planned for their retirement, people like those in the gallery today who chose, year after year, to contribute to their pensions instead of taking a wage increase.

If you support these hardworking Americans, vote ''no'' on this motion.

If you believe the rare effort in this House to achieve bipartisan progress is too important to undermine with cynical partisan games, vote ''no'' on this motion.

If you believe it is critical that the United States-Israel relationship remains bipartisan to ensure Israel's long-term security and find a path to peace, vote ''no'' on this motion.

Yesterday, we spoke in a united voice in support of our ally. Let's do it again today in support of these workers and vote down this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this cynical, partisan motion to recommit.

The bill before us today is not a bailout. It is a backstop. It is a solution to a boiling point that we ignore at the peril of more than a million workers who are now faced with financial catastrophe in retirement.

If we do nothing with this multiemployer pension crisis, taxpayers will pay the price.

If we do nothing, our Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation will tumble.

If we do nothing, 1.3 million hardworking Americans will lose what they paid into their entire working life.

To the teamster who has played by the rules, to the carpenter who is already seeing a drop in his monthly benefits, we are here today to do something.

But the ringing irony, that the very people opposing this bill are some of the very people who rushed to vote to pass a tax relief act for the wealthiest corporations and the biggest banks, ballooning our deficit by $1.9 trillion. We scratch our heads and we ask, Why is it that you cannot lift a finger for the middle class?

Today, we deliver for the American people, and we save the pensions of those who have never asked for anything.

Take it from me, my friends, I know what it is like to be on the phone with the PBGC when the auto industry needed our help.

I know what that means when they tell us that these plans will run insolvent by 2025.

I know what it is like to be working in the Department of the Treasury during the largest economic crisis of our times; when Republicans and Democrats came together, shelving political dogma, to make a uniquely Federal problem right.

Butch Lewis is a good deal, and the kind of deal you make to protect our middle class and the economic security of so many. This is what you do.

Make government work for us. Contribute to the best action in the outcome of the very people—pass Butch Lewis.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 232, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—200

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

NOES—232

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

□ 2022

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 169, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—264

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—169

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr

Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 2034

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINZINGER. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kinzinger moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3239 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 18, after line 10, add the following:

SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol should be commended for continuing to carry out their duties in a professional manner, including caring for the extraordinarily high numbers of family units, unaccompanied alien children, and single adults processed in United States Customs and Border Protection facilities referenced in this Act.

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is very simple. It affirms this Chamber's appreciation of and support for the men and women of the United States Border Patrol.

We in this Chamber know that we can debate and disagree all day long every day, and we have more than enough issues to argue about on a regular basis, but this institution makes laws. We pass the laws, and we expect those laws to be carried out faithfully.

This motion to recommit today is about recognizing the men and women of our U.S. Border Patrol who carry out the very laws that we pass for their hard work and for their dedication.

Without question, we are facing a crisis on our southern border.

Without question, we are facing a crisis on our southern border, and our facilities are overcrowded and overwhelmed. And lacking the resources, our personnel, our CBP agents are overworked, and I can tell you this because I saw it firsthand.

Now, I didn't go in a windbreaker and get a photo op. I didn't start a livestream. Mr. Speaker, I went as a lieutenant colonel in the Air National Guard on a deployment to the mission in Arizona, to the border.

And for me, going to Arizona with my unit in late February was a nice respite from the bitter cold of Illinois, but what I saw truly opened my eyes to the crisis at hand and the shortcomings that our CBP agents face with their limited resources.

This, by the way, was my fourth deployment to the border, and it was only my first under President Trump.

So what does that mean? Yes, that means that my three other border missions and my other deployments came under President Obama, who also saw the crisis at the border and the dire humanitarian concerns.

In February, I watched from above as border agents struggled to thwart migrant groups that would systematically stagger their attempts to run and cross the open border.

My fellow guardsmen shared their accounts of agents giving their last water bottles to dehydrated migrants. My fellow guardsmen shared various accounts, and one was about agents giving their last bottle of water as they came across people who were dehydrated and in a bad situation, often risking their own safety and their own health.

While my mission was nice in February, today it is pretty hot out in the desert. These agents are still expected, by their oath and by the direction of the laws of this body, to walk miles through terrible terrain that, in many cases, cannot even be accessed by vehicles. They are often met with a foot chase, sometimes with multiple people or with dangerous cartel members.

And sometimes this happens even at the end of their shift, so it means that later they are going to have to call home. They are going to have to tell their loved ones that they are not going to be home to tuck the kids in bed or say good night because duty calls.

I listened to defeated Customs and Border Protection agents talk about the emotional and physical tolls that this crisis was taking on them and their family as they grappled with these impossible tasks, and more than once it was mentioned to me the toxic rhetoric used in describing them in many cases in terms reserved for just our enemies.

I saw the compassion in a CBP agent during one of my missions as he helped a young woman we found in the desert to safety after she was left for dead by her cartel handlers because they got spooked and they ran and abandoned her.

These coyotes work for the cartels, and these cartels make money on two primary products: people and drugs. Human lives are viewed as nothing more than commodities for them, and this is what I saw firsthand. This is what I experienced with the hardworking men and women of our border, who are often the first and only defense against such tragedy.

And it is true, the CBP has effectuated over 3,800 migrant rescues so far this fiscal year risking their own lives to save others. If you remove CBP, you will cost lives.

And maybe people don't want to believe that, maybe it doesn't fit a narrative, but it is an undeniable fact. We have placed an unprecedented burden on our agents asking them to handle some really tough things, and for that they have been villainized.

The CBP's facilities were not designed as long-term or even short-term

shelters for families or children, and those resources to accommodate them and handle the influx are limited.

If this Congress cannot agree to provide these agents the resources they need, as this bill fails to do, the least we can do is affirm our appreciation for their work. Agreeing to this motion to recommit will not impact the passage of this bill. Voting in favor of this MTR will not kill the bill that we are voting on here today.

Today what we have is an opportunity and a moment in time to make a simple statement. This institution can leave politics aside and take this time to recognize the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, the sons and daughters, the husbands and wives, our neighbors and the constituents we serve, the men and women of our U.S. Border Patrol working in these facilities every day. Let's show our support by rising above the fray of politics and vote in favor of this MTR.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the MTR.

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, my bill, the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Custody Act, honors CBP agents by giving them the assistance they have requested and so desperately need.

This bill gives them the tools to help protect kids and families.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't about political trickery. It is not about partisan gotcha politics.

This bill is about the goodness of the American people. This bill is a call to our better angels. This bill, and I say this wholeheartedly, is inspired through prayer and by God's loving grace.

You see, it asks us to remember and heed the words of Jesus in the good news book of Matthew: ''For I was hungry, and you gave me something to eat. I was thirsty, and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger, and you welcomed me in'', and, ''Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.''

This bill asks us to fulfill the Golden Rule: ''Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.''

These principles, you see, are fundamental to our American values. They are shared by the CBP agents and doctors I spoke with at the border.

This bill protects children, women, and families by setting humanitarian standards that require basic health screenings and triage, formula for infants, diapers for toddlers, and simple necessities like toothbrushes and soap.

This bill also protects the health of our agents, proud Americans who work tirelessly in dangerous and inhumane conditions, who are also parents and suffer lifelong trauma when someone else's child dies under their responsibilities.

Today, I stand before you not only as a public health professional and an emergency medicine physician trained in humanitarian aid, I stand before you as a parent of two young daughters. I stand before you as a patriot, whose faith in our American values, in the power of basic human decency, has never been stronger.

Tonight's vote isn't about politics, it isn't about party, it isn't even about immigration policy.

This vote is about the beauty and power of grace. This vote is about loving and protecting children, because in the United States of America, we recognize the inherent dignity of every human being, because in the United States of America, every child is worth saving, because in the United States of America, when children die on our watch, we take action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the MTR, then vote ''yes'' for Humanitarian Standards for Individuals Under CBP Custody.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 192, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Chabot
Cheney
Cisneros
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Delgado
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Malinowski
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Porter
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Ryan
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—192

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)

Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—1

Gabbard

□ 2053

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 3239, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN:

Page 18, after line 10, add the following:

SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol should be commended for continuing to carry out their duties in a professional manner, including caring for the extraordinarily high numbers of family units, unaccompanied alien children, and single adults processed in United States Customs and Border Protection facilities referenced in this Act.

Ms. LOFGREN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 195, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

AYES—233

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

NOES—195

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

NOT VOTING—4

Bass
Gonzalez (TX)
Harris
Smith (NE)

□ 2102

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Ms. GRANGER. 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.

Ms. GRANGER. 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 so that we can stand up and protect the sanctity of human life.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISNEROS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional 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.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1365) to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1365

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT.

Title XVII of division A of Public Law 114–328 is amended—

(1) in section 1703(e)—

(A) by striking ''equal to'' and inserting ''not to exceed''; and

(B) by striking ''covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts'' and inserting ''used to reimburse the applicable appropriations'';

(2) in section 1704(a) by striking '', subject to the availability of appropriations,'' and inserting ''from the Claims Fund''; and

(3) by striking section 1707(a).

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—As the budgetary effects for spending provided by this Act were estimated and offset as part of the enactment of the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act (title XVII of division A of Public Law 114–328), the budgetary effects of this Act shall be determined as if the amendments made by this Act were included in the enactment of the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act (title XVII of division A of Public Law 114–328), for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) PAY-AS-YOU-GO COMPLIANCE.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. 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 the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD revised CBO materials.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1365, a bill to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act. This cost estimate supersedes the estimate transmitted on July 10, 2019.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL, *Director.*

Enclosure.

H.R. 1365, A BILL TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT—AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES ON JULY 11, 2019

[By fiscal year, millions of dollars]

	2019	2019–2024	2019–2029
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	40	40
Revenues	0	0	0
Deficit Effect	0	40	40
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	0	0	0
Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply?	Yes	Mandate Effects	
Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030?	No	Contains intergovernmental mandate?	No
		Contains private-sector mandate?	No

H.R. 1365 would authorize a portion of customs duties and federal income taxes collected in Guam to be spent to compensate certain residents and surviving family members for their treatment during the island's occupation by Japanese military forces during World War II. Those customs duties and income taxes are currently deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Using information from the Department of Justice about how much compensation is due, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1365 would increase direct spending by $40 million for compensation payments as funds become available over the 2020–2023 period.

The costs of the legislation (detailed in Table 1) fall within budget function 800 (general government).

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED INCREASES IN DIRECT SPENDING UNDER H.R. 1365

[By fiscal year, millions of dollars]

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2019–2024
Estimated Budget Authority	0	12	12	12	4	0	40
Estimated Outlays	0	12	12	12	4	0	40

This estimate supersedes the CBO estimate for H.R. 1365, a bill to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act that was transmitted on July 10, 2019. Although the five-year and ten-year totals are correct, the initial estimate indicated that there would be some costs in 2019. The legislation has not yet passed either House of Congress and CBO assumes it would be enacted near the end of fiscal year 2019. Given that timing, CBO expects spending would probably commence in fiscal year 2020.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Matthew Pickford. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, this marks the first time that I have taken to this floor to deliver remarks as a Member of Congress. My constituents can attest to the fact that I have never been one known to shy away from a microphone. However, the gravitas of H.R. 1365 that I bring to the floor today is of such consequence that I chose to withhold the privilege of this floor until this day.

While H.R. 1365 is a bipartisan bill that would simply make technical corrections to the current Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, it is the final component of a 75-year saga rooted in loyalty, faith, hope, and love in the midst of unimaginable suffering.

The Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act was passed by Congress and signed into law at the end of 2016, recognizing the sacrifices the people of Guam endured at the hands of foreign occupiers during World War II. Nearly 78 years ago, foreign enemies bombed

Pearl Harbor and then made their way east, taking control of Guam from United States naval forces, many of which were evacuated prior to the invasion.

The civilian population of Guam, regarded as Americans by the enemy, were left undefended, for all intents and purposes. In the 974 days of enemy occupancy, too many of the people of Guam, who today are American citizens, were injured, raped, maimed, murdered, and even forced to dig their own grave sites or those of their family and friends.

These atrocities occurred due to the unwavering patriotism of the people of Guam.

An 83-year-old survivor clearly remembers her family risking their lives to hide and care for the only living U.S. Navy soldier left on the island, who was tasked with sending information to our forces overseas. She shared her observations of enemy soldiers going village to village, looking for radioman George Tweed and leaving a trail of tortured and dead in their path.

Another 83-year-old survivor shared how he witnessed his childhood friend beaten up every day just for looking American.

One survivor, who was 5 years old at the time, testified to remembering her mother, pregnant with her sibling, after being severely beaten, hemorrhage to a slow death while performing forced labor under the grueling Sun. The baby did not survive either.

Though our people experienced such cruel acts, we remained vigilant with the hope and faith that the United States would return and liberate us from enemy forces. Seventy-five years ago this past Sunday, true to their word, our servicemen took to the shores of Guam, many of whom gave their lives to reclaim the island, and rescued those left who survived the brutality.

These stories are the memories of our survivors who continue to carry the heavy burdens of war post-liberation. These survivors, who were steadfast in their devotion to this country, the United States of America, were left out when America forgave its vanquished enemies from any form of redress to those who suffered under their occupation.

Almost 3 years ago, Congress voted to pass the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, providing those remaining survivors with a Federal claims process to seek adjudicated compensation for wartime suffering, a Federal process that, today, 75 years later, has one final hurdle to clear with H.R. 1365 to make those who qualified whole. Of the over 14,000 who suffered, 3,663 survivors have filed claims, with many of the nearly 11,000 having passed before this process could even begin.

Nonetheless, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, since October of last year, has certified over 600 claims, and the Commission continues to adjudicate all claims filed.

Unfortunately, pertinent technical language was left out of the original bill, preventing the Department of the Treasury from making payments for claims adjudicated and certified for compensation by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. H.R. 1365 makes the necessary corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act to see Congress' intent through, and it was drafted in close consultation with the Department of the Treasury and the Department of the Interior, to ensure the language's efficacy.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note for my colleagues that the moneys used for payment of these claims does not create a new expense category for the budget. I repeat, H.R. 1365 does not create a new expense category for the Federal budget. Instead, the moneys deposited in the Guam War Claims Fund is funding that originates from Guam's section 30 Federal income tax transfer payments, essentially moneys already due to the government of Guam. As such, funding for these claims do not represent a new expense but a reprogramming of existing expenses.

It is also important to note that these claimants are not just constituents of mine. Many claimants live in 46 other States and territories and are constituents to 265 districts across our Nation. We have claimants in Alabama; Alaska; Arizona; Arkansas; California; Colorado; Connecticut; Florida; Georgia; Hawaii; Idaho; Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Kansas; Kentucky; Louisiana; Maryland; Massachusetts; Michigan; Minnesota; Mississippi; Missouri; Montana; Nebraska; Nevada; New Hampshire; New Jersey; New Mexico; New York; North Carolina; Ohio; Oklahoma; Oregon; Pennsylvania; Rhode Island; South Carolina; South Dakota; Tennessee; Texas; Utah, the great State that my colleague this evening represents; Virginia; Washington; Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin; Wyoming; the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and Guam.

Over these past 75 years, our World War II survivors and their families have made their home throughout this country. Notwithstanding our current political status, our sons, daughters, mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters have died defending the freedom that liberators brought to our shores 75 years ago.

□ 2115

While we struggle on Guam under inequities and supplemental security income, Medicaid, and even basic voting rights, we remain the Sparta of America, with the highest per capita armed services recruitment rates in the country.

The brutality of the enemy 75 years ago could not break the resolve of our relationship with the United States of America and the generations since then and, to this very day, reflect this exemplary patriotism in our rights of service and those who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly ask my colleagues for their support in passing H.R. 1365 so the Greatest Generation of Guam who instilled in us this faith in American democracy can finally receive the long-awaited closure they have been seeking since the end of World War II.

As a gracious victor who assumed the responsibility for postwar peace, the passage of H.R. 1365 represents an unreconciled act of grace by the United States of America to a people who suffered for their loyalty to America. Perhaps most importantly, it represents an affirmation that, while slow to turn, and sometimes too slow, the wheels of justice in the land of the free do eventually come full circle.

A loyal people await the ultimate passage of H.R. 1365. And I am humbled to not only represent them in this body, but to extend my thanks on their behalf to the Speaker, majority leader, majority whip, committee chairs of jurisdiction, my minority leader, and ranking committee members who have made this moment possible, and to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who, today, do us the tremendous honor of seeing this measure through this House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1365.

As the gentleman has so well already explained, this bill would authorize the release of certain funds from the Guam Treasury that have been set aside to pay Guam World War II survivor claims.

Many individuals living on the island during the Japanese occupation suffered injury and, in some cases, death.

