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 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, 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 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.
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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 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. 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 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 circuit 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. Speaker, I am here now for the fifth congressional hearing on this same issue, on this witch hunt. This is a circus.

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 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 rule 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 on 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, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and oppose this attack on SNAP.

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 drug costs; expand options for people with preexisting conditions—reducing the cost of drugs and make this effort to ensure peace and increase stability in the region.
strengthening protections for pre-existing 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.

I have worked hard to implement the farm bill, to expand 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 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 non-discretionary 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 employees 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 a high-fidelity, state-of-the-art, clinical education, including five clinical simulation suites where students can practice real life clinical scenarios on computer-controlled mannequins with the assistance of their instructors through two-way audio and video such as 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 incursions 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 right 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, and who works 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 ran for 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 just to name 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 as chairman of 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.

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. When his final 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 1 details a “swEEPing and systematic” attack by the Russian Government on our democracy as an attack that our President still refuses to acknowledge. Volume II describes 11 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 obstructively structured justice; substantial evidence 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 knew his conduct was under investigation for 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 that any 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 investigatory 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 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 88 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 oak leaf 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. As a hero, he’s 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 took home a silver medal.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Violet and can’t wait to see how she performs next year.
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The barriers preventing Black families and White families must be addressed. 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.

The growing racial wealth gap in the United States of America

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 for 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.

We are a country of brave and beautiful citizens and immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, the racial gap in our economy is on track to own $0 in wealth by the year 2053. The wealth disparity between Black and White middle-class households has 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.

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 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.

The growing racial wealth gap in the United States of America

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 for 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

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 for 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.

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 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 lady from 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 wish 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 Optimist Club also in-volvement 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 pro-gramming for young people throughout the community.

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

Mr. Speaker, please join me in con-gratulating the Optimist Club of Fay-ette, Missouri, for their hard work and dedication to the youth of the commu-nity for the last 50 years.

Como Fire Chief Randy White

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Columbia, Mis-souri, 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-Mis-souri 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 528 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 depart-ments to follow.

I join with many Missourians, fami-lies, and friends to wish Chief White a fulfilling retirement. I hope Randy en-joys the days he has worked so hard to earn and wish him continued health and happiness in this new phase of life.
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 stunted medical technology investment across the country.

Although Congress has come together on a bipartisan basis to address the long-term challenges, and worked 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.

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.

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, Divestment, 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.

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 the history.

RECOGNIZING BLACKSHEAR TIMES’ ROBERT AND MRS. ROBERT 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, “Like by Many, Cursed 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 the reader, 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 represents half of 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, increasing interest rates, and lowering job 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. 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 must 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, accumulate 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 voted against too 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 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 Roven, and on the 15th of April 1945 over Viroinval. His crew’s mission was to bomb the 30,000 encamped German troops concentrated around Roven on the coast of France.
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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 was used to follow bombs to their targets. Pilots were tired, but they kept the aircraft filled with a thick, sooty smoke that covered all the windows.

Pilots were hit by ground fire, then 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. BOSS. 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 out but understanding how important this issue is to future generations, to the opportunity for our children and grand-children 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.
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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 Emanuel 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 Emanuel 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 whom 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, and I see 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 sacrifices 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, 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 on a badge, strap on their holster, or put 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 dedication, 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 a hero 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 always 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 said.

From the Clerk's Office to the Parliamentarian's staff, from the C-SPAN crew to the stenographers, the non-partisan, 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 over my remarks, which may or may not be profound, but somebody will be able to tell us, "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 committees 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 dive instructor.

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

Mr. Edd Sorenson is known internationally for his courageous and skilled 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 Brutchtly, 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.

Mr. PAYNE. 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.

The plight of Ethiopian Israelis in Israel.
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, 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 anger. We 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, 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.

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 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.

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.

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 DETAINED 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 rise today to ask for the immediate consideration of H. Res. 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, that further consideration 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 with-in 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 chair of the Committee on Rules and designated 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, direct 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. 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. At the 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 116-25 modified by the amendment printed in part C 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 that amend 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 by the chair, 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 a structured rule. The Speaker or his 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.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given five 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 United States House of Representatives. We have spent the past 8 months fighting for American families and 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 money out of politics.

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

And as a result, 33 million Americans will finally get a raise and no more singing 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 my son. I would 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.

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 prominent union family. 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 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 retirees. 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 say that raising the wage is bad for business. 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 institutions to ensure that American employees get the pensions that they were promised to retire on.
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 Mr. 3235, because it is 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 asylum-seeking 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 Alonzo 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 acknowledge 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 attempt to fix the multiemployer pension crisis. Unfortunately, the bill does nothing but create more government, increase confusion, 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 pension plans jointly by a union and multiple companies whose employees are members of that union. These are defined benefit plans that guarantee employment-specific pension benefits at 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.

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 year. And this 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 have a 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 by premiums paid by plans 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 pension 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 trillion-dollar problem? 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 multiemployer pension 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 cover its 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 estimating the budget impact of a previous version of H.R. 397. The new subsidies and the expanded assistance would increase the Federal deficit by $61 billion without truly addressing the underlying financial issues.

And if this bill became 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.

Medical staff are required to be on-site 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 may also 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. They are also the ones to refuse 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 care is absolutely necessary because it is not only feasible 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 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 Democrat 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 in 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 slow 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. 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.

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.

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 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 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 future and the future of the nation 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. CAPTERT. 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 the peace this 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 gentlewoman 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 guarantees. 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. What is going to happen now? 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 solve the structural problem 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 plans through no fault of their own.

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).

Mr. RUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 3239, the Humnanitarian 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 with urine and feces on the floor. The children 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. RUZ. Mr. Speaker, 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 humane 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 aisles 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 to 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 support 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 1.3 million pension funds, covering over 13 million workers, are severely underfunded. This accounts for more than 23,000 workers from the Central States' plan in Wisconsin alone. In just 5% years, their pension fund may become insolvent. Unfortunately, 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’ retirement security, 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 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 not funded 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 or 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 current 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 not cut.

Reforming 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 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. Last April, retirees from 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 yield 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.

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 at 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 back my time as much 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 when they worked for us?

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 Multiemployer Pension Plans. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the underlying 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 (c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back 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 yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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.

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. 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 technical 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.

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.
Sec. 316. Requirement for small shipyard grants.
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. Solar 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. Waivers of jurisdiction for the United States merchant marine academy.

Sec. 421. Coast Guard housing; status and authorities briefing.
Sec. 201. GRADE ON RETIREMENT.

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

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “43,000 for fiscal year 2018 and 45,580 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”.

(b) O THER OFFICERS.—Section 306 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) MISCONDUCT IN LOWER GRADE.—In the case of an officer who the Secretary determines committed misconduct in a lower grade, the Secretary may determine the officer's retired grade.

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

(A) If the retirement of the officer was procured by fraud, the Secretary may conditionally determine the officer's retired grade.

(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 or warrant 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.

(F) 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 in 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:

(4) 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.
§ 3743. Eligibility for promotion

(a) ADMIRALTIES CLAIMS.—Section 937 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by 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".

§ 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 induced from active service to meet personal or professional needs and returned to active service at the end of such period of inactivation from active service.

(b) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—No 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.

§ 2515. Career flexibility to enhance retention of members

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

"(c) ENTRANCE.—Any person to be a Reserve officer under this subchapter, if that officer is an active duty officer, may enter under this subchapter if the Secretary of the Navy specifies that the person has the skill possessed by a Reserve officer serving in a position authorized to be held by a Reserve officer by the Secretary for purposes of such promotions.

"(d) ELIGIBILITY.—Any person who is a Reserve officer and who is entitled to retirement pay after full active duty service under this chapter may be ordered to active duty service under this subchapter, if the Secretary determines that the person has the skill possessed by a Reserve officer serving in a position authorized to be held by a Reserve officer by the Secretary for purposes of such promotions.

