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.