In 2016, Congress enacted the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act to provide for the adjudication of claims and for the payment of compensation as recommended by the Guam War Claims Review Commission in their 2004 report. However, legislation and language in the act unintentionally prevented funds from being provided to World War II survivors and their heirs. This bill fixes the original act's language to ensure survivors can receive these claims.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure. I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my appreciation to various individuals and entities for their unyielding support and assistance in pushing this bill forward.

I thank Ms. Irene Sgambelluri, an 89-year-old war survivor who flew out

here on her own to take meetings at the White House and who now has a White House special assistant on speed dial; Congressman KILILI SABLAN for his assistance in moving this bill through the process; my predecessors for laying much groundwork over many years that brings us to this inflection point; my leadership counterparts in Guam; the speaker of the Legislature of Guam and the Republican Party of Guam, who recognized and endorsed this very important bipartisan measure.

Lastly, I want to thank the senior citizens of Guam, our war survivors whose sacrifices, patience, and fortitude have given us the strength and inspiration to bring this to closure on their behalf.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1365, 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.

EMANCIPATION NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY ACT

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 434) to designate the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 434

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 ''Emancipation National Historic Trail Study Act''.

SEC. 2. EMANCIPATION NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY.

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(47) EMANCIPATION NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—The Emancipation National Historic Trail, extending approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate Highway 45 North, to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas, following the migration route taken by newly freed slaves and other persons of African descent from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, located in the 4th Ward of Houston, Texas.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 434, introduced by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, celebrates the freedom of the last American slaves by authorizing the study of an approximately 51-mile route for inclusion as a national historic trail in the National Trails System. The study will examine the suitability of designating the Emancipation National Historic Trail from Galveston to Freedmen's Town in Houston.

Nearly 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, United States General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves.

Upon gaining their freedom, many of the 250,000 newly freed slaves traversed the route from Galveston to Freedmen's Town in Houston, spreading the news to neighboring communities. This bill is a fitting tribute that honors the historic journey and lasting legacy of the last American slaves.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for championing this important legislation and for her hard work moving this bill through the legislative process.

I strongly support passing this bill.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership and the leadership of Chairman GRIJALVA, for the full committee, and, certainly, the ranking member for his courtesies.

I thank the manager tonight, a friend from Utah, for their kindness in yielding to me. This is an emotional moment for me and, as well, for many in my constituency, and I am delighted to be able to rise to give strong support to H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Study Act.

I thank all of the Members, as I have indicated, and also thank Congresswoman HAALAND, chair of the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, for holding the hearing that allowed the committee to learn of the strong support enjoyed by H.R. 434 and the hard work of dedicated historic preservationists to preserve the rich history of former slaves.

I also thank Naomi Mitchell Carrier of Houston, Texas, for her stalwart efforts to share the stories of newly freed slaves who settled in Freedmen's Town, a section of Houston, to begin their lives as free persons during the end of the Civil War. I want to thank Ms. Carrier as an educator, historian, and author with expertise in African American music, Texas history, and heritage tourism.

I also thank Ms. Eileen Lawal for her April 2019 oral testimony before the Natural Resources Committee in an amazing, passionate expression of how vital this trail will be. Ms. Lawal is the president Houston Freedmen's Town Conservancy, whose mission is to protect and preserve the history of Freedmen's Town.

I also thank the Mayor of the city of Houston, Sylvester Turner; Commissioner Rodney Ellis; the mayor of the city of Galveston; my colleague, my original cosponsor, Congressman WEBER, who represents the Galveston area.

The work of H.R. 434 will result in only the second trail in the United States that chronicles the experience of African Americans.

I am hoping that this will move swiftly through the United States House, then to the United States Senate, and then is signed by the President of the United States.

Currently, the National Park Service only has one national historic trail which centers on the African American experience. It is a Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail which covers a 54-mile path between Selma and Montgomery.

But as slaves lived in this land from 1619 to 1865 as slaves, a 250-year history, to think only one trail would commemorate that historic moment—although a moment in history that all of us are saddened by—it is important to capture the bravery, the courage, the strength of those families who managed to stay together.

The establishment of the Emancipation National Historic Trail will be the second trail for which the National Park Services would have responsibility and, again, would tell the wonderful story for future generations of the rich history of this Nation and the role that African Americans played in the economic, political, religious, cultural, and governmental efforts of this Nation. It ties into the work that we are continuing to do.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail Study Act would pave the way to working to establish an important story. It will go 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, all the way up to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park and Independence Heights, which was the first city organized by African Americans here in the Southwest region.

H.R. 434 requires that we study the post-Civil War history of newly freed slaves in a major slave-holding State following the largest military campaign waged on domestic soil in the history of the United States.

It is important to take note of the fact that those of us west of the Mississippi did not know that Abraham

Lincoln had freed the slaves until 1865. Captain Granger came to the shores and said to us in 1865, those of our ancestors, that they had been freed.

In a second inaugural address, President Abraham Lincoln declared that slavery was America's original sin: ''Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.' ''

We know that Abraham Lincoln wanted to maintain the unity of this Nation, but he wanted it to be without slaves. The story of the trail will be one that will be enlightening because the newly freed slaves established communities. They established schools. They established churches, and they migrated into the Houston community, coming up from that Emancipation National Historic Trail.

Today, the city of Houston is fortunate to call those communities Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park. The first park that was bought in the State of Texas was bought by freed slaves in Independence Heights. Freedmen's Town survived while other communities did not, and it continues to have some of the historic buildings.

By 1915, over 400 African American-owned businesses existed in Freedmen's Town. By 1920, one-third of Houston's 85,000 people lived in Freedmen's Town.

Freedmen's Town is recognized as a historic district. Emancipation Park was established in 1872 as Texas' oldest park, and it was bought, as I indicated, by freed slaves for a mere $8. After the emancipation, Freedmen's Town became one of the only sanctuaries for free persons in Houston.

The Freedmen's Town community has fought to preserve its structures, and though we are suffering from gentrification and the movement of our historic structures, we still have the character of that community.

I am delighted that the new neighbors, the new residents of that area will now be able to recognize how important Freedmen's Town is, and we can work together to build the historical story.

One such struggle was to preserve the handmade red bricks, and this evidences the restoring, the very important ceremony to put the old bricks that were made by freed slaves, to put them back into Freedmen's Town.

There are many stories that have come with this recurrent retelling of this trail, and I believe it will be an important trail and important story as well.

Let me also indicate that Independence Heights, as I said, was the first city, and we have already discussed the importance of Emancipation Park.

On September 24, 2016, the National Museum of African American History and Culture opened its doors, after 13 years of planning and construction and over 100 years of struggle, to see the history of former slaves as part of the complex of the museums of the Smithsonian that began in 1915.

I am proud to say that one of my predecessors, the Honorable Mickey Leland, was the first to seek to establish a museum dealing with slaves.

Then came JOHN LEWIS, who introduced his bill in 2003. I was delighted to be able to be part of it.

I am asking for strong support for H.R. 434. As I indicated, it brings back great memories of understanding our discussion in school about slavery and its aftermath. There was no commemoration to recognize that historic march, that historic migration when the slaves were freed in Galveston at that time and the settling that went on in the city of Houston.

□ 2130

It is very important to have knowledge of our history. With this trail, not only will the information about this historic trail be placed in the annals of the history of the United States, but I will be very grateful that the children and their children's children will really understand the important collective history of this great Nation.

Again, I wish to thank all of those who supported this. It is important to be able to thank Harris County Precinct 1 Commissioner Rodney Ellis, the African American Library at Gregory School, the Houston Freedmen's Town Conservatory, the Freedmen's Town Advisory Committee, the Emancipation Park Conservancy, the Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, the Freedmen's Town Preservation Coalition, the Kohrville Community Amos Cemetery Association, the Texas Center for African American Living History, the Rutherford B. Hayes Yates Museum, the Heritage Society of Sam Houston Park, the Houston Association of Black Psychologists, the Kinder Foundation, and Vanderbilt University.

Ramon Manning, who heads the Emancipation Park Conservancy, was an avid and strong supporter, also, as I mentioned, Sylvester Turner, the mayor of the city of Houston; Jacqueline Bostic; the Fourth Ward Redevelopment Authority; the head of the Emancipation Park Conservancy; and the director of parks. As I said, the mayor of the city of Galveston was also a supporter.

Mr. Speaker, I include letters in support of H.R. 434.

CITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARY DEPARTMENT,
Houston, TX, July 22, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Houston Public Library, on behalf of the African American Library at the Gregory School (The Gregory School), endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Library has a vested interest in the Emancipation National Historic Trail because The Gregory School currently holds and has held a very unique place in the histories of Texas, Houston, and Freedmen's Town/Fourth Ward history for more than 152 years.

In 2009, The Gregory School was established by the Houston Public Library as an African American Research and Archival Center in Houston's Historic Fourth Ward or Freedmen's Town. Freedman's Town was established in 1865 as the destination of former enslaved people in Texas and Louisiana after the Civil War. In 1866, the Freedmen's Bureau opened schools for black children and adults in the area. The Texas Legislature authorized the creation of public schools for the black community in 1870. By 1872 most of the students and teachers who were at the Bureau schools, which were closing, left them to attend the state-managed Gregory Institute. The Gregory Institute was the first school for freed slaves in Houston. Mike Snyder of the Houston Chronicle said that it was ''perhaps the first school for freed slaves in the State of Texas.'' By 1876 the Gregory Institute became a part of the Houston Public School System. The building that now houses the African American Library at the Gregory School first opened in 1926, as a two-story public school building for ''colored children,'' and was named Gregory Elementary School. In March 2019, The Gregory School was designated as a ''site of Memory associated with the UNESCO Slave Route Project'' for being the first public school for freed slaves in the state of Texas.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,
RHEA BROWN LAWSON, Ph.D.,
Director of the Houston Public Library.

HARRIS COUNTY PRECINT ONE,
Houston, TX, July 22, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: I would like to express my strong support for H.R. 434, ''Emancipation National Historic Trail Act.'' The trail will follow the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from Galveston to the vibrant settlement of

Freedmen's Town, which today is located outside downtown Houston in the 18th Congressional District. The trail would extend north 51 miles from Galveston's historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel AME Church along Highway 3 and Interstate 45 to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston.

As the Harris County Precinct One Commissioner, I have the privilege of representing the Freedman's Town and Emancipation Park areas; I firmly believe the trail will further elevate the historical significance of these vibrant communities and tell an important part of our local and national history. The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom.

I applaud you for introducing the bill, which I wholeheartedly support, and urge your support of the creation of the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act. It would bring national attention to a period of history when our nation took significant strides to make real the promise of our founding documents that give all people the right to freedom—a worthy goal, indeed.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

RODNEY ELLIS,
Commissioner.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
Nashville, TN, July 19, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: As the U.S. Member of the UNESCO International Scientific Committee for the Slave Route Project: ''Resistance, Liberty and Heritage,'' I write to endorse H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

My UNESCO charge has been to help identify sites of importance for the history of Africans and their descendants in our country, and to support the nomination of these sites for a UNESCO Slave Route designation. Since 2017, I have had the pleasure of working with the organizations and individuals in Houston who have been dedicated to preserving this important and underappreciated history. After much hard work on their part, this year a number of Houston sites won the UNESCO Slave Route designation. As an historian of the African past in the Americas, I have long recognized the role Galveston played in the African slave trade, filtering newly imported Africans into the U.S. Southwest. Nor did Galveston's engagement in that trade end in 1808 when Congress officially abolished that trade.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

This August I will attend the meeting of the UNESCO International Scientific Committee for the Slave Route Project in Cotonou, Benin, where we will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the project and where I will be proud to report on the successes in Texas. I hope that the passage of this bill will be an additional item to celebrate.

Sincerely,

JANE LANDERS,
Gertrude Conaway Vanderbilt Chair of History, Vanderbilt University, Director, Slave Societies Digital Archive, Member, UNESCO International Scientific Committee for the Slave Route Project.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Kohrville Community Amos Cemetery Association endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Amos Cemetery is the oldest African-American burial ground in the Kohrville community. Amos Cemetery is a significant part of Texas history by awarding it an Official Texas Historical Marker. The designation honors the cemetery as an important and educational part of local history. In 1881, former enslaved blacks from Alabama and Mississippi settled the area located on Cypress Creek. The Kohrville community, centered on farming, ranching and lumber industries, and offered schools for black students. Families that established this community are buried here as history is preserved by the Kohrville Community Amos Cemetery Association.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

CATHYRINE STEWART,
President Kohrville Community Association.

FREEDMEN'S TOWN
PRESERVATION COALITION
Houston, TX, July 22, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: This letter is written to advise you that the Freedmen's Town Preservation Coalition was established in June 2014 to preserve and protect historical sites and properties. We therefore, enthusiastically endorse H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

FTPC is a grassroots citizens-based organization that saw a problem with the destruction of historical cultural sites and properties in Freedmen's Town, the first place for settlement of formerly enslaved Africans. The trail of Freedom led to establishment of Freedmen's Town. FTPC stopped the destruction and removal of the historic bricks that were made, paid for and laid by freedmen and their descendants by first, developing an awareness campaign, secondly, placing a human body in the hole of destruction and finally, through legal action. Hence, as you can see, we recognize that preservation must happen and thusly, we are delighted with your proposed action to establish an Emancipation National Historic Trail.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

DORRIS ELLIS ROBINSON,
Founder and President of the Freedmen's Town Preservation Coalition.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Houston Association of Black Psychologists (HABPsi) endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

As a group of mental health professionals, HABPsi is of the opinion that the recognition of the Emancipation National Historic Trail would extend further the redemption of people of African descent who continue to live with the legacy of enslavement to this day. Even after more than 150 years since the Emancipation Proclamation, African Americans experience mental, emotional and spiritual pain from the experience of generations of enslavement. Acknowledgement of slavery ending . . . of free men, women and children walking away is a powerful remembrance.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

MS. ANELLE WILLIAMS,
HABPsi President.

INDEPENDENCE HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.,

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: On behalf of the Board of Directors, staff and community of historic Independence Heights. we are pleased to offer this letter supporting the establishment of the National Emancipation Heritage Trail. We are excited about this effort and have been engaged to assure all of our local churches, businesses and community groups join us as we endorse H.R. 434: the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, referenced in a hearing held before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

As the local convening agency in Independence Heights, we work everyday to preserve the rich heritage of Independence Heights, the first municipality established by African Americans in the State of Texas. This is especially important to us as we are amongst only a handful of communities remaining across America that still exist today. We are hopeful that H.R. 434 will serve as a beacon and give hope to many other places that are struggling to protect heritage before it is all erased.

African Americans were tenacious people. After the Civil War, they united and established settlements and even incorporated towns in the south amidst racial upheaval and reconstruction. We are proud f this heritage and are proud to stand with other communities including Galveston, Emancipation Park and Freedman's Town in Houston. The passing of this bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves where General Gordon Granger announced the Emancipation Proclamation on June 19, 1865, freeing the last American slaves. The newly freed slaves traveled spreading the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom. It would also bring awareness highlighting the undertold story of many African Americans towns and places. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

TANYA DEBOSE,
Executive Director, Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, Inc.

EMANCIPATION PARK CONSERVANCY,
April 2, 2019.

Hon. DEB HAALAND,
Chairwoman—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN HAALAND AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: I write to express strong support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, introduced by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee. Enactment of this bill will make possible an Emancipation National Historic Trail, which will extend 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, north to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly-freed slaves from the Galveston, Texas a major nineteenth century port to the vibrant settlement of Freedmen's Town, which is today the Fourth Ward of Houston, in the 18th Congressional District.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in the southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to a period of history when our nation took significant strides to make real the promise of our nation's founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

Sparked by the desire to have a place to commemorate the anniversary of their emancipation, known as Juneteenth, former slaves and community members in the Third and Fourth Wards led by Reverend Jack Yates, Richard Allen, Richard Brock, and Reverend Elias Dibble united to raise $1,000 in 1872 to purchase 10 acres of park land to host Juneteenth Celebrations. Emancipation Park is the most historic and culturally significant park in the city of Houston and was formerly one of the only communal spaces for Blacks in Houston. Over the years, Emancipation Park's immediate surrounding area experienced an economic boom, where many Black owned and frequented businesses, financial institutions and venues flourished in Houston's Third Ward. Emancipation Park is significant, not only as a ritual of remembrance and celebration, but also as an early act of exercising the rights of property ownership, commerce and cooperative economics amongst Blacks, which were formerly denied, known in our nation's founding documents as ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness''. The Emancipation National Historic Trail would serve as an invaluable opportunity to share rich cultural, social, historical and economic strides that have shaped society in the past and present. Thank you for your consideration in this designation.

Sincerely,

RAMON MANNING,
Board Chairman,
Emancipation Park Conservancy.

FREEDMEN'S TOWN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Houston, TX, July 20, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON LEE: The Freedmen's Town Advisory Committee would like to express our enthusiastic support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Freedmen's Town Advisory Committee was established by Mayor Sylvester Turner to help preserve the historical integrity of Freedmen's Town for the benefit of generations to come. Historians have stated that Freedmen's Town is potentially the ''largest linear architectural footprint still preserved in America'' of black urban life during the post-slavery Reconstruction era.