"(e) ELIGIBILITY OF OFFICERS.—Any person to be a Reserve officer under this subchapter, if that officer is an active duty officer, must meet the following:

"(1) The person is an active duty officer.

"(2) The person is an eligible Reserve officer.
(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 1825 of title 37 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 by any agreement entered into by the member under chapter 5 of title 37 or section 1825 of title 37.

(3) RETURN TO ACTIVE SERVICE.—

(A) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a member participating in a program, be paid any special or incentive pay or bonus under chapter 5 of title 37 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 by any agreement entered into by the member under chapter 5 of title 37 or section 1825 of title 37 that is in force when the member commences participation in the program.

(4) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a member participating in a program, be paid any travel and transportation allowances authorized by section 474 of title 37 for 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

(B) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE.—An allowance is payable under this paragraph only with respect to travel of a member to and from a single residence.

(5) PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—

(A) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—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, 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.

(B) REPLACEMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (A), a member participating in a program shall be paid any travel and transportation allowance 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.

(C) REPLACEMENT.—A member who is ineligible for payment of a special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by this paragraph because of the requirements established in such paragraph shall be entitled to payment of such pay or bonus in accordance with the terms of the applicable agreement of the member under chapter 5 of title 37.

(D) PAYMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES 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 covered by subsection (e).

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

(g) PROHIBITION.—

(1) OFFICER.—

(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 title 37.

(B) RETURN TO SERVICE.—Upon the return of an officer to active service after completion of the program, the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of the program.

(2) ENLISTED MEMBERS.—An enlisted member participating in a program shall not be eligible for consideration for promotion under chapter 21 or 37 of title 37.

(h) CONTINUATION OF 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 the Coast Guard:

(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 title 10 and chapters 21 and 23 of this title;

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

(i) RETENTION.—The Commandant shall make a recommendation to the Secretary of the Coast Guard for purposes of this section.

(j) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES.—

(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 title 37.

(B) RETURN TO SERVICE.—Upon the return of an officer to active service after completion of the program, the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of this section.

(C) OFFICER.—A member who participates in a program is entitled to carry forward the leave balance existing as of the date on which the member begins participation in the program in accordance with section 701 of title 10, but not to exceed 60 days.

(k) PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—

(A) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—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, 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.

(B) REPLACEMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (A), a member participating in a program shall be paid any travel and transportation allowance 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.

(C) REPLACEMENT.—A member who is ineligible for payment of a special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by this paragraph because of the requirements established in such paragraph shall be entitled to payment of such pay or bonus in accordance with the terms of the applicable agreement of the member under chapter 5 of title 37.

(D) PAYMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES 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 covered by subsection (e).

(E) RETENTION.—The Commandant shall make a recommendation to the Secretary of the Coast Guard for purposes of this section.

(F) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES.—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 title 37.

(G) RETURN TO SERVICE.—Upon the return of an officer to active service after completion of the program, the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of the program.

(H) OFFICER.—A member who participates in a program is entitled to carry forward the leave balance existing as of the date on which the member begins participation in the program in accordance with section 701 of title 10, but not to exceed 60 days.

(i) PROHIBITION.—

(1) OFFICER.—

(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 title 37.

(B) RETURN TO SERVICE.—Upon the return of an officer to active service after completion of the program, the Commandant shall prescribe in regulations for purposes of this section.

(C) OFFICER.—A member who participates in a program is entitled to carry forward the leave balance existing as of the date on which the member begins participation in the program in accordance with section 701 of title 10, but not to exceed 60 days.

(j) PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—

(A) SPECIAL OR INCENTIVE PAY OR BONUS.—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, 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.

(B) REPLACEMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (A), a member participating in a program shall be paid any travel and transportation allowance 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.

(C) REPLACEMENT.—A member who is ineligible for payment of a special or incentive pay or bonus otherwise covered by this paragraph because of the requirements established in such paragraph shall be entitled to payment of such pay or bonus in accordance with the terms of the applicable agreement of the member under chapter 5 of title 37.

(D) PAYMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES 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 covered by subsection (e).
"(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 those identified as female. "

"(2) RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.—(A) An analysis of the changes in the recruitment and retention of women 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 the period 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 REPORT.—An update on the Coast Guard’s progress on the implementation of the action plan required under section 299 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:

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

Section 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 of Transportation under section 312(d) of title 49”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(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 Federal 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), 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 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 General Services Administration 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 basic, applied, or advanced research authorized by section 717 or another transaction authorized by subsection (a)."

"(h) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—Information referred to in subparagraph (A) is the following:

(1) A proposal, proposal abstract, and supporting documents. "

(2) A business plan submitted on a confidential basis. "

(3) Technical information submitted on a confidential basis. "

(4) 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 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."

SECTION 211. POSITIONS OF IMPORTANCE AND RE-SOLVIBILITY.

Section 2103(c)(3) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “vice admiral” and inserting “vice admiral”.

"(a) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.—(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of section 3306 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 designated as shortage positions.

"(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 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) EXCEPTED ANNUITANTS.—An annuitant 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) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of such Act."

"(c) 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 (1).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the heading relating to section 1110 the following:

"1111. Acquisition workforce authorizations.".

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 be equipped with and operate on the navigable waters of the United States, shall be effective beginning on the first day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report to the House of Representatives and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, a report on the allocation of resources by the Coast Guard to support its defense readiness mission.

(b) Exemptions.—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) Exemptions.—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, a report on the allocation of resources by the Coast Guard to support its defense readiness mission.

(a) Requirements.—Section 3150a(a)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(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 determines that electronic charts are necessary for the safe navigation of the vessel.

"(E) Section 8103(j) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking operates' and inserting operates;'

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking those waters,' and inserting those waters; and'

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) permit vessels that operate solely on the 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.

(a) Definition.—Section 3007(k)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended, by inserting after paragraph (25) the following:

"(26) non-operating individual means an individual who—

"(A) does not perform—

"(i) 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 a 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;

"(ii) vessel maintenance, including any repairs that can be performed by the vessel's crew or a rigging gang;

"(i) 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 8001;

"(C) does not serve as a rigging gang member;

"(D) is not a member of the steward's department;

"(E) is not a citizen 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 threat to the United States; and

"(F) is not a current security clearance issued by a Federal agency or a current security clearance issued by 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—

"(1) each non-operating individual possesses—

"(i) a merchant mariner's document;

"(ii) a transportation worker identification credential under section 70018; or

"(iii) a current security clearance issued by a Federal agency; or

"(B) the employer of such an individual attaches a certification 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 is made available 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 is made available to the owner or managing operator that—

"(1) 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 is made available to the owner or managing operator that—

"(1) 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 is made available to the owner or managing operator that—

"(1) 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 is made available to the owner or managing operator that—

"(1) 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;
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 41 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 7061 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(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "46 U.S.C. 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 Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall determine whether an installation vessel exists for which a coastwise endorsement has been issued under section 12112 exists.

"(a) APPLICATION.—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 section 55123(b) before using such non-coastwise qualified vessel for the transportation of an offshore unit; 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 vessel is not available under paragraph (4).

"(b) REQUIREMENTS 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 a request for a particular 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 necessary to engineer the 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 the vessels be submitted within a 45-day period beginning on the date of such publication; and

"(C) with respect to each eligible entity, 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.

"(c) 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 in the training, installation, and maintaining, and repairing a submarine cable ship or cable vessel; and

"(3) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION OF AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall determine a coastwise qualified vessel is not available under paragraph (4).

"(4) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION OF AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall determine a coastwise qualified vessel is not available under paragraph (4).

"(5) PLATFORM JACKET.—The term 'platform jacket' has the meaning given such term in section 55102(a) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by adding at the end the following:

"(A) documents 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

(d) 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

(iii) in the case of a vessel required to be inventoried under paragraph (1)(C), carrying out other services to the offshore industry.