The Committee has worked to promote Freedmen's Town and bring international recognition from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to the area. As a result of this collaboration, multiple sites located on the proposed Trail have been designated as ''Sites of Memory Associated to the UNESCO Slave Route Project''.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities. Should this bill become

law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States.

An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition to the role African Americans played in the building of today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Warm Regards,

EILEEN LAWAL,
Chair.

HOUSTON FREEDMEN'S TOWN CONSERVANCY,
Houston, TX, July 20, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON LEE: With this letter, The Houston Freedmen's Town Conservancy would like to express our enthusiastic support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Houston Freedmen's Town Conservancy is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation that was established to protect and preserve the history of Freedmen's Town for the benefit of future generations. Freedmen's Town was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985, by the U.S. Department of Interior, and some of the historic sites located in this ''Mother Ward'' as it is commonly known, were recognized in March, 2019 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Seven of these historic sites, all located along the proposed Historic Trail, have been designated as ''Sites of Memory Associated with the UNESCO Slave Route Project''.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities. Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States.

An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Warm Regards,

EILEEN LAWAL,
Board of Directors President.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 434 enthusiastically. We look forward to the history being told for all to know, to appreciate, and to understand.

Mr. Speaker, as the author and principal sponsor, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 434, the ''Emancipation National Historic Trail Act.''

I thank Chairman RAÚL M. GRIJALVA for shepherding this legislation to the floor.

I also thank Congresswoman HAALAND, chair of the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands for holding the hearing that allowed the Committee to learn of the strong support enjoyed by H.R. 434, and the hard work of dedicated historic preservationists to preserve the rich history of former slaves.

Let me begin by thanking Ms. Naomi Mitchell Carrier of Houston, Texas, for her stalwart efforts to preserve and share the stories of newly freed slaves who settled in the Freedmen's Town section of Houston to begin lives as free persons following the end of the Civil War.

Ms. Mitchell Carrier is an educator, historian, and author with expertise in African American music, Texas history, and heritage tourism.

I also thank Ms. Eileen Lawal for her April 2019 oral testimony before the Natural Resources Committee, in support of H.R. 434.

Ms. Lawal is the president of Houston Freedmen's Town Conservancy, whose mission is to protect and preserve the history of Freedmen's Town for the benefit of future generations.

The work of H.R. 434 will result in the second trail in the United States that chronicles the experience of African Americans.

Currently, the National Parks Service only has one National Historic Trail, which centers on the African American experience.

It is the Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail, which covers a 54-mile path between Selma and Montgomery, Alabama, was designated a National Historic Trail in 1966.

The Selma to Montgomery Trail tells an important story about a pivotal moment in the nation's struggle with turning away from a history of segregation and toward a future of equality and justice.

Establishment of the Emancipation National Historical Trail will be the second trail for which that the National Parks Services would have responsibility, and it will tell the story of African Americans and will preserve for future generations the rich history of the newly-freed slaves who journeyed to Houston in search of economic and political opportunity, and greater religious and cultural freedom.

It is a remarkable story and one that all Americans can be proud to share with the world.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail Act would pave the way for the establishment of only the second nationally-recognized historic trail that chronicles the experience of African Americans in their struggle for equality and justice.

H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historical Trail Act, designates as a national historic trail the 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, north to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas.

H.R. 434 requires that we study the post-Civil War history of newly-freed slaves in a major slave holding state following the largest military campaign waged on domestic soil in the history of the United Sates.

This period is more than just a story about the North's victory and the South's loss—it is a story about a newly-freed people emerging from over 250 years of slavery and how they survived into the 21st century when other similarly situated communities did not.

In his Second Inaugural Address President Abraham Lincoln declared that slavery was America's Original Sin:

> Yet, if God wills that it continue [The Civil War] until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said ''the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.''

The bloody civil war was one phrase often used by battlefield survivors to describe what it was—blood, suffering, tears, and death, but from this struggle came a new birth of freedom for millions of former slaves.

There were thousands of communities comprised of freed slaves throughout the United States—although most of these communities were found in the South, they could also be found in the North, South, and Midwestern sections of the country.

Newly-freed slaves held malice toward none, including former slave owners.

But the same could not be said for those who once owned slaves.

Through economic hardship, natural disasters, and the period of 1919–1921 called the ''Burnings,'' dozens of communities ceased to exist.

The City of Houston is fortunate that much of this early history of former slaves has survived to this day: Freedmen's Town, Independence Heights, and the Emancipation Park areas, which are treasures in our nation's history.

Freedmen's Town survived where other communities did not, and it is the only surviving 19th century community built by former slaves to have a notable number of original structures that have been protected, preserved, or restored.

Freedmen's Town became the center of opportunity for freed slaves throughout the Houston area.

By 1915, over 400 African American-owned businesses existed there.

By 1920 one-third of Houston's 85,000 people lived in Freedmen's Town.

Freedmen's Town is a recognized Historic District.

Emancipation Park was established in 1872 and is Texas's oldest public park.

After emancipation, Freedmen's Town became one of the only sanctuaries for freed persons in Houston, Texas.

Today, Freedmen's Town hosts an impressive number of post-Civil War surviving structures—which include homes, public buildings, and commercial spaces built by former slaves.

The Freedmen's Town community has fought to preserve structures, unique construction features, and period materials which are unique in their continued presence as originally installed.

One such struggle was the work to preserve handmade red brick street in Freedmen's

Town that streets would have been destroyed had community leaders and preservationists not fought and succeeded in winning needed infrastructure improvements, and the re-installation of the period bricks onto the street.

There are concerns that Texas Department of Transportation's announced highway improvements on I–45 in the City of Houston would impact the historic areas of Independence Heights before the study directed by this bill could begin.

The reason the National Parks Service exists is to preserve the public lands for all to use and enjoy.

The nation has invested a great deal in protecting national parks and historic places due to their unique beauty, typographical features, or historic relevance.

The stories that make up the American experience have, for far too long, been limited to those of one group of Americans.

The limited view of what is of value or interest to the American public has changed with the establishment of a Native American History Museum and most recently the opening of the National African American History and Culture on the Mall.

The ''whites-only'' version of American history must end and at the same time we can make room for other American stories.

In 1915, the first suggestion of creating an African American History Museum came from African American Union veterans of the Civil War.

By 1988, Congressmen JOHN LEWIS and Mickey Leland introduced legislation for a stand-alone African American history museum within the Smithsonian Institution.

Their bill faced significant opposition in Congress due to its cost.

Supporters of the African American museum tried to salvage the proposal by suggesting that the Native Indian museum (then moving through Congress) and African American museum share the same space.

But the compromise did not work, and Congress took no further action on the bill.

In 2001, Congressman LEWIS and Congressman J.C. Watts reintroduced legislation for a museum in the House of Representatives which became law, creating a federal commission to study the idea of an African American Museum near Capitol Hill.

After completing a 2-year study the Commission determined that an African American history museum would be of substantial benefit to the nation.

In 1994, despite winning approval in both House and Senate committees, the bill died once more, due to opposition by North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms, who refused to allow the legislation to come to the Senate floor despite bipartisan support.

In 2003, the House passed the ''National Museum of African American History and Culture Act,'' which passed the Senate and was signed into law by President George W. Bush.

On September 24, 2016, the National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC) opened its doors after 13 years of planning, and construction and over a hundred years of struggle to see the history of former slaves as part of the complex of museums on the Capital Mall began in 1915.

The success of the National Museum of African American History and Culture reveals the hunger in the nation and across the world for authentic stories from our past.

Since its opening the NMAAHC has generated a sustained demand for tickets, an unprecedented problem for a museum—where interest far outstrips capacity to accommodate visitors.

About three million people have already visited the NMAAHC, which is the newest museum in the Smithsonian Institution and houses close to 37,000 rare artifacts within three stories.

Not only is demand for tickets high, according to the museum's associate director, so is the amount of time visitors spend in the museum once they get in.

The museum's associate director told NPR.com that while most venues have a ''dwell'' time of an hour and 45 minutes to two hours, visitors are spending up to six hours exploring. It's already an important part of many people's list of things to do in Washington, D.C.''

There is a hunger in the nation for stories about African Americans from our past that link us to our present and act as guideposts to our future.

This is a momentous opportunity—one that fires the imagination for fully telling the American story from the voices and perspectives of all of our nation's citizens.

The richness of these diverse stories is found in Houston's African American historic areas.

These areas of Houston tell the story of many peoples who are part of our nation's history by filling in gaps of the story of the United States that too many Americans do not know or understand because these stories are now being taught as part of American history.

It is important to ensure that the public trust to preserve our nation's history is also a commitment to preserving all of its history, including that which reflects both its best and worst moments.

By way of example, when I was a young girl, I learned the story of Crispus Attucks—a key figure in our nation's history who on the eve of the American Revolution lost his life during a protest of British rule prior to the start of the Revolutionary War.

However, Crispus Attucks was not the sole person of African descent who wanted to see freedom from British rule—he fought for the United States and was joined by thousands of other persons of African descent who participated in the Revolutionary War.

Over time the history of the American War for Independence is revealing a tapestry of diversity that had not been well understood.

In the 1980s the daughters of the American Revolution initially would not accept black women as members until one stood up and took a stand.

According to a March 1984 story in the Washington Post, Lena Lorraine Santos Ferguson, a retired school secretary, was denied membership in a Washington, D.C. chapter of the DAR because she was black.

Her two white sponsors, Margaret M. Johnston and Elizabeth E. Thompson, were shocked at Ms. Ferguson's rejection.

Ms. Ferguson met the lineage requirements and could trace her ancestry to Jonah Gay, a white man who fought in Maine.

When the reason for not admitting Ms. Ferguson became known, the public reaction was swift and negative.

The Daughters of the American Revolution revisited their denial of Ms. Ferguson, and upon reconsideration accepted her as a member, making her the first of many women of color who became members of the organization.

The history of the United States is more complex and immensely richer than would be apparent if we only consider the history of one group of people.

The tenacity demonstrated and the focus on historical accuracy and the need to save what is a unique aspect of American history for future generations is important.

For this reason, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 434.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 434, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the proposed Emancipation National Historic Trail. This 51-mile trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves and other persons of African descent from the major 19th-century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town in Houston.

Although President Abraham Lincoln officially ended slavery through the Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862, many slaves were not freed until much later when news of the proclamation reached their towns. The last of those slaves lived in the South and were freed on June 19, 1865, after the Emancipation Proclamation was read in Galveston.

On January 1, 1866, the Emancipation Proclamation was read at the African Methodist Episcopal Church on 20th and Broadway, now Reedy Chapel. A large number of the freed slaves marched from the courthouse on 21st and Ball Streets to the church, where the director of the Freedmen's Bureau read the proclamation to the marchers.

The Emancipation Proclamation is still read at the church each year at the Juneteenth celebration.

Houston, Texas, has rich ties to African American history. The Emancipation Trail proposed by H.R. 434 ends in Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston. Freedmen's Town is one of the first and the largest of the post-Civil War Black urban communities in Texas. The community was established by former Texas slaves who left their plantations for the safety of Houston.

Emancipation Park is also significant to Houston African American history. In the years following the emancipation of slaves in Texas, African American populations across Texas collected money to buy property dedicated to the Juneteenth celebrations. In honor of their freedom, they named it Emancipation Park.

This bill is an important reminder of the struggles of African Americans throughout our Nation's history as we have worked to form a more perfect union. I support Ms. JACKSON LEE's efforts to study the proposed trail and highlight the important African American history of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters in support of H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act:

CITY OF HOUSTON,
Houston, TX, March 26, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Natural Resources Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I write today to express my support of Representative Sheila Jackson Lee's bill, H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act. Passage of this bill will pave the way for the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which will extend approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas, on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role that African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the surrounding area. I urge you to pass this bill to create the Emancipation National Historic Trail.

Sincerely,

SYLVESTER TURNER,
Mayor.

KINDER FOUNDATION,
Houston, TX, July 22, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Kinder Foundation endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Kinder Foundation actively supports the community development and preservation of the historic Freedmen's Town and Third Ward in Houston, Texas, which has a direct relationship and serves as a key location in H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act. The Kinder Foundation is participating in planning efforts for Freedmen's Town and provided early funding for the renovation of Emancipation Park located in Third Ward. Emancipation Park began as 10 acres of land purchased in 1872, by Reverend Jack Yates, Richard Allen, Richard Brock, and Reverend Elias Dibble to serve as a gathering place for former slaves living in the Third and Fourth Wards to commemorate the anniversary of their emancipation (''Juneteenth''). The Kinder Foundation also actively supports the Emancipation Park Conservancy to further programming and operations at Emancipation Park, as well as the Emancipation Community Development Partnership and the Emancipation Economic Development Council in an effort to revitalize the area through affordable housing and education initiatives. Passing H.R. 434, will have an enormous impact and be a major contribution towards the historical and cultural preservation of three of Houston's most historically significant neighborhoods.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

NANCY G. KINDER,
President & CEO.

RUTHERFORD B. H. YATES
MUSEUM, INC.,
Houston, TX.

Hon. SHIELA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Rutherford B H Yates Museum, Inc. endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

The Rutherford B H Yates Museum, Inc. believes that the approval of H.R. 434 will be the first major step toward the goal for the 40 block Freedmen's Town National Register Historic Place-TCP and its related sites, to become U.S. National Landmarks and ultimately to receive UNESCO-World Heritage Cite recognition. In March 2019, the first six (6) of the (74) sites that RBHYates Museum, Inc. had nominated in 2016, have been awarded as ''Sites of Memory Associated with the UNESCO-Slave Route''. We continue to submit documents for consideration of the nominated sites, in the UNESCO-Slave Route process.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to include the Freedmen's Town National Register Historic Place-TCP, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows a migration route taken by previously enslaved peoples from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the founding of the earliest Urban settlement of Freedmen's Town-4th Ward, Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston and from Plantations throughout Texas. to other cities and states in search of family members who had been previously sold into slavery, and to spread the news of freedom to neighboring communities.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail Act would bring long overdue historic recognition for the role African Americans played in the building of Houston and Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by heritage cultural tourists who visit and walk this trail will benefit the City of Houston and the State of Texas.

Sincerely,

THEOPHILUS HERRINGTON, PH.D.

THE HERITAGE SOCIETY
AT SAM HOUSTON PARK,
Houston, TX.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Heritage Society endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

Since its founding, The Heritage Society, a non-profit 501(c)(3), has acquired and restored ten historic buildings in the city of Houston. The result is a treasure for our city, with buildings that tell the stories of how diverse segments of society lived daily, from freed slaves building new lives for themselves to prosperous merchant families from Houston's early years. The Heritage Society is an educational institution whose mission is to tell the stories of the diverse history of Houston and Texas through its collections, exhibitions and programing.

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

Two of the historic buildings cared for by The Heritage Society, the Jack Yates House and the 4th Ward Cottage, have been nominated as ''Sites of Memory'' as part of the UNESCO Slave Route Project. Obtaining international recognition to the Jack Yates House signifies its importance as a place that embodies what is was to be an enslaved African-American, who, once freed, became a community leader whose lasting impact is seen today. Recognizing this Historic Trail would truly provide a larger understanding of how Houston's history is both unique and

also very much a part of the larger story of the impact of enslavement of African Americans in the United States.

Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

ALISON A. BELL,
Executive Director.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The Texas Center for African American Living History endorses H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

Owing to my research to document historic sites and markers from Galveston to Houston Freedmen's National Historic District, I, Naomi Carrier, develop a written testimony that has become a part of the historical record for H.R. 434, as expressed in this excerpt from Congresswoman, Sheila Jackson Lee:

''As the founder and CEO of Texas Center for African American Living History, your insight will be beneficial to the effort to see H.R. 434 become law. In the past thirty years, you have endeavored to bring a fresh perspective to Texas History through performance art and education. If you will prepare written remarks in support of the bill, I will see that your written statement is placed into the record for the hearing and that you will be recognized. There will also be a seat for you to observe this historic hearing. I ask that you plan to attend, you should plan to arrive the evening before or the morning of the hearing to allow us an opportunity to speak before the hearing begins.

Your written testimony is welcomed and appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Sheila Jackson Lee
Member of Congress''

This bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate 45 North to Freedmen's Town, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from the major 19th century seaport town of Galveston to the burgeoning community of Freedmen's Town, which is now the 4th Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

The start of the trail is located where General Gordon Granger sailed into Galveston, Texas, with troops on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The newly freed slaves traveled from Galveston to spread the news to neighboring communities. Should this bill become law it would establish the first trail in the Southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring long overdue historic recognition due to the role African Americans played in the building of the today's Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

My research gathered over the past 30 years will be an invaluable asset to the National Park Service in the study of the Trail and relevant 19th and early 20th century historic sites in the surrounding areas.