SEC. 306. ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) NATIONAL OFFSHORE SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—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 inserting "exploration and production operations";

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking "engaged in diving services related to offshore construction, inspection, and maintenance" and inserting "engaged in diving services related to the offshore industry";

(4) in subparagraph (F), by striking "engaged in safety and training services related to offshore exploration and construction" and inserting "engaged in safety and training services related to the offshore industry";

(5) in subparagraph (G), by striking "engaged in providing services related to offshore construction" and inserting "engaged in providing safety and training services related 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 oil exploration and production on the outer Continental Shelf adjacent to Alaska”.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES; TESTIMONY.—
Section 13108(j)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to a member or element of the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security, including the charter, membership, and other aspects thereof, void, not in force, or not in effect:

(I) to deem, find, or declare such committee, including the charter, membership, and other aspects thereof, void, not in force, or not in effect; or

(II) to suspend the activities of such committee; or

(III) to bar the members of such committee from a meeting.

(c) GREATEST PILOTAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—
Section 15109—
(1) in general—Title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking section 9307 and inserting the following:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Great Lakes Pilotage Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).”

“(b) FUNCTION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary 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 7 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 States 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 may consider 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 15109, the Committee shall be treated as a committee established under chapter 151; and

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of section 15109, the Committee shall be treated as a committee established under chapter 151;
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, unify, or identify a specific position, place, item, or object.".

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

"70014. Aiming a laser pointer at a vessel."

SEC. 310. MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENTS.

Section 5500(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "an assessment of the condition and inserting "a condition and performance analysis;"

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (5) by striking the period and inserting a comma; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) A comprehends 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) offshore energy development activities, as described in section 8(p)(1c) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(1c)), and any other fixed platforms;

"(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 in the economic zone.

(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 a 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 REQUIRYMENT.

(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:

"(1) Use Requirement.—

"(i) 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.

"(ii) Waiver of Requirement.—The Secretary may grant 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. 315. CREATION OF OFF-SHORE SHIPYARD GRANTORS.

Section 5410(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Grants awarded" and inserting "the following:

"(i) 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 4092(c) 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."
(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 Aeronautics and Space Administration whose primary responsibility is aeronautics (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 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.

(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)(2), including specific findings and recommendations.

SEC. 318. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR DOMESTIC MARITIME WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 5102 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting “or subsection (d)”; 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 5102(d) of this title, as a center of excellence under this section.”

SEC. 319. REPORTS OF UNMANNED 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 international voyages.

(b) Briefing.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide a briefing 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 achieve 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 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 Commerce, Science, and Technology 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.

(b) Report.—

(1) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, 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 systems 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, with satellite vessel tracking technologies, and the estimated costs of accessing, acquiring, or operating such systems.

(c) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) UNMANNED MERCHANT MARINER.—(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 was a 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) Internship 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 operational capability.

(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) 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) that, with respect to a voyage described in subsection (a)(1), is listed—

(A) in 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

(B) 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 voyage 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 vessels operating 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 in subsection (a); and

(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, or the Secretaries of Transportation or the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, 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 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 category the Commandant determines necessary.

(2) An overview of technologies that may be necessary to ensure the continued operational viability and increase the resiliency of the identified vulnerable installations; and

(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 actions that may be necessary to ensure mission resiliency and the cost of such mitigations.

(c) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences, and 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.

(3) The assessment under subsection (a) shall provide—

(1) an examination of emerging issues that may affect the Coast Guard oversight, regulation, or action;

(2) a description of potential limitations and shortcoming 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.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences, and not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall brief the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) REPORTING.—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 strategies to implement cloud computing for the entire Coast Guard, including—

(1) The goals and acquisition strategies for all post-2005 cloud computing service procurements;

(2) A strategy to sustain competition and innovation throughout the period of performance under sections 5307 and 5309 of title 10, United States Code, including the procurement of cloud-computing goods and services for the Coast Guard, including defining opportunities for multiple cloud-service providers and innovative cloud technologies; and

(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.
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(1) a description of the material condition of Coast Guard housing facilities;
(2) the amount of current Coast Guard housing construction and deferred maintenance backlog;
(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 104-308) 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(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(b)) may be completed by the United States 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 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 Department of Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate reports containing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the study required under subsection (a),”;

(b) 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 70002 of title 46, United States Code, in addition to the safety of the vessel or to prevent the loss of life or property; or

(2) the risk and benefits of historic practices for commercial vessels anchoring; and

(3) the risk and benefits of establishing anchorage grounds on the Hudson River.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year 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 containing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the study required under subsection (a).

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 70002 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) MANNER OF EXTENSION.—Any extension granted under this section may be extended or renewed as many times as the Secretary shall determine.

(2) by striking paragraph (6).

(c) DETERMINATION.—The determination referred to in paragraph (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.

(d) MANNER OF EXTENSION.—Any extension granted under this section may be granted to individual vessels or to a specifically identified group of vessels.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—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:

“§ 646. ROTATIONAL CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

“To enhance the Department’s cybersecurity capability, 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) CEREMONIAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the items relating to such subtitle the following:

“*646. 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 Commandant 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. 2121(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The;”;

(b) adding at the end the following:

“(2) SUBROGATED RIGHTS.—Except for a guarantor claim pursuant to a defense under section 1016(c)(1), Fund compensation of any claim by an insurer or other indemnitee 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.”.

(c) 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. 2133) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1012(a) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2121(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by adding “and” after the semicolon at the end of the section;

(2) in paragraph (5), 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 require the owner of such deepwater port 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) the oil storage capacity of the deepwater port and associated vessels;

“(iii) the oil handling capacity of the deepwater ports and associated vessels;

“(iv) oil throughput;

“(v) proximity to sensitive areas;

“(vi) type of oil handled; and

“(vii) history of oil discharges; and

“(B) 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 require the owner of such deepwater port 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) the oil storage capacity of the deepwater port and associated vessels;

“(iii) the oil handling capacity of the deepwater ports and associated vessels;

“(iv) oil throughput;

“(v) proximity to sensitive areas;
“(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 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 $50,000,000.

“(D) LIMIT 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 $500,000,000 and not less than $1,000,000,000.

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) Report shall include—

(1) a statement of the Coast Guard mission requirements for drug interdiction in the Caribbean basin;

(2) a maritime sector of maritime surveillance hours and Coast Guard assets used in each of the fiscal years 2017 through 2019 to counter the illicit trafficking of drugs and other related threats in 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(l)(1)(G)(iv) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1855(l)(1)(G)(iv)) is amended by striking ‘‘shall concur’’ and inserting ‘‘act only by the affirmative vote of at least 350,000,000 and not less than 50,000,000.’’

SEC. 429. TRANSPORTATION WORK IDENTIFICATION CARD PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 7010S(g) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘‘shall concurrency’’ and all that follows and inserting the following: ‘‘shall—

(1) before a vessel is in place and identified for use in the demonstration program; or

(2) upon receipt of a joint application developed under paragraph (1) concurrently process an application from an individual for a transportation security card issued under this section; and

(3) in the case of a fishing vessel, or as an aircraft, or both; or

(4) in the case of a fish tender vessel, engaged in the Aleutian trade.

(2) The term ‘‘subject vessel’’ means a vessel to which this chapter applies that—

(A) is more than 79 feet in overall length as measured along 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) is built after February 8, 2016.

In this chapter:

‘‘4501. Application.

4502. Definitions.

4503. Safety standards.

4504. Vessel construction.

4505. Operating stability.

4506. Transfer.

4507. Vessel certification.

4508. Alternate safety compliance program.

4509. Subchapter 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) 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;

(B) in the case of a fish tender vessel, engaged in the Aleutian trade.

(2) The term ‘‘auxiliary craft’’ means a vessel that is carried on board a fishing vessel and is normally used to support fishing operations.

(3) The term ‘‘bulk’’ 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.

(4) The term ‘‘carrying’’ means that the vessel is in place and identified for use in the demonstration program.

(5) The term ‘‘keel is laid’’ means that the vessel’s keel is laid.

(6) The term ‘‘major conversion’’ means a conversion that extends beyond the renewal of existing spaces or the addition of new spaces.

(7) The term ‘‘subject vessel’’ means a vessel that is a fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, or fish tender vessel.

(8) The term ‘‘subject vessel’’ means a vessel to which this chapter applies that—

(A) is more than 79 feet in overall length as measured along 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) is built after February 8, 2016.
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§ 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; or

(2) less than 50 feet overall in length; and

(3) built after January 1, 2010.

§ 4505. Operating stability

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an alternate safety compliance program developed in coordination with the commercial fishing industry.

(1) 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).

(2) 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 fishing, or fishing, 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.

(3) EXCEPT VESSELS.—(1) Notwithstanding subsection (b), vessels owned by a person who owns more than 30 vessels subject to that subsection are not required to comply with alternate safety compliance program requirements until January 1, 2030.

(A) A person enters into a compliance agreement with the Secretary that provides for a fixed schedule for all such vessels owned by that person,

(B) to meet requirements of such paragraph by such date; and

(C) the Secretary prescribes an alternate 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 that the Secretary has delegated to any organization approved by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph.

(2) Construction of a substitute-eligible vessel shall be oversees 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; and

(B) have written stability and loading instructions from a qualified individual that are provided to the owner or operator; and

(C) have an assigned official.

(4) A substitute-eligible vessel shall not be substantially altered without the review and approval of an official 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 an out-of-water survey at least once every 3 years, with not more than 3 years between surveys, at the satisfaction of a marine surveyor of an organization accepted by the Secretary.

(6) A substitute-eligible vessel shall undergo as a naval architect or marine engineer before the beginning of such substantial alteration.

(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 an alternate safety compliance program.

(9) 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) 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 may:

(1) direct the individual in charge of a vessel to which this chapter applies to immediately take reasonable steps necessary for the protection 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) direct the individual in charge of an uninspected fishing 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 508.

§ 4513. Penalties

(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—The owner, charterer, manager, 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 $5,000 for each violation, or both.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—An individual who willfully violates this chapter or a regulation prescribed under this chapter shall be fined not more than $5,000, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

§ 4514. Compliance; Secretary actions

(a) TO ENFORCE COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS CHAPTER.—The Secretary—

(1) shall require the individual in charge of a substitute-eligible 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 2 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).

(b) 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 exception; 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 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 services.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Entities receiving funds under this section may use such funds for—

(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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal year 2020 and 2021 for activities under this subsection.

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 108-283; 14 U.S.C. 501 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 enu-

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF EXISTING PROVISIONS.—

(1) FOOTNOTE REMOVED.—The footnotes referred to in section 320(b)(1) of title 14, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 321 of that title, and amended so that the enu-

(c) 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.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under this subsection.

(e) AWARD CRITERIA.—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 organizations with expertise in fishing safety, to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of the commercial fishing industry, including vessel design, emergency equipment, vessel monitoring systems, communications devices, de-icing technology, and severe weather detection.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for activities under this subsection.

SEC. 503. ACQUISITION

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Section 215 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-283; 14 U.S.C. 501 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 enu-

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF EXISTING PROVISIONS.—

(1) FOOTNOTE REMOVED.—The footnotes referred to in section 320(b)(1) of title 14, United States Code, transferred to appear after section 321 of that title, and amended so that the enu-

(c) 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.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under this subsection.

(e) AWARD CRITERIA.—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 organizations with expertise in fishing safety, to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of the commercial fishing industry, including vessel design, emergency equipment, vessel monitoring systems, communications devices, de-icing technology, and severe weather detection.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for activities under this subsection.

SEC. 504. ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER

(a) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Section 401 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (107–265; 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 enu-

(B) If, after 90 days following the elevation to the Chief Acquisition Officer of any design or other dispute regarding level 1 or level 2 ac-

(c) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Section 401 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (107–265; 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 enu-

(B) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(1) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(2) If, after 90 days following the elevation to the Chief Acquisition Officer of any design or other dispute regarding level 1 or level 2 ac-

(c) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(1) ELEVATION OF DISPUTES TO THE CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—

(2) If, after 90 days following the elevation to the Chief Acquisition Officer of any design or other dispute regarding level 1 or level 2 ac-
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(E) Section 217 of the Coast Guard Author-
ization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–231; 14
U.S.C. 504 note)—
(ii) is redesignated as section 511 of title H,
United States Code, transferred to appear
after section 510 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—
(F) Section 353 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 fol-
lowing:
(D) In this paragraph, the term ‘covered
individual’ means an individual who is iden-
tified as a victim of a sexual assault in the case files of a military criminal investiga-
tive organization.
(F) Section 305 of title 46, United States Code, is
amended—
(i) by transferring such section to appear
after section 70006 of title 46, United States
Code;
(ii) by inserting “70007. Establishment by Secretary of Home-
land Security of anchorage grounds and regu-
lations generally”;
(B) by inserting 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:
“212. Restricting notification require-
ment.”.
(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, as amended by this Act,
is further amended by striking the item relating to section 1110 and insert-
ning the following:
“1110. Elevation of disputes to the Chief Ac-
cision (c) of section 111 of the Pipeline
Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Cre-
aton 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 3(b)(4) of title 14, United States
Code, is amended by striking “marine trans-
portation system” and inserting “maritime
transportation system”.
(b) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE TO MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PROGRAMS.—Sec-
tion 508(a)(7) of title 46, United States Code,
is amended by striking “maritime transpor-
tation” and inserting “maritime transporta-
tion”.
SEC. 602. REFERENCES TO “PERSONS” AND “SE-
AMEN”.
(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 528—
(A) by striking “person” each place it appears and inserting “individual”; and
(B) by striking “person” and inserting “individual”; and
(C) in subsection (b), by striking “persons” and inserting “individuals”;
(8) In section 793—
(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”.
(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—
(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.
(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section
14305(a)(10) of title 46, United States
Code, is amended by striking “sections 8303 and 8304” and insert-
ing “sections 8303 and 8304”.
(4) STANDARDS FOR VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section
1912 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—
(A) by striking “(a)” before the first
sentence; and
(B) by striking subsection (b),
(ii) by transferring such section to appear
after section 70006 of title 46, United States
Code;
(ii) by inserting “70007. Establishment by Secretary of Home-
land Security of anchorage grounds and regu-
lations generally”;
(B) by inserting 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:
“212. Restricting notification require-
ment.”.
(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, as amended by this Act,
is further amended by striking the item relating to section 1110 and insert-
ning the following:
“1110. Elevation of disputes to the Chief Ac-
cision (c) of section 111 of the Pipeline
Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Cre-
aton 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 3(b)(4) of title 14, United States
Code, is amended by striking “marine trans-
portation system” and inserting “maritime
transportation system”.
(b) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE TO MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PROGRAMS.—Sec-
tion 508(a)(7) of title 46, United States Code,
is amended by striking “maritime transpor-
tation” and inserting “maritime transporta-
tion”.
SEC. 602. REFERENCES TO “PERSONS” AND “SE-
AMEN”.
(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 528—
(A) by striking “person” each place it appears and inserting “individual”; and
(B) by striking “person” and inserting “individual”;
(8) In section 793—
(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”. 
in the heading for section 2767, by striking "persons" and inserting "individuals".

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(41) in section 2768, by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(42) in section 2773—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking "persons" and inserting "individuals";

(B) by striking "person" each place it appears and inserting "individual".