Sincerely,

NAOMI MITCHELL CARRIER,
M.Ed.—Professor,
Houston Community College, Author, Go Down, Old Hannah, Founder, Texas Center for African American Living History (TCAALH), Director, Performing and Visual Arts Workshop.

FOURTH WARD REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, TIRZ NO. 14, FREEDMAN'S TOWN,
Houston, TX, April 1, 2019.

Re H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act

Hon. DEB HAALAND,
Chairwoman, House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN HAALAND: On behalf of the Boards of Directors for Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone Number Fourteen, City of Houston, Texas (''TIRZ #14'') and Fourth Ward Redevelopment Authority (the ''Authority''), please allow this correspondence to serve as our expression of support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, introduced by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee.

It is our understanding that the enactment of this bill will make possible an Emancipation National Historic Trail which will extend 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas along Highway 3 and Interstate 45 north to Freedman's Town and Emancipation Park located in Houston, Texas. The trail will follow the migration route taken by newly-freed slaves from Galveston, Texas, a major nineteenth century port, to the vibrant settlement of Freedmen's Town which today is also referenced as the Fourth Ward Houston within the 18th Congressional District.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in the southwest region of the United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to make real the promise of our nation's founding documents attesting to the rights of all men to live free.

Freedmen's Town is contained within the boundaries of TIRZ #14 and within our zone we have significant structures that are directly related to the founders of Emancipation Park. Of note are the historic brick streets that were laid by freed slaves; Bethel Church founded by Jack Yates which has been restored as an open space park; and The African American Library at Gregory School which originally served as the first public school for black students. Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, the oldest African American church in Houston (1876) whereby Jack Yates served as pastor still resides in the historic boundaries of Freedmen's Town just east of the TIRZ boundaries.

Through our project plan that directs TIRZ #14 to allocate its funds to historical preservation, among other designated projects, the Authority has set its priorities on preserving and renovating the institutional vestiges of Freedman's Town to assure that for generations to come the story of the African-American experience in Houston can be retold and personally experienced. We strongly believe that The Emancipation National Historic Trail will lend itself to act as the impetus by which the nation will come to know and experience the tenacity and strength of the freed slave to build, thrive and prosper in its own community.

Therefore, it is an honor to lend our support to the H.R. 434, The Emancipation National Historic Trail Act.

Very truly yours,

JACQUELINE BOSTIC,
Chair.

EMANCIPATION PARK CONSERVANCY,
April 2, 2019.

Hon. DEB HAALAND,
Chairwoman, House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member, House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN HAALAND AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: I write to express strong support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, introduced by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee. Enactment of this bill will make possible an Emancipation National Historic Trail, which will extend 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, north to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly-freed slaves from the Galveston, Texas a major nineteenth century port to the vibrant settlement of Freedmen's Town, which is today the Fourth Ward of Houston, in the 18th Congressional District.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in the southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to a period of history when our nation took significant strides to make real the promise of our nation's founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

Sparked by the desire to have a place to commemorate the anniversary of their emancipation, known as Juneteenth, former slaves and community members in the Third and Fourth Wards led by Reverend Jack Yates, Richard Allen, Richard Brock, and Reverend Elias Dibble united to raise $1,000 in 1872 to purchase 10 acres of park land to host Juneteenth Celebrations. Emancipation Park is the most historic and culturally significant park in the city of Houston and was formerly one of the only communal spaces for Blacks in Houston. Over the years, Emancipation Park's immediate surrounding area experienced an economic boom, where many Black owned and frequented businesses, financial institutions and venues flourished in Houston's Third Ward. Emancipation Park is significant, not only as a ritual of remembrance and celebration, but also as an early act of exercising the rights of property ownership, commerce and cooperative economics amongst Blacks, which were formerly denied, known in our nation's founding documents as ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness''.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would serve as an invaluable opportunity to

share rich cultural, social, historical and economic strides that have shaped society in the past and present. Thank you for your consideration in this designation.

Sincerely,

RAMON MANNING,
Board Chairman, Emancipation, Park Conservancy.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
March 29, 2019.

Chairman RAUL GRIJALVA,
Washington, DC.
Ranking Member ROB BISHOP,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP: We appreciate the opportunity to share our support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act. The National Trust enthusiastically endorses this legislation and looks forward to its enactment in this Congress.

INTERESTS OF THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a privately-funded charitable, educational, and nonprofit organization chartered by Congress in 1949 to ''facilitate public participation in historic preservation'' and to further the purposes of federal historic preservation laws. The intent of Congress was for the National Trust ''to mobilize and coordinate public interest, participation, and resources in the preservation and interpretation of sites and buildings.'' With headquarters in Washington, D.C., nine field offices, 27 historic sites, more than one million members and supporters, and a national network of partners in states, territories, and the District of Columbia, the National Trust works to save America's historic places and advocates for historic preservation as a fundamental value in programs and policies at all levels of government.

H.R. 434, EMANCIPATION NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL ACT

We appreciate Representative Sheila Jackson Lee's leadership on this legislation to establish the Emancipation National Historic Trail in the state of Texas. The route would extend approximately 51 miles from the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate Highway 45 North to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park located in Houston.

The designation of this historic trail-to be administered by the National Park Servicetraces the 19th century migration route from Galveston to Houston of newly freed slaves and persons of African descent. On June 19, 1865, General Gordon Granger arrived at Galveston to announce the freedom of the last American slaves, which belatedly freed approximately 250,000 slaves nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. Their migration to the community of Freedmen's Town located in the Fourth Ward of Houston would be codified in this proposed historic trail designation and further allow the National Park Service to tell the stories of all Americans.

National Historic Trails administered by the National Park Service provide an opportunity to recognize, commemorate, and interpret travel routes of national historic significance while sharing the significant histories of our nation. We urge Congressional support of this legislation and look forward to enactment of H.R. 434.

Sincerely,

PAM BOWMAN,
Director of Public Lands Policy.

EMANCIPATION PARK CONSERVANCY,
Houston, TX, April 2, 2019.

Hon. DEB HAALAND,
Chairwoman—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN HAALAND AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: I write to express strong support for H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, introduced by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee. Enactment of this bill will make possible an Emancipation National Historic Trail, which will extend 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, north to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration route taken by newly-freed slaves from the Galveston, Texas a major nineteenth century port to the vibrant settlement of Freedmen's Town, which is today the Fourth Ward of Houston, in the 18th Congressional District.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would be the first trail in the southwest United States that recognizes the role of African Americans in the legacy of freedom in the United States. An Emancipation Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to a period of history when our nation took significant strides to make real the promise of our nation's founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

Sparked by the desire to have a place to commemorate the anniversary of their emancipation, known as Juneteenth, former slaves and community members in the Third and Fourth Wards led by Reverend Jack Yates, Richard Allen, Richard Brock, and Reverend Elias Dibble united to raise $1,000 in 1872 to purchase 10 acres of park land to host Juneteenth Celebrations. Emancipation Park is the most historic and culturally significant park in the city of Houston and was formerly one of the only communal spaces for Blacks in Houston. Over the years, Emancipation Park's immediate surrounding area experienced an economic boom, where many Black owned and frequented businesses, financial institutions and venues flourished in Houston's Third Ward. Emancipation Park is significant, not only as a ritual of remembrance and celebration, but also as an early act of exercising the rights of property ownership, commerce and cooperative economics amongst Blacks, which were formerly denied, known in our nation's founding documents as ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness''. The Emancipation National Historic Trail would serve as an invaluable opportunity to share rich cultural, social, historical and economic strides that have shaped society in the past and present. Thank you for your consideration in this designation.

Sincerely,

RAMON MANNING,
Board Chairman—Emancipation Park Conservancy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 434, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3877, BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 549, VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–183) on the resolution (H. Res. 519) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3877) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

YSLETA DEL SUR PUEBLO AND ALABAMA-COUSHATTA TRIBES OF TEXAS EQUAL AND FAIR OPPORTUNITY SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 759) to restore an opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 759

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 ''Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas Equal and Fair Opportunity Settlement Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT.

The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act (Public Law 100–89; 101 Stat. 666) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 301. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude or limit the applicability of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 759, introduced by Representative BABIN from Texas, amends the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama-Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act of 1987 to clarify that the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act applies to both the Pueblo and the Tribe.

The Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas was federally terminated in 1954, followed by the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, also known as the Tigua Tribe, in 1968. Congress rightfully restored both the Pueblo and the Tribe in 1987 at one time by enacting the aforementioned Restoration Act.

The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act was enacted just 1 year later, in 1988. The framework that it created should have applied to both the Pueblo and the Tribe, just as it did to every other Tribe. However, since the Restoration Act was passed at a time when Indian gaming was just emerging and Federal regulations had not yet been implemented, it contains a section regarding gaming.

We know from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the intent of this section of the Restoration Act was to clarify Indian gaming policy at the time, not to completely prohibit gaming on these lands in perpetuity, but that is what is occurring. The language in the Restoration Act has been used by the State of Texas to completely stymie the Pueblo's and the Tribe's ability to engage in Class II gaming, much to the detriment of the economic health and well-being of both the Pueblo and the Tribe.

Additionally, the only other federally recognized Tribe in Texas, the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe, is allowed to operate a Class II gaming facility, as they were restored by Congress in 1983 without any type of gaming restrictions.

H.R. 759 remedies this inequality by clarifying that the Pueblo and the Tribe, like the Kickapoo, have the same rights and responsibilities under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act as virtually every other federally recognized Tribe in the United States. The legislation confers no new or special rights to the Pueblo or the Tribe, nor does it in any way limit the existing rights of the State of Texas. This is simply a matter of parity and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 759, sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), would amend the act of Congress that restored Federal recognition to the two Tribes in Texas that are the subject of this bill.

The amendment would override a gaming limitation imposed by Congress on the Tribes, thereby authorizing the Tribes to operate the casinos regulated under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 and not under Texas law.

The question of whether Texas law or the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act applies to the two Tribes is no longer under serious dispute. Federal courts have settled the question, and the result of the litigation is that the two Tribes may not conduct gaming under IGRA unless Congress enacts a measure to allow them to do so.

This bill enjoys significant local support in the communities around the reservations of the two Tribes, and the Members who represent the Tribes strongly support enactment of the measure because the reservations, where the casinos would be operated, are within their districts.

However, while the bill enjoys support in Texas, I must note that the Governor of Texas, Greg Abbott, has written letters to the House leaders and committee leaders in opposition to the legislation. In the view of the Governor, this bill allows the Tribes to violate the Texas constitution without the consent of the State of Texas.

It is my hope that such concerns with the measure can be worked out as the legislative process continues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is about fairness, and when you have been in this office as long as I have been—I was here when we passed the 1984, the 1985, and the 1986 gaming laws—we tried and expected to do the right thing for all Tribes. I say I have been involved with this. When I was chairman, we tried to do the same thing. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. The most important thing is it is a simple matter of fairness.

I will say it again. These two Tribes have been denied the same opportunity of every other federally recognized Tribe, including the Kickapoo Tribe, to engage in Class II gaming on their reservation. Class II is bingo.

This legislation opens no new door to gaming in Texas. The Kickapoo Tribe has been offering bingo on their reservation for the better part of two decades with no interference from the State of Texas.

Second, it should be noted that virtually all communities surrounding the Alabama-Coushatta reservation have passed a resolution endorsing this legislation. In fact, over 30 resolutions in favor of H.R. 759 show that support for the bill runs from the Gulf of Mexico to the Red River border on Oklahoma.

This represents genuine grassroots support for the people who will be most impacted. Far from thwarting the will of the people of Texas, this legislation enables it.

Mr. Speaker, from someone who has worked on this legislation a long time, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to solve an unfair state.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress to take on and address the tough issues facing our Nation and the world and leave it a better place for my grandchildren, which I will note climbed to number 16 with the arrival of Truett Ryan Babin just yesterday.

When I say the tough issues, I mean the ones most of us would agree on: border security, immigration, taxes, trade, national security, and on and on.

But when you take this job, you realize that working on behalf of your constituents as their elected Representative to the Federal Government can mean taking on issues that you weren't expecting to, and this is certainly one such case.

But I am proud and honored to be here, and I thank the leaders from both sides of the aisle who have come together and worked with us to get H.R. 759, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas Equal and Fair Opportunity Settlement Act, passed favorably out of committee and here to the floor today.

I am not in this fight because of a love for gaming. I am here because it is about fairness. It is about equal treatment under the law, jobs, and economic development and opportunity.

With the exception of a few years in the military, I have lived in southeast Texas all of my life, and I have seen firsthand how these proud Native Americans have provided jobs and economic opportunity not only for members of their Tribe but for Texans throughout our entire region. That is why the 32 government and civic organizations who live and work closest to this reservation have given their strong endorsement of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letters and resolutions from every one of them.

GOVERNMENT & COMMUNITY ENTITIES IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 759

Chambers County, Cherokee County Commissioners Court, CHI St. Luke's Health Memorial, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Deep East Texas Council of Governments, Hardin County Commissioners Court, City of

Ivanhoe, Jasper County Commissioners Court, Jasper Economic Development Corp, Jefferson County Commissioners Court.

City of Livingston, Texas, Livingston Rotary Club, Lufkin & Angelina County Chamber of Commerce, Madison County Commissioners Court, National Congress of American Indians, Newton County Commissioners Court, City of Onalaska, Texas, Orange County Commissioners Court, Polk County Chamber of Commerce, Polk County Commissioners Court.

Polk County GOP, The River Church, Sabine County Commissioners Court, San Augustine County Commissioners Court, San Jacinto County, Trinity County Commissioners Court, Tyler County Chamber of Commerce, Tyler County Hospital District, USET Sovereignty Protection, Walker County Commissioners Court, Walling Printing Company, City of Woodville.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a federally recognized Indian Tribe located in Polk County, Texas and is committed to supporting the economic development and creation of jobs within Polk County and surrounding counties of Deep East Texas; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas' Naskila electronic bingo facility, has created over 560 new jobs in Deep East Texas and is the third largest employer in the region, and is responsible for injecting nearly $140 million annually in revenue to the region; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas provided over 46 fully paid collegiate scholarships for graduating high school students of the Tribe in 2018; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas being a good community partner, contributed $500,000 in donations after Hurricane Harvey to several counties, and purchased 30 manufactured home units; and

Whereas, United States Congressman Brian Babin (R–Woodville) has filed H.R. 759 to clarify conflicting federal statutes regarding the right of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas to offer Class II electronic bingo on their tribal lands pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, a right enjoyed and exercised by the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe ofTexas since 1996; and

Whereas, the passage of H.R. 759 is vital to continued economic development and health of both the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas and all Deep East Texas; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the Cherokee County Commissioners Court hereby joins the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas in support of its effort for passage of H.R. 759 to clarify that the Tribe can enjoy the opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and to protect jobs. Further, the Cherokee County Commissioners Court urgently requests that United States Senators John Cornyn and Ted Cruz of Texas, as well as the other 35 Texans elected to the United States House of Representatives, join Congressman Babin in securing the enactment of H.R. 759 into law.

Witness our hands this 9 day of July, 2019.

CHRIS DAVIS,
County Judge.
KELLY TRAYLOR,
Commissioner, Precinct 1.
STEVEN NORTON,
Commissioner, Precinct 2.
PATRICK REAGAN,
Commissioner, Precinct 3.
BILLY MCCUTCHEON,
Commissioner, Precinct 4.

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a federally recognized Indian Tribe located in Polk County, Texas and is committed to supporting the economic development and creation of jobs within Polk and surrounding counties of Deep East Texas; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas' Naskila electronic bingo facility, has created over 560 new jobs in Deep East Texas and is the third largest employer in the region, and is responsible for injecting nearly $140 million annually in revenue to the region; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas provided over 46 fully paid collegiate scholarships for graduating high school students of the Tribe in 2018; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas being a good community partner, contributed $500,000 in donations after Hurricane Harvey to several counties, and purchased 30 manufactured home units; and

Whereas, United States Congressman Brian Babin (R–Woodville) has filed H.R. 759 to clarify conflicting federal statutes regarding the right of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas to offer Class II electronic bingo on their tribal lands pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, a right enjoyed and exercised by the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas since 1996; and

Whereas, the passage of H.R. 759 is vital to continued economic development and health of both the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas and all Deep East Texas; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the CHI St. Luke's Health Memorial hereby joins the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas in support of its effort for passage of H.R. 759 to clarify that the Tribe can enjoy the opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and to protect jobs. Further, the CHI St. Luke's Health Memorial urgently requests that United States Senators John Cornyn and Ted Cruz of Texas, as well as the other 35 Texans elected to the United States House of Representatives, join Congressman Babin in securing the enactment of H.R. 759 into law.

Approved this 26 day of March, 2019.

MONTE BOSTWICK,
Market Chief Executive Officer, CHI St. Luke's Health Memorial.