(26) in section 2732, by striking "person" and inserting "an individual".

(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 "persons" and inserting "individuals".

(31) in section 2738, by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(A) by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual"; and

(B) by striking "that person" and inserting "that individual".

(32) in section 2739, by striking "person" each place it appears 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, by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual";

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "person" and inserting "individual";

(C) in subsection (c), 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 "persons" each place it appears and inserting "individual".

(37) in section 2745, by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(A) in section 2746, by striking "person" in the section heading, by striking "person" and inserting "individuals"; and

(B) in section 2747, by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(B) by striking "persons" and inserting "individuals";

(ii) by striking "person" and inserting "individuals";

(38) in section 2754, by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual"; 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, by striking "person" and inserting "an individual";

(A) by striking "person" and inserting "individual"; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(41) in section 2772(a), by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(42) in section 2773—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking "persons" and inserting "individuals";

(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 "person" each place it appears and inserting "individuals".

(B) in the analysis for chapter 27, by striking the item relating to 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 2906(b), by striking "person" and inserting "individual".

(49) in section 2907(b)(1)(B), by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual".

(50) in section 2909, by striking "person" and inserting "an individual".

(A) by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual"; and

(B) by striking "person's" and inserting "individual's".

(51) in section 3007—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking "person" and inserting "individual"; and

(ii) by striking "person's" and inserting "individual's";

(B) in subsection (d), by striking "a person" and inserting "an individual"; and

(C) by striking "A person" and inserting "An individual".

(B) by striking "merchant seamen" and inserting "an individual or a specifically identified group of individuals".

(7) in section 7510 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "An individual".

(B) in subsection (d), by striking "merchant seamen" and inserting "merchant mariner"; and

(C) in subsection (j), by striking "seamen" and inserting "individuals".

(8) in 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)(B), by striking "seaman's" and inserting "individual's";

(E) in subsection (k)(3)(C), by striking "merchant mariners" each place it appears and inserting "merchant mariners".

(9) in section 8104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "A licensed individual or seaman" and inserting "an individual"; and

(B) by striking "A licensed individual or seaman" and inserting "an individual".

(10) in section 8302(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "3 persons" and inserting "3 individuals".

(11) in section 11201 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "a person each place it appears and inserting "an individual".

(12) in 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) in 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) in section 15109(i)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "additional persons" and inserting "additional individuals".

SEC. 603. COMMON APPROPRIATIONS STRUCTURE.—

(a) AMENDMENTS TO CONFORM TO COMMON APPROPRIATIONS STRUCTURE.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT OF FUNDS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE.—
506 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—
(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "established under chapter 56 of title 19" after "Medically Eligible Retired 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 of an aircraft, of an aircraft facility, or of an aircraft system, for research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft systems, and for research and development"; and
(B) in subsection (b)(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 "acquisition of equipment and " and inserting "procurement".

(C) HISTORIC LIGHT STATION SALES.—Section 305106 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking "acquisition" and inserting "procurement".

(D) HISTORIC LIGHT STATION SALES.—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); and
(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and
(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking "research, development, test, evaluation and insertion "research and development".

COMMON APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE.—Sections 3217(b), 7504, and 8005(b)(3) of title 46, United States Code, are each amended by striking "operating expenses" and inserting "operations and support".

COMMON APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE.—
(A) OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.—Section 1002(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".
(B) HISTORIC LIGHT STATION SALES.—Section 305106 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking "acquisition" and inserting "procurement".

(6) APPROPRIATION 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); and
(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and
(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking "research, development, test, evaluation and insertion "research and development".

(7) TRANSFERS.—Sections 3217(b), 7504, and 8005(b)(3) of title 46, United States Code, are each amended by striking "operating expenses" and inserting "operations and support".

(8) BRIDGE PERMITS.—Section 712(a)(2) of the Coastal 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".

(9) 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".
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July 24, 2019
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

506 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—
(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 2736 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "himsel" and inserting "such officer".
(C) Section 2732 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—
(1) by striking "distinguish himself conspicuously and display conspicuous"; and
(2) by striking "his" and inserting "such individual".
(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4); and
(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking "research, development, test, evaluation and insertion "research and development".

(3) VESSELS.—Section 3217(b)(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) USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 903 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017" and inserting "Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018".

(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":
(1) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(2) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(3) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(4) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III".

(4) USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 903 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017" and inserting "Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018".

(5) THE ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 700 OF TITLE 46, United States Code, is amended—
(A) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(B) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(C) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(D) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III".

(6) USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 903 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017" and inserting "Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018".

(7) THE ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 700 OF TITLE 46, United States Code, is amended—
(A) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(B) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(C) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(D) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(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":
(1) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(2) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(3) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(4) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(5) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III".

(8) USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 903 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2017" and inserting "Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018".

(9) THE ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 700 OF TITLE 46, United States Code, is amended—
(A) by striking "through C" and inserting "through III";
(B) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(C) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III";
(D) by striking "A through C" and inserting "I through III".

(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),” and inserting “in accordance with subsection (a)(2),” 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 “year of the enactment of the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018.”

(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 Transportation of Patients Act (Public Law 115–141)” after “(Public Law 115–31).”


(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.

(c) 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.”

(1) 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)—

(1) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding;” and

(2) 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 the Commonwealth of the Independent 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).”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “12.6 or 12.7” and inserting “19.6”; and


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 15 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)—

(1) is redesignated as section 70022 of title 46, United States Code, transferred to appear in title 46, United States Code, and amended so that the enumerator, section heading, typeface, and typetyle conform to those appearing in other sections in title 46, United States Code;

(2) as so redesignated and transferred, is amended—

(i) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “section 4(a)(1)” of such Act, and inserting “section 70001(a)(5)” of such an Act;

(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 7003(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. Condition of 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 Improvement 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 “$28,060,480 for fiscal year 2020 and $28,639,538 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 of 2019.”

SEC. 802. COAST GUARD ACADEMY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall, in coordination 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 economic backgrounds; 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 assessment described in subsection (a) shall require the Secretary of 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 of the Senate the assessment described under subsection (a)(1).

(2) ASSESSMENT SCOPE.—The assessment described under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(C) review the National Academy of Public Administration’s relevant assessments, 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) merging institutional practices, policies, and structures; and

(ii) any other changes deemed appropriate by the National Academy of Public Administration;

(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 Committee on Transportation of the Senate, in coordination with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, shall submit to the President 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 parts of the recommendations contained 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 from different geographic groups, 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 under chapter 51 of title 14, Coast Guard shall include in the first annual report any 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 to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Senate a report required under section 5112 of title 14, United States Code, that includes the following:

'(1) the status of the implementation of the plan required under 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 1005 of the Coast Guard Academy Improvement Act;

'(3) a study, or an audit if appropriate, of the process the Coast Guard Academy uses to—

'(A) identify candidates for recruitment;

'(B) recruit applicants in the application process;

'(C) assist applicants in the application process;

'(D) evaluate applications; and

'(E) make admissions decisions;

'(4) a determination regarding how a congressional nominations requirement in current law impacts diversity efforts of the Coast Guard Academy admissions process; and

'(5) recommendations for improving the process, including whether a congressional nominations process should be integrated into such process.

SEC. 808. COAST GUARD ACADEMY MINORITY OUTREACH TEAM PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the section 801 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, 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;

'(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) CLEERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the section 801 the following:

‘1905. Coast Guard Academy minority outreach team program.'
the program shall participate in military activities each month, as required by the Commandant, prior to attending Officer Candidate School.

(2) 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) 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) CO-OP EXPERIENCE.—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.

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, re-
Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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, 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 conference 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.

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 with 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.

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 represents a 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 coastlines 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 bill 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 gentleman 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 GARETT 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 process 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 cutters from icebreakers 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 by other members 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 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
moved over 9 metric tons of cocaine for the fiscal year 2019, the Coast Guard readdressing these threats and securing 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 gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. PLASKETT)

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. We owe 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, MEMBER 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: 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 to balance the budget.