GREATER CLEVELAND CHAMBER,
Cleveland, Texas, April 24, 2019.

NASKILA GAMING,
Yolanda Poncho, Public Relations Manager, Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas, Livingston, Texas.

DEAR MRS. PONCHO: Thanks to you and your team for the presentation to our Board on Thursday, April 4, 2019 regarding a resolution by our board supporting HR 459.

Our Board held its regular meeting on Thursday, 4/18/19 and discussed the issue. After review by our board and it has been determined that Greater Cleveland Chamber By-Laws will not allow a resolution endorsing the bill.

The Board did vote to send give the attached letter supporting Naskila.

I hope this helps your cause and thank all of you a Naskila for the support your give to the Chamber and the Cleveland community.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the above.

Respectfully,

CHARLIE RICE,
President & Chairman of the Board.
JIM CARSON,
Vice President and COO.

GREATER CLEVELAND CHAMBER,
Cleveland, Texas, April 24, 2019.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: This is a Letter of Support for Naskila Gaming, 540 State Park Road 56, Livingston Texas and the Alabama-Coshatta Tribe of Texas. Naskila Gaming joined the Greater Cleveland Chamber of Commerce in October 2016 at the ''Distinguished Investor'' membership level. They are committed to our Chamber events and were a Bronze Level sponsor of our 2019 annual awards banquet—Cleveland Through the Ages.

The Greater Cleveland Chamber appreciates the support Naskila gives to both the people, as well as the businesses in the greater Cleveland area.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE RICE,
President & Chairman of the Board.
JIM CARSON,
Vice President and COO.

DETCOG RES0LUTION—Deep East Texas Council of Governments & Economic Development District

IN SUPPORT OF THE ALABAMA-COUSHATTA TRIBE OF TEXAS

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a federally recognized Indian Tribe located in Polk County, Texas and is committed to supporting the economic development and creation of jobs within Polk and neighboring counties of Deep East Texas; and

WHEREAS, through the creation of Naskila Gaming, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas has created over 560 new jobs in Deep East Texas and is the third largest employer in the region, and is responsible for injecting nearly $140 million annually into our regional economy; and

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a great asset to our region and a wonderful neighbor and friend to all of Texas. When Hurricane Harvey devastated our state, they were among the first to step up and provide emergency financial assistance to victims throughout Deep East Texas and many other hard-hit areas; and

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas supports the youth of Deep East Texas and provided 46 fully paid collegiate scholarships for graduating high school students in 2018, and

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas deserves to be treated equally and fairly and enjoy the same opportunities as other federally recognized Tribes; and

WHEREAS, federal statutes conflict regarding the right of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas to offer Class II electronic bingo on their tribal lands pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, a right enjoyed and exercised by the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas since 1996, and Representative Brian Babin has filed legislation to clarify the conflicting federal statutes; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED,the Board of Directors of the Deep East Texas Council of Governments hereby states its support for the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas in the effort to clarify that the Tribe can enjoy the opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and to protect jobs.

ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Deep East Texas Council Governments and Economic Development District on the 28th day of March, 2019.

THE HONORABLE DAPHNE SESSION,
President.

THE HONORABLE ROY BOLDON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION—12–19

STATE OF TEXAS, §, COMMISSIONERS COURT.

COUNTY OF HARDIN, §, OF HARDIN COUNTY, TEXAS.

BE IT REMEMBERED at a meeting of Commissioners Court of Hardin County, Texas, held on this 26TH Day of March. 2019, on motion by LW Cooper Jr., Commissioner of Precinct No. 1, and second by . . .. Alvin Roberts, Commissioner of Precinct No. 4, the following RESOLUTION was adopted:

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 759

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a Federally recognized Indian Tribe located in Polk County, Texas and is committed to supporting the economic development and creation of jobs within Polk and surrounding counties of Deep East Texas; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas' Naskila electronic bingo facility has created over 560 new jobs in Deep East Texas. and is the third largest employer in the region and is responsible for injecting nearly $140 million annually in revenue to the region; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas provided over 46 fully paid collegiate scholarships for graduating high school students of the Tribe in 2018; and

Whereas, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas being a good community partner contributed $500,000.00 in donations after Hurricane Harvey to several counties, and purchased 30 mobile home units; and

Whereas, United State Congressman Brian Babin (R-Woodville) has filed H.R. 759 to clarify conflicting federal statutes regarding the right of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas to offer Class II Electronic Bingo on their tribal lands pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, a right enjoyed and exercised by the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas since 1996; and

Whereas, the passage of H.R. 759 is vital to continued economic development and health of both the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas and all Deep East Texas; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Hardin County Commissioners Court hereby joins the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas in support of its effort for passage of H.R. 759 to clarify that the Tribe can enjoy the opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and to protect jobs. FURTHER, the Hardin County Commissioners Court urgently requests that United States Senators John Cornyn and Ted Cruz of Texas, as well as the other 35 Texans elected to the United States House of Representatives, join Congressman Babin in securing the enactment of H.R. 759 into law..

SIGNED this 26th, day of MARCH, 2019.

JUDGE WAYNE MCDANIEL,
County Judge
L.W. COOPER JR.,
County Commissioner, Precinct 1.
COMMISSIONER CHRIS KIRKENDALL,
County Commissioner, Precinct 2.
KEN PELT
COMMISSIONER, KEN PELT,
County Commissioner, Precinct 3.
COMMISSIONER, ALVIN ROBERTS,
County Commissioner, Precinct 4.

Mr. BABIN. All I want is for this Tribe in my district to simply have the same rights and the same opportunities as their counterparts at the Kickapoo Tribe of Texas facility in Eagle Pass, Texas, and what they deserve under a fair interpretation of IGRA, the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Why should one Tribe be able to play bingo and another Tribe not be able to in the same State of Texas?

Poverty and joblessness are a scourge in many communities across this country, but the consequences are especially dire on the reservation lands of the Native American peoples across this Nation.

□ 2145

This facility has already helped turn that tide of poverty away from my district, creating over 500 jobs, contributing $140 million in economic activity each year. But all of those benefits and more aren't just at risk if this bill doesn't pass. They are guaranteed to go away.

So please join us today and stop that from happening, and please support this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 759, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas Equal and Fair Opportunity Settlement Act.

As a Representative with more Tribes in my district than any other Texan, it is my solemn obligation to fight on behalf of Texas' native people.

I am a proud Texan, and there is no greater State in the Union, no prouder people than we Texans, and for all the blessings bestowed upon the Lone Star State, we still fall short in our efforts of providing true economic stability to our Native American Tribes.

The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo are the oldest community in the State of Texas claiming a governing body since 1682.

During the Texas Revolution, it was the Alabama-Coushatta of East Texas who provided refuge, food, and medicine to the great Sam Houston and his army. Their story is sewn into the fabric of Texas' history.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 759 is not about whether one agrees or disagrees with gambling. This bill isn't about gambling. It is about letting two Tribes in two of Texas' most economically distressed zones engage in what every other Tribe in America engages in. This bill would allow these two Tribes in Texas to do bingo.

That is it. Not blackjack. Not poker. Not craps. Just bingo.

For too long, the Alabama-Coushatta and the Tigua Tribes have been prevented from achieving self-sufficiency. It is time we right this wrong.

We will take today efforts to give the Alabama-Coushatta and Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribes a chance to embark on the American Dream. We will vote to lift their families out of poverty. We will vote to educate their youth, and we will vote to grow their economies. I am hoping my 432 colleagues say ''yes'' with their vote.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Texas, my friend, Dr. BABIN, and I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, Chairman GRIJALVA and others, because without them, this would not have happened.

Mr. Speaker, we still work in a bipartisan way here in Washington, D.C., and the fact that we are going to help these two Tribes support their community is an example of this today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, do not wish for my support of this measure to indicate or to be misconstrued as support for gaming.

My support of this measure has everything to do with what my colleague on the other side of the aisle has stated. This is about parity, and this is about the unique sovereignty that recognized Tribes have with the Federal Government through our own Constitution.

If we are going to be recognizing this unique sovereignty, we should do so equally among all the other Tribes. This equality is so necessary if we are going to maintain the credibility of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for my colleagues and all the work that they put into this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 759, 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.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 776) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 776

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 ''Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w–9(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2014, and'' and inserting ''2014,''; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: '', and $22,334,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 776.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, for 35 years, the Emergency Medical Services for Children, or EMSC, program has been the only Federal grant program specifically focused on addressing the needs of children in emergency medical systems.

If ever a parent or caregiver is required to call 911 to get emergency care for a child, they should know that the child will receive the medical care that they need.

The EMSC program helps provide this peace of mind by enhancing care for all children, no matter where they live, travel, or go to school.

The EMSC program invests in research, care delivery enhancements, data monitoring, innovation in both prehospital EMS settings as well as hospital emergency departments.

The program has led to real results and better care for children. For example, research funded by EMSC has led to a new pediatric head injury algorithm, which has led to a reduction in unnecessary radiation exposure from CT scans in children who have suffered head injuries.

Mental health and substance abuse screenings have been created to better assess children in emergency situations, and a full 50 percent of hospitals have adopted new guidelines to assist them in transferring children to appropriate facilities when specialized care is needed.

Any doctor, nurse, or EMS provider will tell you that we can't simply treat children as small adults. They need specialized treatment and protocols to ensure that the care they receive is appropriate and available to them when and where they need it. Passing this 5-year reauthorization of the EMSC program will continue to provide innovative and appropriate care to children.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 776, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I would like to thank Representatives PETER KING and KATHY CASTOR for their work on this important legislation.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children program was enacted in 1984 to provide grant funding to increase the ability of emergency medical systems to care for pediatric populations. Not only does this program provide funding so that emergency departments and hospitals can equip themselves with the appropriate pediatric medical tools, it enables partnerships and drives research and innovation in emergency care for children.

Whether children require emergency care following a car crash or fall ill in the middle of the night with nowhere else to turn, our emergency medical system needs to have staff trained in how to treat children. A major part of that is providing the resources to equip healthcare professionals with the right size medical tools.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children program provides grants for the State Partnership Program to integrate pediatric care into the EMS system and reduce pediatric morbidity and mortality. States can focus on providing quality prehospital and hospital-based care, in addition to establishing plans to handle disaster and trauma care.

Our Nation's healthcare workforce still has much to learn about the treatment of pediatric populations, which is why continued research through the Pediatric Emergency Care Applied Research Network is crucial. This body is the first federally funded pediatric emergency medicine research network in the country and conducts a wide variety of research about acute illness and injuries in children.

The reauthorization of the Emergency Medical Services for Children program is critical to maintaining and improving pediatric emergency care. Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of H.R. 776, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge support for this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 776, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act, sponsored by Representatives Peter King and Kathy Castor. This legislation reauthorizes grants that focus on addressing the unique needs of children in emergency medical systems, with the ultimate goal of reducing the prevalence of morbidity and mortality in children that may occur as a result of acute illness and severe injury. This is really critical legislation for parents and children in our communities—no one should have to know the pain of losing a child. I urge my fellow House members to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise in strong support of H.R. 776, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children Program (EMSC) reduces child and youth mortality and morbidity due to severe illness or injury by increasing awareness among health professionals, providers and planners, and the general public of the special needs of children receiving emergency medical care.

Specifically, the EMSC program has provided grants to all states since I 1985 for the State Partnership, Targeted Issues, State Partnership Regionalization of Care, and The Pediatric Emergency Care Applied Research Network.

Additionally, the EMSC program has been used to establish national resource centers and a pediatric emergency care research network.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of children are treated in community and rural emergency departments rather than specialized centers such as large children's hospitals.

As a result, pediatric visits make up less than 20 percent of cases at emergency departments, so they lack the quality of pediatric emergency care needed for established practice guidelines.

I support H.R. 776 because Congress has a responsibility to ensure that every child has access to necessary emergency medical services and that no child in our nation is left untreated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 776, the "Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 776.

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.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2507

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 "Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. IMPROVED NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOW-UP FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

(a) PURPOSES.—Section 1109(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "enhance, improve or" and inserting "facilitate, enhance, improve, or";

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

"(3) to develop, and deliver to parents, families, and patient advocacy and support groups, educational programs that—

"(A) address newborn screening counseling, testing (including newborn screening pilot studies), follow-up, treatment, specialty services, and long-term care;

"(B) assess the target audience's current knowledge, incorporate health communications strategies, and measure impact; and

''(C) are at appropriate literacy levels;''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''followup'' and inserting ''follow-up''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', including re-engaging patients who have not received recommended follow-up services and supports''.

(b) APPROVAL FACTORS.—Section 1109(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or will use'' and inserting ''will use''; and

(2) by inserting '', or will use amounts received under such grant to enhance capacity and infrastructure to facilitate the adoption of,'' before ''the guidelines and recommendations''.

SEC. 3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN.

Section 1111 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–10) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and adopt process improvements'' after ''take appropriate steps'';

(B) in paragraph (7) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) develop, maintain, and publish on a publicly accessible website consumer-friendly materials detailing—

''(A) the uniform screening panel nomination process, including data requirements, standards, and the use of international data in nomination submissions; and

''(B) the process for obtaining technical assistance for submitting nominations to the uniform screening panel and detailing the instances in which the provision of technical assistance would introduce a conflict of interest for members of the Advisory Committee; and'';

(E) in paragraph (9), as redesignated—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (K) and (L) as subparagraphs (L) and (M), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the appropriate and recommended use of safe and effective genetic testing by health care professionals in newborns and children with an initial diagnosis of a disease or condition characterized by a variety of genetic causes and manifestations;''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 4. CLEARINGHOUSE OF NEWBORN SCREENING INFORMATION.

Section 1112(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–11(c)) is amended by striking ''and supplement, not supplant, existing information sharing efforts'' and inserting ''and complement other Federal newborn screening information sharing activities''.

SEC. 5. LABORATORY QUALITY AND SURVEILLANCE.

Section 1113 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–12) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''performance evaluation services,'' and inserting ''development of new screening tests,''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''performance test materials'' and inserting ''test performance materials''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) performance evaluation services to enhance disease detection, including the development of tools, resources, and infrastructure to improve data analysis, test result interpretation, data harmonization, and dissemination of laboratory best practices.''; and

(2) in subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children established under section 1111, shall provide for the coordination of national surveillance activities, including—

''(1) standardizing data collection and reporting through the use of electronic and other forms of health records to achieve real-time data for tracking and monitoring the newborn screening system, from the initial positive screen through diagnosis and long-term care management; and

''(2) by promoting data sharing linkages between State newborn screening programs and State-based birth defects and developmental disabilities surveillance programs to help families connect with services to assist in evaluating long-term outcomes.''.

SEC. 6. HUNTER KELLY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 1116 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting '', or with a high probability of being recommended by,'' after ''recommended by''; and

(ii) by striking ''that screenings are ready for nationwide implementation'' and inserting ''that reliable newborn screening technologies are piloted and ready for use''; and

(2) in subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) FUNDING.—In carrying out the research program under this section, the Secretary and the Director shall ensure that entities receiving funding through the program will provide assurances, as practicable, that such entities will work in consultation with State departments of health, as appropriate.''.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 1117 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–16) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''$11,900,000'' and inserting ''$31,000,000'';

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(C) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''$8,000,000'' and inserting ''$29,650,000'';

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(C) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 8. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS; ETHICS GUIDANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12 of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 289 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 12. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS; ETHICS GUIDANCE PROGRAM.

''Research on nonidentified newborn dried blood spots shall be considered secondary research (as that term is defined in section 46.104(d)(4) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) with nonidentified biospecimens for purposes of federally funded research conducted pursuant to the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 200 et seq.).''.

SEC. 9. NAM REPORT ON THE MODERNIZATION OF NEWBORN SCREENING.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Medicine (in this section referred to as ''NAM'') (or if NAM declines to enter into such an agreement, another appropriate entity) under which NAM, or such other appropriate entity, agrees to conduct a study on the following:

(1) The uniform screening panel review and recommendation processes to identify factors that impact decisions to add new conditions to the uniform screening panel, to describe challenges posed by newly nominated conditions, including low-incidence diseases, late onset variants, and new treatments without long-term efficacy data.

(2) The barriers that preclude States from adding new uniform screening panel conditions to their State screening panels with recommendations on resources needed to help States implement uniform screening panel recommendations.

(3) The current state of federally and privately funded newborn screening research with recommendations for optimizing the capacity of this research, including piloting multiple prospective conditions at once and addressing rare disease questions.

(4) New and emerging technologies that would permit screening for new categories of disorders, or would make current screening more effective, more efficient, or less expensive.

(5) Technological and other infrastructure needs to improve timeliness of diagnosis and short- and long-term follow-up for infants identified through newborn screening and improve public health surveillance.

(6) Current and future communication and educational needs for priority stakeholders and the public to promote understanding and knowledge of a modernized newborn screening system with an emphasis on evolving communication channels and messaging.

(7) The extent to which newborn screening yields better data on the disease prevalence for screened conditions and improves long-term outcomes for those identified through newborn screening, including existing systems supporting such data collection and recommendations for systems that would allow for improved data collection.

(8) The impact on newborn morbidity and mortality in States that adopt newborn screening tests included on the uniform panel.

(b) PUBLIC STAKEHOLDER MEETING.—In the course of completing the study described in subsection (a), NAM or such other appropriate entity shall hold not less than one public meeting to obtain stakeholder input on the topics of such study.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the agreement under subsection (a), such agreement shall require NAM, or such other appropriate entity, to submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the appropriate committees of jurisdiction of Congress a report containing—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a);

(2) recommendations to modernize the processes described in subsection (a)(1); and

(3) recommendations for such legislative and administrative action as NAM, or such other appropriate entity, determines appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated

$2,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2507.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, every year over 12,000 newborns are born with conditions that require early detection and treatment. With proper screening, parents can receive education and children can receive appropriate follow-up and treatment and, ultimately, better long-term health outcomes.

Over the years, as more screening tests and treatments have become available as we have expanded our medical and scientific knowledge, we have also seen greater potential for improving outcomes for children.

However, prior to Congress passing the first Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act in 2008, a patchwork of State requirements for screening led to some newborns screened for many disorders and others for very few.

Since the Newborn Screening law was enacted, we have seen tremendous progress around the country, with all 50 States screening for at least 29 recommended conditions. But as we develop new screening tests and treatments for diseases once thought untreatable, we must ensure that States are able to adopt recommended screening tests more quickly.

The bill we are considering today will do that by reauthorizing the program for 5 years, with higher authorization levels, improved processes and pilot testing for new screening tests, and a study focused on how we can better modernize newborn screening for the future.

This bipartisan bill will bring us closer to the goal of every child born in the United States receiving all recommended screening tests and will improve countless lives of the youngest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support it and ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing it today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2507, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Newborn screening is critical in early detection and intervention for conditions, some life-threatening, for our Nation's infants. These screenings inform both physicians and the families of a newborn what steps may be necessary to treat or prevent further health complications as the infant ages.

The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, which passed for the first time in 2008, aims to improve the ability to address pediatric health by standardizing newborn screening programs.

□ 2200

Newborn screenings are incredibly important in providing physicians and families with information regarding their baby's health, enabling them to practice early intervention and treatment, if necessary.

According to the March of Dimes, in 2017, only 10 States and Washington, D.C., required infant screening for the recommended disorders.

Since enactment of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, all the States, D.C., and Puerto Rico screen for at least 29 of the 35 recommended conditions.

This bill would reauthorize funding for the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health to ensure that our newborn screening remains comprehensive and that our Nation's healthcare providers are adequately equipped to conduct the screenings.

Newborn screenings are for serious but rare conditions that families and doctors may otherwise be unable to detect at birth.

Newborns are screened in the hospital when they are 1 or 2 days old by blood tests, in addition to hearing and heart screenings. About 1 in 300 newborns has a condition that can be detected via newborn screening.

By catching these disorders early, many can be managed successfully, allowing children to live fuller, better lives. However, if not detected and left untreated, these conditions can impact a child for the rest of their life by causing disabilities, delays in development, illness, or even death.

Prior to the passage of the initial bill in 2008, States had varying standards for newborn screening. Some States were only screening for 4 conditions in 2002, when other States were screening for more than 30.

Reauthorizing the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act will allow the CDC to work with States to continue to level the playing field and provide for equal access to newborn screenings across the country.

H.R. 2507 also reauthorizes grants through the Health Resources and Services Administration that not only allows for expansion of screening programs but improved follow-up care after a detection.

The bill also allows for the continuation of the National Institutes of Health Hunter Kelly Newborn Screening program, which helps to identify new treatments for conditions detected in newborn screenings.

I applaud Representatives ROYBAL-ALLARD and SIMPSON for their work on this bill, and I urge my fellow Members to support H.R. 2507.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the chairwoman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support reauthorization of my Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, which I first introduced in 2002.

Let me begin by extending my sincere gratitude to Congressman MIKE SIMPSON for our 15-year partnership championing newborn screening. Many thanks to Congresswomen KATHERINE CLARK and JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER who, this year, joined us as House champions. And my heartfelt appreciation to the coalition of public health groups, who continue to support my newborn screening efforts, especially the March of Dimes and the APHL.

Newborn screening involves a baby receiving a simple blood test to identify life-threatening diseases before symptoms begin. Prior to the first newborn screening test being developed, these children would have died or suffered lifelong disabilities.

And, until enactment of my original newborn screening bill in 2008, newborn screenings and access to follow-up information were not consistent and available to families in all communities. At that time, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on the diseases.

Today, 49 States and D.C. require screening of at least 31 of the 35 core treatable conditions, and a national clearinghouse of newborn screening information is available for parents and professionals.

Rapid identification and treatment make the difference between health and disability—or even life and death—for the approximately 12,000 babies who, each year, test positive for one of these serious conditions.

In addition, this simple test saves our healthcare system millions of dollars in care for each child who is identified and treated early.

This truly public health success story exemplifies what can be accomplished when private and public institutions, industry, advocates, scientists, providers, and parents partner to ensure a healthier future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, to maintain and advance the incredible progress that we have made over the last decade, we must reauthorize the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act.

Passing H.R. 2507 will ensure the advisory committee continues its critical

work of recommending new screenings to State programs. It will guarantee access to the most current follow-up programs and educational materials for parents and providers, as well as high-quality technical assistance for State programs and public health labs.

Reauthorization will also commission a National Academies of Sciences study to make recommendations for a 21st century newborn screening system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the passage of H.R. 2507 to ensure all our newborns receive the comprehensive and consistent testing and follow up that they will need for a healthy and productive life.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I would ask my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to support this legislation. I thank the sponsor, the chairwoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of both the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2507, the ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2019.''

The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act would yield major improvements in both the screening and follow up processes involved in the testing of infants for heritable diseases and conditions.

In the United States, more than 4,000,000 infants and children are screened every year, and up to 4,000 of the children test positive for one or more disease or disorder.

Mr. Speaker, 4,000 conditions detected are 4,000 young lives saved, as many of the diseases on the uniform screening panel, the list of conditions that newborns are tested for, are very treatable but can be deadly if left unaddressed.

However, there is an ever-present need to continue adapting the panel of conditions that newborns and young children are tested for, as improvements in technology allow medical professionals to identify new diseases, sooner.

Mr. Speaker, children and their families should have access to state of the art testing, and treatments.

H.R. 2507 specifically improves the current Newborn Screening Act in several ways, including:

Creating new educational strategies and practices regarding the screening and follow-up treatments for heritable diseases and conditions;

Creating an advisory committee for heritable diseases in newborns and children;

Creating a Clearinghouse of newborn screening information;

Improving laboratory quality and surveillance, which includes implementing new tools, resources and infrastructure, to improve data analysis, interpretation and lab practices;

Increasing funding for the Hunter Kelly Institute; and

Authorizing $2 million in Appropriations to the National Academy of Medicine, to fund studies dedicated to further improving the practice and procedure of the Uniform Screening Panel.

The screening of children has already been proven to be effective, and improvements and additions to the panel of diseases that are tested for can only result in more lives being saved.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 2507, the ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2019.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2507, 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.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's designation, pursuant to clause 7(a)(1) of rule XV, of H.R. 693 as the measure on the Consensus Calendar to be considered this week.

U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS MEMORIAL PREVENT ALL SORING TACTICS ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 693) to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the 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. 693

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 ''U.S. Senator Joseph D. Tydings Memorial Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2019'' or the ''PAST Act''.

SEC. 2. INCREASED ENFORCEMENT UNDER HORSE PROTECTION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(1)(A) The term 'action device' means any boot, collar, chain, roller, or other device that encircles or is placed upon the lower extremity of the leg of a horse in such a manner that it can—

''(i) rotate around the leg or slide up and down the leg, so as to cause friction; or

''(ii) strike the hoof, coronet band, fetlock joint, or pastern of the horse.

''(B) Such term does not include soft rubber or soft leather bell boots or quarter boots that are used as protective devices.''; and

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

''(6)(A) The term 'participate' means engaging in any activity with respect to a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction, including—

''(i) transporting or arranging for the transportation of a horse to or from a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction;

''(ii) personally giving instructions to an exhibitor; or

''(iii) being knowingly present in a warm-up area, inspection area, or other area at a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction that spectators are not permitted to enter.

''(B) Such term does not include spectating.''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Section 3 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1822) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting ''and soring horses for such purposes'' after ''horses in intrastate commerce''; and

(B) by inserting ''in many ways, including by creating unfair competition, by deceiving the spectating public and horse buyers, and by negatively impacting horse sales'' before the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(6) the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture has determined that the program through which the Secretary inspects horses is inadequate for preventing soring;

''(7) historically, Tennessee Walking Horses, Racking Horses, and Spotted Saddle Horses have been subjected to soring; and

''(8) despite regulations in effect related to inspection for purposes of ensuring that horses are not sore, violations of this Act continue to be prevalent in the Tennessee Walking Horse, Racking Horse, and Spotted Saddle Horse breeds.''.

(c) HORSE SHOWS AND EXHIBITIONS.—Section 4 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1823) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''appointed'' and inserting ''licensed''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''In the first instance in which the Secretary determines that a horse is sore, the Secretary shall disqualify the horse from being shown or exhibited for a period of not less than 180 days. In the second instance in which the Secretary determines that such horse is sore, the Secretary shall disqualify the horse for a period of not less than one year. In the third instance in which the Secretary determines that such horse is sore, the Secretary shall disqualify the horse for a period of not less than three years.'';

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''appointed'' and inserting ''licensed'';

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(c)(1)(A) The Secretary shall prescribe by regulation requirements for the Department of Agriculture to license, train, assign, and oversee persons qualified to detect and diagnose a horse which is sore or to otherwise inspect horses at horse shows, horse exhibitions, or horse sales or auctions, for hire by the management of such events, for the purposes of enforcing this Act.

''(B) No person shall be issued a license under this subsection unless such person is free from conflicts of interest, as defined by the Secretary in the regulations issued under subparagraph (A).

''(C) If the Secretary determines that the performance of a person licensed in accordance with subparagraph (A) is unsatisfactory, the Secretary may, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, revoke the license issued to such person.

''(D) In issuing licenses under this subsection, the Secretary shall give a preference to persons who are licensed or accredited veterinarians.

''(E) Licensure of a person in accordance with the requirements prescribed under this

subsection shall not be construed as authorizing such person to conduct inspections in a manner other than that prescribed for inspections by the Secretary (or the Secretary's representative) under subsection (e).

''(2)(A) Not later than 30 days before the date on which a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction begins, the management of such show, exhibition, or sale or auction may notify the Secretary of the intent of the management to hire a person or persons licensed under this subsection and assigned by the Secretary to conduct inspections at such show, exhibition, or sale or auction.

''(B) After such notification, the Secretary shall assign a person or persons licensed under this subsection to conduct inspections at the horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction.

''(3) A person licensed by the Secretary to conduct inspections under this subsection shall issue a citation with respect to any violation of this Act recorded during an inspection and notify the Secretary of each such violation not later than five days after the date on which a citation was issued with respect to such violation.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) The Secretary shall publish on the public website of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture, and update as frequently as the Secretary determines is necessary, information on violations of this Act for the purposes of allowing the management of a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction to determine if an individual is in violation of this Act.''.

(d) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Section 5 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1824) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''or (C) respecting'' and inserting ''(C), or (D) respecting''; and

(B) by striking ''and (D)'' and inserting ''(D) causing a horse to become sore or directing another person to cause a horse to become sore for the purpose of showing, exhibiting, selling, auctioning, or offering for sale the horse in any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction; and (E)'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''appoint'' and inserting ''hire'';

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''appoint'' and inserting ''hire''; and

(B) by striking ''qualified'';

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking ''appointed'' and inserting ''hired'';

(5) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''appointed'' and inserting ''hired''; and

(B) by inserting ''that the horse is sore'' after ''the Secretary''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(12) The use of an action device on any limb of a Tennessee Walking Horse, a Racking Horse, or a Spotted Saddle Horse at a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction.

''(13) The use of a weighted shoe, pad, wedge, hoof band, or other device or material at a horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction that—

''(A) is placed on, inserted in, or attached to any limb of a Tennessee Walking Horse, a Racking Horse, or a Spotted Saddle Horse;

''(B) is constructed to artificially alter the gait of such a horse; and

''(C) is not strictly protective or therapeutic in nature.''.

(e) VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES.—Section 6 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1825) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, any person who knowingly violates section 5'' and inserting ''Any person who knowingly violates section 5 or the regulations issued under such section, including any violation recorded during an inspection conducted in accordance with section 4(c) or 4(e)''; and

(ii) by striking ''more than $3,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.'' and inserting ''more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than three years, or both, for each such violation.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking ''(2)''; and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, and moving the margins of such paragraphs (as so redesignated) two ems to the left; and

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

''(4) Any person who knowingly fails to obey an order of disqualification shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 for each failure to obey such an order, imprisoned for not more than three years, or both.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''section 5 of this Act'' and inserting ''section 5 or the regulations issued under such section''; and

(ii) by striking ''$2,000'' and inserting ''$4,000''; and

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

''(5) Any person who fails to pay a licensed inspector hired under section 4(c) shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $4,000 for each such violation.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting '', or otherwise participating in any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction'' before ''for a period of not less than one year''; and

(ii) by striking ''any subsequent'' and inserting ''the second'';

(B) by inserting before ''Any person who knowingly fails'' the following: ''For the third or any subsequent violation, a person may be permanently disqualified by order of the Secretary, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing before the Secretary, from showing or exhibiting any horse, judging or managing any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction, or otherwise participating in, including financing the participation of other individuals in, any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction (regardless of whether walking horses are shown, exhibited, sold, auctioned, or offered for sale at the horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction).''; and

(C) by striking ''$3,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$5,000''.

(f) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section, including regulations prescribing the requirements under subsection (c) of section 4 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1823(c)), as amended by subsection (c)(3).

(g) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 693.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lead H.R. 693, the U.S. Senator Joseph D. Tydings Memorial Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, with my colleague, good friend, and fellow veterinarian, Congressman TED YOHO.

The PAST Act would finally end the incredibly abusive practice of horse soring. Soring is the act of deliberately causing pain on a horse's legs or hooves to artificially exaggerate the horse's normal gait. The gait is called the ''big lick.''

Horses can, and are, trained to do this naturally, but, unfortunately, a cottage industry has been built up around this abusive soring practice.

Soring is most commonly done to Tennessee Walking Horse, Racking Horse, and Spotted Saddle Horse breeds.

Soring can be done by applying caustic chemicals to a horse's lower leg—imagine that—trimming their hooves unnaturally, applying weighted shoes to the horse's hooves, and wrapping ''action devices'' like heavy chains around a horse's hooves.

The Horse Protection Act of 1970 outlawed chemical soring, supposedly, which causes burning and blistering to horses' legs, and soring caused by—actually, they used to inject nails, tacks, and chemical agents into the limb of the horse.

It did not include the action devices, however, or the stacked shoes which are also common in today's soring techniques.

We have a photo, I think, that shows very clearly what this is like. The photo actually shows—which we would like to get up here at some point in time, if that is remotely possible—that it is actually a package.

What they do is use plastic pads and wedges stacked on one another, actually nailed together, and then attached to the bottom of the hoof.

The package elevates the horse's front feet and adds weight and pressure, causing the horse's foot to strike at a very unusual and painful angle.

The chains are wrapped over the horse's chemically sored and raw front pastern, increasing the pain felt by the horse and further exaggerating that big lick, pain-induced gait, which again, as I said before, is not necessary. Horses will move with that action under their own volition when properly trained by an actual trainer.

Our bill will make it illegal to use these and other similar devices in the show ring, and horses would only be allowed to show with a normal horseshoe.

There is the photo I was alluding to earlier.

Some people may argue that these action devices are not harmful for horses, but the experts at the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, and the United States Equine Federation all say that pressure from these items contained in this package produce pain in the hoof and in the leg, that the horse lifts its feet higher and faster in an exaggerated gait beyond what they are naturally able to do.

All of these organizations support a ban on action devices and packages to protect the health and welfare of the horse.

As a veterinarian with over 30 years' experience, I agree with them. I agree with the AVMA that it is indisputable that soring causes horses an unnecessary and unacceptable level of pain. These horses—it is horrible when you see them, you see what is going on in the legs of these horses.

They used to actually use soldering irons sometimes to blister the horses' legs so that they would react to these chains in an exaggerated manner. I saw that.

In addition to outlawing action devices and stacked shoes, the PAST Act will also end the unsuccessful system of industry self-policing that we tried for almost 40 years.