There is something that is really important to point out: the men and women of the Coast Guard do an incredible job in protecting our shores and our coastal communities. They do an incredible job in protecting our seas; they are in charge of drug interdictions in the Caribbean Basin meet mission requirements.

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 of 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.

And 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 Transpor- tation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3409, the Coast Guard Authorization Act—bipartisan legisla- tion 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. We owe 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, MEMBER 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: 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 to balance the budget.

There is something that is really important to point out: the men and women of the Coast Guard do an incredible job in protecting our shores and our coastal communities. They do an incredible job in protecting our seas; they are in charge of drug interdictions in the Caribbean Basin meet mission requirements.
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.

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 the 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 the video that became available last week of the Coast Guard boarding a semi-submersible 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, 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 there were 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 man-hours.

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 terminate 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 unanimously a vote by the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the Senate won’t take 1¼ 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 would certainly support the reauthorization of 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 6,500 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 coast 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 Members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee 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 Colleges in District 20 to see the 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 advancing 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 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. 1684) 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. 884

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 item:

"§ 1127. Reporting of disaster-related assistance.

(1) Requiring significant Federal resources to support a multi-agency, multi-year restoration of infrastructure and commerce in affected communities.

(2) 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.

(3) Knowledge about disaster-related expenses will illustrate opportunities for reducing these expenses through efforts to reduce vulnerabilities to future natural disasters.

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.

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. 884.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 884, 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 us 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 2,800 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 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 GONZALEZ-COLON).

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON 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 appropriated.

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.

It is not lost on me 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 beneficiaries.

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. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I request 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 multyear 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 with disaster relief.

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 how the Federal Government is doing to help those affected by disaster.

I strongly urge all members to support this necessary and vital legislation.
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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,

SEC. 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 that crosses the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Indiana, in said bridge and its approaches thereto, and in land underneath or adjacent to such bridge and its approaches.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO HARMONY WAY BRIDGE ACT.

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. ROSEY 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, 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 public benefit of 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. ROSEY 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, would give me the ability 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 lay this 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, with a similar bill that is going to allow the States of 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 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. ROSEY 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. BUCHON 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. BUCHON).

Mr. BUCHON. 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. 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.

Mr. Chairman, 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. RODNEZ 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.
(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 tem. 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.

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 tem. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Graves. 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 in-scrutable 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 mechanism for the public to track agency disaster recovery efforts and the amount of assistance expended, on a quarterly basis.

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. 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 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. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman 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 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DeFazio. 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 Oregon. 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 amounts that are 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. 2289. 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. 3735) 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. 3735

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 the 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 the definition of such calls and prevent such calls from being made or sent (as the case may be) without consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is exempted by paragraph (1), (2)(B), or (2)(C) of section (b) of such section; and

(3) consumers can withdraw consent for such calls and text messages;

(4) evasion or evasion of such section is prevented;

(5) telephone numbers to record to demonstrate that such callers have obtained consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is uncorrected; 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 (B), by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) shall ensure that any exemption under subparagraph (B) or (C) contains require;

ments for calls made in reliance on the ex-

emption with respect to—

(i) the classes of parties that may make such calls;

(ii) the classes of parties that may call such calls; 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 require-

ment described in subparagraph (I) of such section, as added by subsection (a). To the extent such an exemption contains such a re-

quirement before such date of enactment, nothing in this subsection or the amendment made by this section shall be construed to require the Commission to prescribe or amend regulations relating to such require-

ment.

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, or in one case the making call 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 call without; and

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 Sec-

ond Report and Order with respect to making calls must demonstrate that, before making such call, the person appropriately checked the most recent update of the data-

base and the database reported that the number had not been disconnected; and

(C) that if the person makes the demo-


nstration 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 re-

turn 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 telephone call made by a subscriber or customary user of the telephone number to which the call is made, determined at the time when the call is made.''


(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 begin-

ning on the date on which the database des-

cribed 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 de-

termin the last date of permanent dis-

cision of which an automobile number. No-

thing 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 For-

futter 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:

"(5) No Citation Required to Seek For-

futter Penalty.—Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a viola-

tion made with the intent to cause such vio-

lation of this subsection.''

(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 by adding at the end the following:

"(5) 4-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 503(b), no forfeiture penalty for a violation of this subsection shall be determined or imposed against any person if the violation charged occurred more than—

(A) 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);'

"(B) if the violation was made with the in-

tent 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).'

"(C) if the violation was made with the in-

tent 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 pen-

alty 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 deter-

mined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an addi-

tional penalty not to exceed $10,000.''

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ROBOCALLS AND TRANSMISSION OF MISLEADING INFORMATION VIOLATIONS.—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:

"(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 sections (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 the preceding five calendar years, for each of the following categories:"
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“(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).

(iv) The number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsection (b), and details of each such citation.

(v) 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.

(vi) 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.

(vii) The number of forfeitures, including any proposed forfeitures, that are the result of such subsections, and of which such a forfeiture penalty or criminal fine was collected.

(viii) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

(ix) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service that discount lawful, short duration calls to the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution to increase the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

(x) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service to the total number of calls made in violation of subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

(xi) The amount of forfeitures or criminal fines collected, during the preceding calendar year, by the Commission or the Attorney General for violations of such subsections.

(xii) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution to increase the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

(xiii) An analysis of barriers to the implementation required in subsection (a), the Commission shall prescribe regulations in order to decrease the total number of calls to the total number of calls made in violation of subsection (a), and make publicly available on its website, a report on the implementation of subsection (b), which shall include—

(I) an analysis of the extent to which providers of a voice service have implemented effective call authentication technology, including the availability of necessary equipment and equipment upgrades that has impacted such implementation; and

(ii) an analysis of the extent to which providers of a voice service have implemented effective call authentication technology, as being implemented under subsection (b), in addressing all aspects of call authentication.

(xiv) V OICE SERVICE DEF INED.—In this section, the term ‘voice service’ includes

(A) a call made or a text message sent in violation of subsection (c); or

(B) a call or a text message for which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

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) require 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 shall—

(i) make findings on any burdens or barriers to the implementation required in paragraph (1), including—

(ii) for providers of voice service to the extent the networks of such providers use time-division multiplexing; and

(iii) for small providers of voice service and those in rural areas, alternative effective methodologies to protect customers from unauthorized calls during any exemption given under subparagraph (A)(ii). Such methodologies may use any additional line item charge to customers.

(k) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—Section 202 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 202), as amended by section 6, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) an analysis of the extent to which providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service are provided with no additional line item charge to consumer or small business customer subscribers for the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1); and

(2) UNAUTHENTICATED CALLS.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall prohibit subscribers from receiving unwanted calls from a caller using an unauthorized 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 Representa-

(iv) for providers of voice service to the extent the networks of such providers use time-division multiplexing; and

(v) for small providers of voice service and those in rural areas, alternative effective methodologies to protect customers from unauthorized calls during any exemption given under subparagraph (A)(ii). Such methodologies may use additional line item charge to customers.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE CALL AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission 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) require 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.

(3) 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.

(4) ACCURATE IDENTIFICATION.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall include guidance to providers of voice service on how 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 subscribers from receiving unwanted calls from a caller using an unauthorized number, through effective means of enabling the subscriber or provider to block such calls, with no additional line item charge to the subscriber; and

(6) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and no later than 1 year after the date on which 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 unauthorized 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.

(1) an analysis of the extent to which providers of voice service have implemented effective call authentication technology, including the availability of necessary equipment and equipment upgrades that has impacted such implementation; and

(ii) an analysis of the extent to which providers of voice service have implemented effective call authentication technology, as being implemented under subsection (b), in addressing all aspects of call authentication.

(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'text message' includes any service that is interexchange with the switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or 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

(3) STOP ROBOCALLS.—(a) INFORMATION SHARING REGARDING ROBOCALL AND SPAMMING 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:

(2) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—Section 202 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 202), as amended by section 6 and subsection (a) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—

(A) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(B) transmissions without limitations, 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.
such call back to the source of such call.

(2) PROTECTION FROM ONE-RING SCAMS.

SEC. 10. PROTECTION FROM ONE-RING SCAMS.
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such violation of such section (and laws of foreign countries prohibiting similar conduct); and

(4) CONSIDER.—As part of their benefit and potential sources of additional resources for the Federal enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section.

(c) ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(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 between States, in the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section;

(3) identify existing and potential interagency working group shall—

(1) refer a matter to the Attorney General;

or

(2) 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;

(c) 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).

(d) SCOPE.—The term "robocall violation" shall have the same meaning as in subsection (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).
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 and the actions taken by the registered consortium to coordinate with the Commission.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under section (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.

(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 through the registered consortium.

(4) The reason, if any, each voice service provider identified by the registered consortium for not participating in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(5) The reason, if any, 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) 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 ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the "Hospital Robocall Protection Group''.

(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. 227).

(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.

(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 through the registered consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRIVATE-LED EFFORT TO TRACE BACK.—The term "private-led effort to trace back" means the efforts by a 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" 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.

(B) PROVIDING 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 described in 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 in such section in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term "voice service'' 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

(f) INCLUDES—

(1) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) Providers of one-way voice over internet protocol services described in subsection (e)(4)(B)(ii).

(3) Consumer advocacy organizations.

(4) Hospitals.

(5) State government officials focused on combatting unlawful robocalls.

(6) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.

(7) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.
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 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 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 of 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 criminals. 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 physican under a 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 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.

The consumer 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 Poaching Robocalls 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 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, and I think we have all heard stories of how this legislation became a reality.

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, and I think we have all heard stories of how this legislation became a reality.

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.
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Americans depend on every day. So I think we have found the right balance here.

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 we 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 to find 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—a way for us to get around this effort.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

By taking all this into account, we can achieve the same kind of bipartisanship 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—a way for us to get around this effort.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

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. In an average day, 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
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.

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 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 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 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 am also pleased that H.R. 3375 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 $50 each.

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 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), vice chair of our committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I 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 Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman 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.
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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.
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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.
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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 cancer only 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 Chair 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 a federal response.

Madam Speaker, I also thank Representative DAREN 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 behalf of the House, 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 gentlewoman 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 support of this bill, and I look forward to enacting 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 affected 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 don’t belong.

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 gentlemwoman 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. Nation-wide, half of all calls to cellphones are robocalls. Many more, I urge my colleagues to support the 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 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yiel[d] 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. Nation-wide, half of all calls to cellphones are robocalls. Yesterday, in my staff meeting, our discussion of floor consideration of the StopPinging Bad Robocalls Act was literally interrupted by two different robocalls.

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 StopPinging Bad Robocalls Act. This bill ensures that consumers can block calls they receive 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 this 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 there is a fraudulent actor on the other line. Providers have no way to prevent 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.

According to testimony by Dave Summit of the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center, in 90 of their real hospital, they receive 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 complaints.

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 robocall 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. Madam 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, Ms. BULIRAKIS, Mr. VAN DEWE, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WALLBERG 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. JOHN- son, 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. BUR- gess 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. MCENNERY 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 his timely 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 CTIA, The Wireless Association; NCTA, The Internet & Television Association; Charter Communications, and Verizon.


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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKERS 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 occurs.

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 issue 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 impersonation 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 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, which the Committee on Energy and Commerce approved by a unanimous vote of 48-0, will help secure important protections for all Americans.

Robocalls are an ever-increasing plague. Last year, Americans received an estimated 47.8 billion robocalls. They harass us, disrupt our personal lives, and make it more difficult to communicate with family, and interfere with important communications. Many of these annoying automated calls are to sell products or to collect debts. They also enable scammers to enter our homes. Truecaller found that consumers had lost an estimated $10.5 billion to phone scams, 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 once and for all. Verizon has already begun implementing call authentication and texting that uses deceptively spoofed calls, including calls from scammers. The bill will also help get rid of loopholes in order to stop robocallers from gaming 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 will still be more work to be done, but this 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 bill.

We hope this is the first of several positive steps that Congress will take.”

AARP: “AARP commends Chairman Palone, 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 the 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, Ranking Member Lenta, and Ranking Member Latta 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, Ranking Member Lenta, Ranking Member Latta, and Ranking Member Doyle for their bipartisan commitment to combat illegal robocalls and protect consumers, and we thank Committee Leadership for tackling this important issue. We look forward to working on getting robocall legislation renewed.”

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

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT STopping BAD ROBOCALLS

(From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019)

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING H.R. 3375, THE STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

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 Fraud Watch; National Lending Law Legal Aid & Defender Association; National Rural Social Work Caucus; Public Citizen; Public Knowledge.

Center for Democracy, Alabama; The Alabama Appleseed Center for Law & Justice; Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AKPIRG); Center for Economic Integrity; Arizona 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; California Privacy Rights Clearhouse, California; Public Good Law Center, California; Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, California; Foundation for Natural Law Foundation, California; Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco/Consumer Advocacy; Funeral Consumer Alliance of Connecticut, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Rights Project, District of Columbia; Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Florida; Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection, Florida; Florida Silver Hair Senior Citizens, Florida; Independent Party of Florida, Florida.

Mid-Pinellas Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Florida; Funeral Consumers Alliance of Georgia, Georgia; Green Forest CDC, Georgia; Georgia Watch, Georgia; Woodstock Institute, Illinois; Digital Privacy Alliance, Illinois; Western Illinois Area Agency on Aging, Illinois; AARP 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; Mississipi Center for Justice, Mississipi; Montana Organizing Project, Montana.

New Jersey Citizen Action; Legal Services of New Jersey; Empire Justice Center, New York; New York Legal Aid Project; Public Defenders Fund; New York; Financial Protection Law Center, North Carolina; Oregon Legal Guides; Oregon Consumer League; SeniorLAW Center, Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania Public Interest Research Group, Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania Attorney General; 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 Justice Commission, Texas A&M University; Family Violence Prevention Services, Texas; AAA Fair Credit Foundation, Utah; Virginia Citizens Consumer Advocacy Center; Virginia Public Broadcasting Network; Washington; Mountain State Justice, Inc., West Virginia; West Virginia Center for Budget and Policy; WV Citizen Action Group, West Virginia; National Association of State Workforce Agencies.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS

(From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019)

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING H.R. 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 STopping BAD ROBOCALLS

(From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019)

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING H.R. 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 STopping BAD ROBOCALLS

(From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019)

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING H.R. 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.
they can appear to take on existing phone lines. The federal government as well as multiple large telecommunications corporations are equipped with information on these robocallers and the groups 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.”

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. 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 calls 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 outweigh 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 exactions of the stress that families are challenged with.

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. 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 calls 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 outweigh 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 exactions 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 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.

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 CO-ORGANIZATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE NHIS WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH ON AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER.

Section 409C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “and toxicology,” and inserting “neurobiology, genetics, genomics, psychopharmacology, developmental psychology, behavioral psychology, and clinical psychology,”; 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, interventions, and treatments.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “cause” 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 “disabilities’’; 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 underserved, 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. 280d) 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 “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. 280c-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 all that follows through “disabilities.”
autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities across their lifespan;”; 

(2) in subsection (b), 

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities across their lifespan;”; 

(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”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “autism spectrum disorder and” after “individuals with”;

(A) in subsection (e), 

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “across their lifespan before” and “ensure” and 

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “across their lifespan” after “other developmental disabilities”;

(B) by redesigning 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) IN Underserved Area.—In this paragraph, the term ‘underserved area’ means—

(i) a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 338(b)(3));

(ii) an urban or rural area designated by the Secretary as an area with a shortage of personal health services (as described in section 338(h)(3)(A));

(3) in subsection (f), by inserting “across the lifespan of such individuals” after “other developmental disabilities”; and 

(4) in subsection (g), by striking “2019” and inserting “2024.”