The USDA has let it run, and, unfortunately, it has been completely ineffective. Our bill will require the USDA to create a process to train, license, assign, and oversee impartial inspectors—hopefully veterinarians, among others—who can detect and diagnose horses that have been sored.

It will also require the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to publicly publish information on sorers so that the folks managing the horse shows, competitions, and sales know who has broken the law and abused their horses.

Soring has been illegal since 1970, yet here we are 50 years later, and soring is still taking place. Self-policing has not worked.

There is a clear and demonstrable need for this bill. To oppose this action is a disservice to the people who really work hard and train and show horses the right way, without abusing them.

That is who we should be focused on right now—not the abusers but the animals, these equine athletes that we love and revere so much.

Our bill is supported by the American Veterinary Medical Association; the American Horse Council; American Association of Equine Practitioners; National Sheriffs' Association; Kentucky-based United States Equestrian Federation; the All American Walking Horse Alliance; Animal Wellness Action; Humane Society; veterinary medical associations from all 50 States; and many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Horse Council.

AMERICAN HORSE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2019.

Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TED YOHO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES SCHRADER AND YOHO: The American Horse Council (AHC) congratulates you for your leadership and hard work to position the Sen. Joseph Tydings Memorial Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act (H.R. 693) for a vote on the House floor prior to adjourning for the August recess. With more than 300 cosponsors on your bill, we look forward to a resounding and long-awaited legislative victory for equine welfare.

As you know, the PAST Act outlines a commonsense solution to prevent the continued practice of taking action on a horse's limb to produce an accentuated gait during competition. The scope of the bill is limited. It lays out a specific framework that focuses enforcement efforts on three horse breeds—the Tennessee Walking Horses, Spotted Saddle Horses, and Racking Horses—that continue to be the target of soring practices. The treatment of these select breeds stands in stark contrast to the dramatic decline in the overall mistreatment of horses that has occurred since enactment of the HPA during the 1970s. AHC, along with most major national horse show organizations and state and local organizations, supports the PAST Act. Also, AHC members have sent hundreds ofletters to your House colleagues this year supporting H.R. 693.

Thank you very much for all the efforts you're making to push this important bill across the finish line. If you'd like more information related to the PAST Act, feel free to contact me.

Regards,

JULIE M. BROADWAY, CAE,
President, AHC.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, the PAST Act will strengthen existing law to ensure that horse soring becomes a thing of the past.

It is a commonsense bill and widely supported. I am proud to have 307 of my colleagues as cosponsors on this bill, especially the original cosponsors, the long-time champions of this bill: Dr. TED YOHO, Congressman COHEN of Tennessee, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, Congressman ESTES, and Congressman COLLINS.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the PAST Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2215

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 693, the PAST Act. In a bipartisan fashion, this bill takes a step forward to protect horses from abuse and make the practice of ''soring'' something of the past.

As with many other professions, I know the vast majority of breeders and trainers care deeply about their horses and their businesses.

As someone who has been a practicing pharmacist for over 30 years, I can tell you that there is nothing more offensive than people in your profession who don't follow the rules. That is why it is so important to address the small number of bad actors and ensure that the men and women who follow the rules have the ability to operate in a profession they care so deeply about.

Although the practice of soring is already banned and the industry takes action to police itself, there are still examples of this occurring in the United States.

Additionally, loopholes in Federal law often disallowed the United States Department of Agriculture from taking action against those individuals who are soring their horses. That is why this bill is so important.

H.R. 639 amends the 1976 Horse Protection Act to make important changes in enforcement and to address any criteria that could lead to soring.

In addition to the technical provisions laid out in this bill, it is an example of the work that can be accomplished when both sides of the aisle work together.

While I would have preferred we address this in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we are here because of the widespread support for this legislation, which has 307 cosponsors. Simply put, we are here because we want to improve the support and strengthen it, not weaken it.

It is my hope that we can continue to work on these and other issues together to ensure a better industry for all of those involved.

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the best committee in the House.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon, particularly for saying we are the best committee in the House.

I rise in support of his bill, H.R. 693, the PAST Act.

I want to start by thanking Representatives SCHRADER and YOHO for their work over the past several years on this important bill that will finally put an end to the cruel practice of soring Tennessee Walking Horses, Spotted Saddle Horses, and Racking Horses.

This incredibly painful practice has been illegal in the United States for

nearly 50 years, since Congress passed the Horse Protection Act of 1970. But despite the Federal ban, soring continues to run rampant in some segments of the walking horse industry.

The bill would amend the Horse Protection Act and finally put an end to the abhorrent practice for good. The bill bans the use at horse shows of chains, weighted shoes, and other devices that are commonly used to sore horses.

It also puts an end to the failed system of industry self-policing by giving the USDA authority to train and license independent inspectors at horse shows. The legislation also strengthens penalties on those who violate the law.

This bill has received endorsements from hundreds of equine and veterinary organizations, including more than 60 State and national horse groups, and all 50 State veterinary medical associations.

So, again, I thank Representative SCHRADER for his continued leadership. It is time that Congress pass this legislation and put an end to soring once and for all.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a veterinarian, who has worked on this bill tirelessly and has done a yeoman's job at getting it to this point here.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues. I would like to thank Dr. SCHRADER, and the leadership of the House to bring this bill up.

I am here today for two reasons: One, we shouldn't even be here to have to run this through this body and take up valuable time, legislative time, that we could be talking about our debt, border, those kinds of things, but we are here.

First, it saddens me that we have to pass a bill to stiffen fines and penalties to keep people from doing the despicable act of intentionally soring a horse's forelegs. And this is done through chemical means or mechanical devices to artificially—understand this—artificially accentuate the gait of the Tennessee Walking, Racking, or Saddle Horse.

Dr. SCHRADER and I are both equine vets, the only ones in the House. We know this. We have seen this. We have dealt with this.

As Dr. SCHRADER brought up, the Horse Protection Act was passed in 1970 to stop this. It was passed to stop this. That industry has had 49 years to bring this to an end, and they wanted to self-police. They have had 49 years to self-police, and they have not brought this to an end.

I have got a shoe here that the gentleman had a picture of. This is a built-up shoe that we use on horses. I could drop it on the table, but I don't want to get the bill to fix it. This weighs about 10 pounds. This is one foot, on the front of a leg.

Then they put these devices on there. After they put the chemical irritant on the leg to irritate it, then they put this on there. And you know why they do that? So they can win a blue ribbon. So that they can win a blue ribbon and take it and say, Look what we have accomplished.

It makes me sick that we have to spend the time to do this stuff.

Secondly, it saddens me. We are talking about preserving a terrible practice of animal abuse. And I see it very clearly. You are either supportive of animal abuse or you are against it. That is the bottom line here.

Congress shouldn't have to do this; but, again, that industry has had 49 years. I had one of the trainers come in my office with an owner, for an hour and a half, to try to tell me not to support this bill. He showed me these weights and he looked at my watch. He goes: Congressman, that watch probably weighs about the same in relationship, body weight, as what you are wearing.

I said, You know what? You are probably absolutely right. But there is a huge difference.

And he goes, What is that?

I said, I choose to put this watch on. That horse has no option.

This bill is a good bill to get rid of a practice that is archaic and shouldn't be done. And it won't hurt this industry. It will make this industry stronger.

And anybody that says this is going to kill the Tennessee Walking Horse industry is equivalent to the guy in the late 1800s that said, Those automobiles are bad; if you go over 30 miles an hour, you are going to die.

We know that was a fallacy. Their argument is a fallacy.

Every one of these agencies that he mentioned, the AVMA, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, every veterinary college in the United States of America, 98 percent of the farrier associations are for this bill. They are against the opposition to this bill, and I stand with this.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the other gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and for his tireless efforts on this with Mr. YOHO. I have watched as the gentleman has battled this for years. I have worked with him to get cosponsorships.

We have had the Animal Protection Caucus having sessions, bringing staff members, having demonstrations of this horrific practice.

This is the ninth year that this has been before us. Now, I am pleased that we are here. I am pleased that we are making the case. I am pleased that, tonight, we are going to pass this legislation, although I wish it weren't at 10:30 at night for a few minutes; because there is no guarantee that, even with this case, with the momentum, that we are going to be able to get it through the Senate, where we have seen objection in the past.

I hope that this legislation occasions a little bit of soul-searching. The animal protection agenda of this Congress is one of the areas that brings people together, like my two veterinarian friends have shown bipartisan cooperation dealing with the facts, mustering support, being far more patient than I would have.

I mean, the last two Congresses, we had 280 cosponsors. We couldn't even get a hearing, let alone get it on the floor. That is outrageous.

Now, there is a little bit of political blowback. Some people who are part of that aren't here anymore. I hope that there are some lessons, both in terms of the politics and the basic decency for protection of animal welfare.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia, I wish it went through regular order. I wish that we had an opportunity in committees of jurisdiction to give a little bit of the time that is merited to be able to give the public a view of what is going on; the bureaucracy that, for 49 years, has been unable to take the self-policing mechanism and be able to make it work.

I hope that this is the first of a series of items. I plan on talking to our leadership, and I hope we will have leadership on the other side of the aisle who, in the past have held off, despite overwhelming support, to the frustration, I know, of one of the principal sponsors.

I hope that we understand that this is something that shouldn't be dealt with in a partisan fashion, and there shouldn't be jurisdictional battles. People ought to be able to take fundamental animal welfare issues and bring them forward on the merits, have the debate, and get them enacted. It will make people in this body feel better, because for a number of days, I think, people don't feel so good watching what happens around here, and we don't have much to show for our efforts.

So I want to commend my colleagues for their patience and their perseverance.

VERN BUCHANAN, my co-chair of the Animal Protection Caucus, has been writing op-eds with me and working on this, so it's a culmination of a lot of work.

But I hope it is a first step toward dealing with an area that is supported by the American public. It is important work. It is not particularly controversial, except for a few special interests who, frankly, don't have a leg to stand on, even though they didn't have one of those things on their legs.

I hope that we can use this as an opportunity to make more progress in a bipartisan way to solve problems, not just for animal welfare, but other areas that the American people would like us to add.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 693, the PAST Act.

The only thing good about the PAST Act is the name, because it is reflective of just that, the past.

I have been listening to my colleagues, and I don't think they have been spending time where I have, in the inspection barns over the last six-plus years, where I see people who love their animals, take care of them, and treat them like family.

What I have seen is inspectors that were abusing the process, not self-policers, people sent by the USDA. And these people are being disqualified, not being able to perform, and then not subsequently being cited or penalized after the fact.

Now, the last couple of years there has been an improvement. And today, the Tennessee Walking Horse has over 96 percent compliance rate, according to the USDA's own numbers.

The only problem with the Tennessee Walking Horse today is that the current inspection methods are subjective. The PAST Act does nothing to change this.

What is even more concerning is the PAST Act would increase fines and penalties, including up to 3 years in prison, while still utilizing subjective inspection methods.

I have a bill, H.R. 1157, that numerous groups, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, believe is a better course of action, as it would require all inspections be objective and science-based.

As a medical professional, I realize the importance of utilizing science to identify medical conditions. USDA realizes this problem and has sought to address it by partnering with the National Academy of Sciences to determine the best objective, science-based methods to inspect the Tennessee Walking Horse.

I strongly believe that all legislation should be held off until this study reaches its conclusion next May.

This legislation is a product of animal welfare groups spreading misinformation on the status of the Tennessee Walking Horse industry, again, living in the past. I fear that, to this point, some Members have been fed one side of the story from powerful interest groups like the Humane Society or PETA who, in advocating for their position, neglect the fact that numerous veterinarians, equine experts, and agricultural groups, including the Tennessee and Kentucky Farm Bureaus, have come out in strong opposition to the PAST Act.

□ 2230

An example of the biased presentation of this bill is the misguided scrutiny of action devices that are highlighted in the PAST Act.

The claims put forth by special interests behind this bill that action devices are cruel or inhumane rest on very little academic evidence. In fact, to the contrary, a 2018 study by the American Veterinary Medical Association, the scientific authority on animal welfare issues, found that the application of stacked wedges and action devices to the forefeet of horses evoke no acute or subacute stress to the horse.

I heard my colleague and good friend Dr. YOHO talk about his wristwatch. Most of you in here are wearing wristwatches, or some of you may just use your smartphones now, but you wear those all day, and that doesn't hurt you. If there is a soring agent applied, then, yes, that is going to cause problems. Action devices are pieces of equipment no different than a saddle or a bridle or a bit.

This is a slippery slope, folks. What will these groups seek to ban next? Saddles, maybe riding horses at all.

Like my colleagues, I feel strong that animal abusers should be identified and punished; however, the PAST Act will not accomplish this goal. These horses are already incredibly regulated, more so than any other horse, including those in rodeo, those that race, and those that do jumping and dressage.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. No other horses are subjected to taxpayer-funded inspections, and these owners are already incredibly compliant. Furthermore, it is not true when groups suggest there is no additional cost to taxpayers. The CBO has scored this legislation at $2 million per year.

The PAST Act purports itself to be an innocent bill that would provide stricter enforcement of standards in protecting horses. The fact of the matter is that it is a Federal overreach into an issue in which compliance is higher than any other USDA-regulated industry, including the food industry.

I strongly urge my colleagues to carefully consider the consequences of this bill before casting their votes. It should go back to committee and be transparent.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee coming down and talking on this, and obviously he is from Tennessee and has an interest, maybe a slightly special interest in talking about the industry from his perspective.

And if, indeed, most of the industry is complying, then he shouldn't object to this bill. This bill just makes sure that the bad actors that the gentleman from Georgia referenced in his opening remarks are, frankly, taken care of and they can, therefore, not compete unfairly against the other 90 percent that are doing the right thing.

I will show you a picture here. I don't know if it shows up, but look at all the nails in here. Look at all this stuff. Congressman YOHO and I in our previous lives treated a lot of horses, would see a lot of limb problems, would see a lot of coffin bone problems in their feet.

This sort of thing almost guarantees a horse is going to prematurely get arthritic, end its athletic career, and have serious problems. It is completely unnecessary and unfair.

The Veterinary Medical Association states unequivocally, along with the American Association of Equine Practitioners, who are the medical experts—not the Farm Bureau from Kentucky or Tennessee; these are the medical experts—say that pads and chains cause harm to the horses.

I believe the veterinary experts. There is no doubt.

I would certainly hope that folks here would go with the body of evidence, the folks who care about the horses passionately, deeply, have worked on them for their entire professional career. Let's be fair about this, and let's make sure there is no unfair competition.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE).

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today I rise in opposition to H.R. 693, the PAST Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Kentucky and Tennessee Farm Bureau Federations opposing the PAST Act.

KENTUCKY FARM BUREAU,
July 23, 2019.

Hon. MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Please accept this letter as a statement of opposition to H.R. 693, the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act by the Kentucky Farm Bureau and Tennessee Farm Bureau.

The PAST Act is misleading in its strategies and purpose and sets a dangerous precedent for animal agriculture. Please take the time to review it closely and understand this initiative and the agenda of the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). While the PAST Act expressly targets Walking Horses, this push by the HSUS brings to question which segment of animal-based agriculture will be targeted next.

Supporters of the PAST Act argue the bill will ''eliminate soring'' within the Walking Horse Industry. However, soring is essentially nonexistent today. The bill professes to end soring by banning hoof pads and action devices which are used in Walking Horse performance shows, and implies such items cause soring. Hoof pads and action devices do not cause soring. Hoof pads are used to provide protection from ground force, to accentuate movement, and balance motion. These pads are used in many breeds other than the Walking Horse including the American Paint Horse, American Quarter Horse, American Saddlebred, and Morgan breeds. An action device is a band/chain weighing six (6) ounces or less. We are not aware of a study that indicates action devices or pads produce pain or cause tissue damage.

The Tennessee Walking Horse is the most inspected horse in the world. The industry and its shows maintain a compliance rate with the Horse Protection Act that averages 92–95%. This rate is significant considering the inspection process today is almost 100% subjective.

The PAST Act eliminates the organizations established by Congress in the original

Horse Protection Act called Horse Industry Organizations (HIOs). These independent organizations provide inspectors for shows and are trained and certified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Without HIOs, the PAST Act requires an increase in the USDA's workforce as well as additional employees for the U.S. Department of Justice. The Congressional Budget Office numbers reflect this cost.

We urge you to not accept the mistreatment claims from years past as true today. Visit a Walking Horse farm and see the horses. Visit with a horse owner, trainer, farrier and their veterinarians. Contact your state Farm Bureau, the Tennessee Farm Bureau or the Kentucky Farm Bureau if you want assistance arranging a visit or tour.

We urge you to oppose H.R. 693.

Thank you for your consideration of this information.

Sincerely,

JEFF AIKEN,
President, Tennessee Farm Bureau.

MARK HANEY,
President, Kentucky Farm Bureau.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as an eighth-generation farmer and Tennessean, the grand tradition of Tennessee Walking Horses is among my earliest and fondest memories. We take great pride in the Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration, drawing neighbors and tourists alike to Shelbyville, Tennessee, every year for our world-class showcase.

However, this grand tradition is not unmarred by a few bad actors looking to gain at the expense of innocent exhibitors. Soring has been investigated and debated, and both Congress and industry leaders have put forth their best efforts to end this horrible practice.

Tennessee Walking Horses are regal and strong, but the ones that suffer from soring are harmed in ways that are cruel and unjust. The bad actors who are soring compromise fair competition and the integrity of this great tradition, but most importantly, they endanger our prized Tennessee Walking Horses.

I can assure you we in Tennessee stand against this vile practice. My strong opposition to soring is why I rise today in opposition to the PAST Act. It is my belief that this bill is not the best solution to this cruel practice.

While I appreciate the sincere motives of those who support this bill, I call on my colleagues to consider another, better solution. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1157, the Horse Protection Amendments Act, authored by my colleague from Tennessee, Congressman DESJARLAIS. This bill works to end soring in a way that is fair to those acting properly and humanely and provides timely consequences for those who are not.

Inspections must be objective, but the PAST Act does not correct the current subjective process that is used. My colleagues' bill, H.R. 1157, creates a framework for consistent, scientific, and objective inspections.

H.R. 693 does not solve the real issue here: soring. Industrywide, the current compliance rate is between 92 and 95 percent. In fact, Tennessee's celebration had a compliance rate of 96 percent last year. These compliance rates are based on the USDA standards.

As the Farm Bureau has pointed out, the Tennessee Walking Horse is the most inspected horse in the world. Overall, the industry has a USDA compliance rate higher than even the food industry. With that, the rate of catching bad actors at this point is, of course, extremely low.

These low rates mean we must be vigilant if we are going to find and stop bad actors. Vigilance will require a new system. The PAST Act does not create a scientific, objective process for inspections, and until we have that, the remaining bad actors will continue to go under the radar, while those acting with integrity could be treated unfairly.

It is because of these concerns that I will oppose the PAST Act today. I call on my colleagues to oppose the PAST Act and, instead, stand with me in truly stopping soring by supporting H.R. 1157.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out for those who are listening that the bill referenced by the gentleman from Tennessee is another self-policing bill where you have, frankly, the industry and the horse people from those States selecting and designating these people for inspection. And contrary to some of the remarks, the PAST Act has science behind it, licensed, trained professionals—again, probably veterinarians, for the most part—who are going to be the ones who are going to be looking at this.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding the time.

The information you just heard there is a lot of fallacy in that. He makes it sound like the Farm Bureau is behind this. The Farm Bureau is not behind it, other than in Tennessee and in Kentucky.

I have got a list here of the infractions, and 90 percent of them are from Tennessee; a couple from Kentucky, a couple from North Carolina, but the majority are from Tennessee.

This bill, we sat down specifically with the USDA, APHIS, the regulating body of the USDA on animal cruelty, and we made sure, being a practicing veterinarian, that the owner was protected and that the trainer was protected from an overzealous USDA inspector. They have to be certified and trained, and they have to be licensed. And we added the objective testing.

We use thermography. We use radiology. We do swabs of the skin. In fact, we use the same technology that our Department of Homeland Security uses to pick up traces of explosives and things like that. That is how in-depth we went. But we also made sure the safeguards were there for the owner and for the trainer.

This bill should not have to—he talked about this is something in the past. Well, if it was in the past, we wouldn't do it.

And he brought up the expense of this bill. So we are saying it is okay, if it is too expensive, we can't do this. We can sore the horses because it is too expensive. That is a bogus argument, and I think it is a shameful argument.

And again, the bottom line comes, you are either for animal cruelty or you are against it. It is real simple.

And, again, let me show you this. Look at the nails in this. This is a keg shoe. A horse doesn't need that. This is to win a blue ribbon.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

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

As a family owner and a fan of the Tennessee Walker breed, I rise today in strong support of this very important animal protection bill, the PAST Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for his tireless leadership on this bill, as well as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER). I thank them.

So the PAST Act bans the practice of soring, which is a process of inflicting pain on horses' hooves and their legs in order to give them a higher gait. Breeders sometimes use soring to give their horses an advantage in competition, as we have talked about tonight, but the pain inflicted upon the animals is inhumane, and it should be stopped.

For years, we have known about this harmful practice, yet there has been very little action to remedy or fix the problem.

A recent story I read described the process of exposing sensitive tissues within the hooves of the horse by filing away the hoof. Sharp objects, such as screws, are then pierced into the sensitive tissue inflicting pain to the animal. The damaged tissue that appears after this process is burned away sometimes with acids that burn the horse's skin.

Sadly, this barbaric practice continues, and sometimes even out in the open.

The current enforcement mechanisms we have in place are not working well enough, and it is time to pass this important bipartisan piece of legislation. Horses, especially those used in shows, are beautiful animals that have done nothing to deserve the pain that soring causes.

So once enacted into law, the PAST Act will ensure that we have a more efficient system in place to protect our equine companions from unnecessary, inhumane, and cruel suffering.

So once again, I want to thank my friend, the veterinarian from Florida, for his work and also just to let you know that my Tennessee Walkers, our family's Tennessee Walkers, Just Power and Dancers Boss Lady, thank you, as well.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in

supporting H.R. 693, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the discussion here tonight. I wish we didn't have to have this discussion. Unfortunately, soring is still with us, and it is crystal clear we need the PAST Act, a commonsense bill to give USDA and the industry itself the ability to clean out these bad actors who are, frankly, a stain on the Tennessee Walking industry that we all love and respect. Those horses are majestic. Anyone that has been around an equine athlete just can't be but in awe of what they are able to do.

Soring is completely unnecessary. Good trainers, good veterinary help, these horses are going to perform in a way that make Americans proud.

I thank my colleagues for the work on the bill and urge all my colleagues to support the PAST Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 693, 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. SCHRADER. Mr. 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.

□ 2245

MARKING FIRST 200 DAYS AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 200 days into my first term as a Member of Congress. It has been an incredible honor to serve the residents of the 39th Congressional District in California.

I am very proud of what we have accomplished so far in Congress, from the passage of three of my pieces of bipartisan legislation this week, which will expand access to benefits for veterans, servicemembers, and their families; to the 32 amendments my colleagues and I have offered that were agreed to on a bipartisan basis; and the three bipartisan bills that I had the honor of supporting that have been signed into law by the President.

I am most proud of our constituent services in the district. In just 200 days in office, we have retrieved over $190,000 from Federal agencies for our constituents and worked on over 250 cases.

I work for the people of my district. It is why I have attended hundreds of local events and met with thousands of my constituents.

I look forward to the next 100 days and beyond, working for the people; bringing change to Washington, DC; and ensuring I give my constituents the representation they deserve.

IT IS GAME OVER FOLLOWING SPECIAL COUNSEL TESTIMONY

(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, today, the Democrats got their wish. Special Counsel Robert Mueller testified before not one but two House committees.

I wonder if they would reconsider that in hindsight. I don't think it went as they had planned.

Today's hearings only hammered home the simple fact we already knew. The special counsel did not find evidence to charge the President with a crime. Game over.

Sadly, this was nothing more than political theater and a colossal waste of time. Democrats wanted reinforcement for their partisan witch hunt against the President. Didn't happen.

If anything, today's testimony is only going to raise more questions as to why this entire investigation was even opened in the first place and why exculpatory evidence wasn't included in the report.

After wasting 22 months, 25 million taxpayer dollars, and countless other resources, Americans deserve to know the truth about how this whole episode was fabricated and who is responsible.

The Steele dossier, abuse of our intelligence agencies, DNC direct involvement? If Democrats would put as much effort in improving our country as they do into baseless attempts to impeach the President, we might just be able to get something done around here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to move on from this disaster and get back to work for the American people.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2249. An act to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 1327. An act to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 693, the PAST Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1365, a bill to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 3299, the PRIDE Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3299

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	−56	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	−41	−18

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 3352, the Department of State Authorization Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3352

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	50	100

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3409

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	15	30

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1752. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining Electric Program Procedures (RIN: 0572-AC40) received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1753. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences, Privacy Act of 1974 [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0042] (RIN: 0790-AK61) received July 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1754. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reduced Reporting for Covered Depository Institutions [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0032] (RIN: 1557-AE39) received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1755. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Liquidity Coverage Ratio Rule: Treatment of Certain Municipal Obligations as High-Quality Liquid Assets [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0013] (RIN: 1557-AE36) received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1756. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program (RIN: 0575-AD10) received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Jefferson County Definitions and Federally Enforceable District Origin Operating Permits [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0758; FRL-9996-92-Region 4] received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [MD 205-3121; FRL-9992-15-Region 3] received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lactic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0157; FRL-9994-63] received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1760. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Human Research Subjects [EPA-HQ-ORD-2018-0280; FRL-9996-48-ORD] received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1761. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0179; FRL-9995-63] received July 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1762. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics, Incentive Auction Task Force, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Auction of Construction Permits for Low Power Television and TV Translator Stations Scheduled for September 10, 2019; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 104 [AU Docket No.: 19-16] [GN Docket No.: 12-268] [MB Docket No.: 16-306] received July 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1763. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Income Inclusion When Lessee Treated as Having Acquired Investment Credit Property [TD 9872] (RIN: 1545-BM74) received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1764. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Indexing adjustments for certain provisions under Sec. 36B of the Internal Revenue Code (Rev. Proc. 2019-29) received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1765. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Automatic Consent to Change Methods of Accounting to Comply with Section 846 (Rev. Proc. 2019-30) received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1766. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Allocation of Creditable Foreign Taxes [TD 9871] (RIN: 1545-BM56) received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1767. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Agency's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Regulations on the Requirement To Notify the IRS of Intent To Operate as a Section 501(c)(4) Organization [TD 9873] (RIN: 1545-BN25) received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1768. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Notice: Additional Preventive Care Benefits Permitted to be Provided by a High Deductible Health Plan Under Sec. 223 [Notice 2019-45] received July 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. 2385. A bill to permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program; with an amendment (Rept. 116–179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3931. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGEL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3352. A bill to provide for certain authorities of the Department of State, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER; Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2336. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to the definition of ''family farmer'' (Rept. 116–182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 519. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3877) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 116–183). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 3927. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a pilot program to test the feasibility and outcomes of integrating a substance use disorder and behavioral health treatment locator tool into the prescription drug monitoring programs of 5 eligible States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIGGLEMAN:

H.R. 3928. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve to satisfy certain requirements before providing any new payment service, or substantially changing or expanding any existing payment service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 3929. A bill to direct the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board to develop a minimum nonvisual access standard for home use medical devices, exercise equipment, and home appliances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 3930. A bill to cap noninterest Federal Spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the government, grow the economy, and balance the budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventive health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 3933. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish State and Indian tribe grants for community colleges and grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BACON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. VELA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to replace the windfall elimination provision with a formula equalizing benefits for certain individuals with non-covered employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 3935. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for the continuing requirement of Medicaid coverage of nonemergency transportation to medically necessary services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 3936. A bill to establish in the States of North Carolina and South Carolina the Southern Campaign of the Revolution National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 3937. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at Highway-155, Coulee Dam, WA 99116, as the ''Nathaniel 'Nat' Washington Power Plant''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BACON, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3938. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that children of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be preference eligible for purposes of appointments in the civil service, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3939. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a quantitative impact study of any proposed real-time payment system under the Faster Payments Initiative before implementing such system; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 3940. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, 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. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 3941. A bill to enhance the innovation, security, and availability of cloud computing services used in the Federal Government by establishing the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program within the General Services Administration and by establishing a risk management, authorization, and continuous monitoring process to enable the Federal Government to leverage cloud computing services using a risk-based approach consistent with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 and cloud-based operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 3942. A bill to apply requirements relating to delivery sales of cigarettes to delivery sales of electronic nicotine delivery systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow accelerated depreciation of certain qualified film and television and live theatrical productions in

Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 to modify the procedure for communicating certain emergency risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 3945. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers for flood control projects and storm damage reduction projects in areas affected by flooding in the city of Jacksonville, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 3946. A bill to provide further means of accountability with respect to the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3947. A bill to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3948. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to extend the provisions of that Act to cover a debt collector who is collecting debt owed to a State or local government, to index award amounts under such Act for inflation, to provide for civil injunctive relief for violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3949. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for drinking water fountain replacement in playgrounds and parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIM, Mr. COX of California, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a grant program for the improvement of remedial education programs at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to require that funds deposited be available for withdrawal in real time and to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to create a real time payment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to establish a waiver from the matching requirement for certain grants under the specialty crop research initiative; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to expand the requirement for States to suspend, rather than terminate, an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while the individual is an inmate of a public institution, to apply to inmates of any age; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to include the exclusive economic zone as part of the United States for patent infringement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 3955. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Silver Cliff, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. FRANKEL):

H.R. 3956. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEIL:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Mutiemployer Pension Plans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the need to inform American consumers with more balanced purchasing information for prescription drugs through the disclosure of price information in direct-to-consumer (DTC) advertisements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MOULTON):

H. Res. 515. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 23, 2019, as a national day of remembrance of the tragic 1983 terrorist bombing of the United States Marine Corps Barracks in Beirut, Lebanon; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H. Res. 516. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 517. A resolution supporting the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), malaria, and its Sixth Replenishment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 518. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORREA:

H. Res. 520. A resolution remembering kindness in the United States and affirming our commitment to fostering community and building resiliency through every day acts of kindness; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 521. A resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People's Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., executive; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

123. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the United States Congress to act favorably in regard to legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Merrill's Marauders; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

124. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the United States Congress to act favorably in regard to legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Merrill's Marauders; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

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. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. RIGGLEMAN:

H.R. 3928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 3930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 3933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 3934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power

to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 3936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 3937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 3938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 3940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8; U.S. Constitution

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 3943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

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; [and . . .]

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. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 3945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to t] following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . . .''

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 Commerce Clause

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 3951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 3952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3953.

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. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 3955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 93: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 95: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 194: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 310: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 333: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 336: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 437: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 497: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 510: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 571: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 586: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 587: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 628: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 647: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 663: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 724: Mr. ABRAHAM and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 729: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 737: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 830: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 849: Mr. García of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 886: Mr. YOHO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 913: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 961: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 1024: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1025: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1034: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1035: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1049: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1108: Ms. WATERS, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1109: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1135: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1154: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SCHRIER, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1173: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1175: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. FLETCHER and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1301: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 1380: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1398: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1400: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1423: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1440: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 1452: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1471: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1511: Ms. TITUS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1529: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1533: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1554: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1570: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1597: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1607: Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 1629: Mr. FLORES and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1678: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1694: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1695: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1709: Ms. SHALALA, Ms. TITUS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1713: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Miss González-Colón of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1766: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1786: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. Luján.

H.R. 1864: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1869: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1873: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1887: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1923: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. OMAR, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1925: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 1934: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1978: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1980: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 1987: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 2026: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2031: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2046: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2048: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2096: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2118: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2155: Ms. TITUS and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2167: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 2200: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2201: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2208: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2218: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2219: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2235: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2256: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2271: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2311: Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2382: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2404: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2408: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2411: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 2420: Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 2431: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2433: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 2442: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2452: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2501: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2550: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2584: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2605: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2616: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2668: Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mrs. AXNE, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 2678: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2682: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2721: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2733: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2747: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2751: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2771: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2775: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2802: Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. VELA, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2847: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2851: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2856: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 2958: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2969: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2970: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2975: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2991: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3026: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3115: Ms. SHALALA, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 3145: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3157: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3162: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3182: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 3195: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3205: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 3219: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3221: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3266: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3280: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3302: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3332: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3356: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3369: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3388: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3396: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3412: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3463: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PORTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TRONE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3465: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3473: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 3497: Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOST, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3515: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. WALKER, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3557: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3575: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3580: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 3602: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3604: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3623: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 3637: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3654: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3663: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3666: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3667: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3668: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TRONE, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3670: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3742: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3744: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 3760: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3775: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3783: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3786: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3794: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3799: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 3807: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3816: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 3828: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3829: Mr. RYAN and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3846: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3848: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 3861: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3862: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3867: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3872: Mr. ROSE of New York and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3874: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3882: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3884: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 3909: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3918: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. HILL of California.
H. Res. 54: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 60: Mr. EVANS and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H. Res. 217: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DUNN.
H. Res. 219: Mr. COOK.
H. Res. 255: Mr. PETERS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 259: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H. Res. 326: Mrs. HAYES.
H. Res. 374: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 387: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 395: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 452: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 480: Mr. RUSH and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 493: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H. Res. 499: Mrs. MURPHY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

34. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Commission of the City of Miami, FL, relative to Resolution R-19-0236, urging President Donald J. Trump to prohibit any further cultural exchanges between Cuba and the United States until freedom of expression is restored for all Cubans; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.