(c) INTERAGENCY AUTISM COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 399EE of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280–3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Autism CARES Act of 2014” and inserting “Autism CARES Act of 2019”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A), (B), (D), and (E), by striking “Autism CARES Act of 2014” 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 Education, Labor, and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a report concerning the health and well-being of individuals with autism spectrum disorder.”;

(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) by amending 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 the impact 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—

(1) community-based behavioral supports and interventions;”;

“(E) nutrition, recreational, and social activities; and 

“(F) recommendations that seek to improve health outcomes for such individuals, including across their lifespan, by addressing—

(ii) screening and diagnosis of children and adults;”;

“behavioral and other therapeutic approaches;”;

“(iii) primary and preventative care;”;

“(iv) communication challenges;”;

“(v) aggression, self-injury, elopement, and other behavioral issues;”;

“(vi) premature mortality;”;

“(vii) medical practitioner training; and 

“(z) caregiver mental health.”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399EE of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280–4) 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 “$46,000,000 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.

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
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of 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. FALLONE. 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 bill.

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. FALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the principal author of the bill.

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. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Dr. BURGESS; and my deep gratitude to the Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee: $296 million annually to 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.

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 FALLONE, 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 whole-hearted 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.

It 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

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.
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 constitutionally 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 council, IACC, mandating 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. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, IACC has a strategic plan that is updated every year, so there is no duplication of autism, 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.”


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 1 in 34 in the United States, in my state 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.

Being faced with 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 then. Today, 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 personally moving story, readers must read about how 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 people like the Gallagher family research and develop new programs and sharing best practices. The bill authorizes 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, and Advocacy.

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 known experts in autism research and development, 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 environmental 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 Ledbetter, 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 ones at UCSD 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 support the idea that 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, personal interventions, nutrition and recreational and social activities, personal safety and more.


The legislation extends the Autism CARES Act for 5 years, and that is very, very important. The other very important bookend is that the bill funds research at the NIH to study 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.

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 study 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.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Eshoo), chairwoman of our Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. 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 study 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.

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 study 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.

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 study 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.

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.
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 detect 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 Healthcare 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 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 do not 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.

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 help 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 colleagues 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. WALORCH. 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. 290v–3) is amended as follows:

“SEC. 2904. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.

“(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. 290ii–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 insert 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move 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 to families with children 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 improving 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 the ways that are most important to care. 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 homes for those who are struggling.

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. In addition, many American caregivers 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 these 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 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 worker shortage by training respite providers. I am thrilled to be here today to continue building on Lifespan Respite Care’s successes and reach even more family caregivers.

Mr. Speaker, family caregivers are a critical part of the long-term services and systems 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 $70 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 this important role, only 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 it comes to the needs of the 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 help launch the CareBreaks program which helps family members caring for an individual of any age access respite when they have nowhere else to turn.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that 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 are further 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 mom 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 important leadership on this bill. And, 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 important leadership on this bill. And, Mr. Speaker, our family caregivers are truly unsung heroes.

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 approach 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 gentleman 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 an 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.

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 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 for caregivers and their 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, most 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. 3299, 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. 3299) 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]
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Table of Members Voting Yea, Nay, Not Voting]

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the previous order was suspended.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that question the vote was announced.

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

[Further discussion]

NAYS—198

[Members listed]

[Further discussion]

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Table of Members Voting Yea, Nay, Not Voting]

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that question the vote was announced.

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

[Further discussion]
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
Aderhold
AgUILAR
Allen
Alfred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Azar
Babin
Balduin
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barrajan
Beatty
Bera
Bernie
Beyer
Biggs
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brooks (NY)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Buchon
Burchett
Burgess
Butko
Butterfield
Byrne
Caldwell
Cárdenas
Carr
Carson (TN)
Carson (GA)
Carson (MD)
Carson (NV)
Carson (NM)
Carson (OH)
Carson (NM)
Carson (NM)
Caster (FL)
Caterwright
Case
Cassett (IL)
Cassett (FL)
Cassett (CA)
Chabot
Chesney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis (KS)
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Upton
Walker
Wallberg
Walden
Walker
Walker
Walders
Walden
Welch
Weber (TX)
Weber (FL)
Weber (TX)
Warsaw
Watters
Watters
Weigand
Weigand
Wells
Willis
Witman
Wright
Wyatt
Wyatt
Wynton
Wyunt
Wright
Wynn
Wynn
Wynn
Wyman
Wynn
Wyson
Xavier
Xavier
Xavier
Yoho
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 result 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 rollover No. 501.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollover 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. DELGAIDO). 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 rules and pass the bill, as amended, for which 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.

AFFIRMING THE VALIDITY OF SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED AND INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY ANY STANDING OR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY 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 investigation 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 and investigations 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 25 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 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) an 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. 116-108) 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.

PROTECTING 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 apply similarly to 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 601(b) of such Code and the time prescribed by section 601(b)(2)(A) of such Code for filing the 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), 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) AMENDMENTS, ETC. RESTRICTED TO DOUBLE MARRIED COUPLES.

(1) The period of limitation prescribed by section 6511(b)(2) of such Code shall not apply only with respect to amendments of returns involving the return of tax, and claims for credit or refund, relating to a change in the marital status of the taxpayer under section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of the individual.

SEC. 3. RULES RELATING TO ALL LEGALLY MARRIED COUPLES.

(a) In General.—In the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in section 21(d)(2)—

(A) by striking “HIMSELF” in the heading and inserting “SHE”;

(B) by striking “any husband and wife” and inserting “any married couple”; and

(2) in section 22(e)(1)—

(A) by striking “husband and wife who live” and inserting “married couple who live”;

(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(2)(b)(5)(C), by striking clause (1) and inserting the following new clause:

“(1) 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”;

(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 125—
(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” and inserting “married couple makes”;
(7) in section 165(b)(4)(B), by striking “husband and wife” and inserting “married couple”;
(8) in section 170(b)(4), by striking “a husband and wife filing” and inserting “individuals or mother who files”;
(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—
(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 subparagraph (C), by striking the following new subparagraph:
“(C) TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY INCOME.—In applying subparagraph (A) with respect to amounts 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” and inserting “a married couple”;
(16) in section 1272a(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”; and
(B) in section 1316(c)(1)(A)(i), by striking “a husband and wife” and inserting “married couple”;
(19) in section 241(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, or the purpose 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 or the gift 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 251(c), over such interest. For purposes of this section, the individual shall be considered as 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 first 2 years after the calendar year.”;
(21) in section 2514—
(A) by striking “Where a husband and wife enter” and inserting “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 5513(d)(2), by striking “husband and 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 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 “executor or administrator” and inserting “the decedent’s executor or administrator”;
(ii) by striking “with respect to both him” 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, the individual’s 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’s spouse, and all payments, credits, refunds, or other repayments made or allowed with respect to the separate return of either the individual or the individual’s spouse 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”;
(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 609(a), by striking “of husband and wife having” and inserting “reporting”; and
(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), by striking “return filed by husband and wife” and inserting “return”;
and
(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.”;
(32) 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.—
(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”; (D) in section 68(f)(4), by striking “his” both places it appears and inserting “the individual’s”; (E) in section 106(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, His Spouse, and His Dependents” and inserting “and the Employer’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), by striking “his” both places it appears and inserting “the employee’s”; (I) in section 119(d)(5)(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 120(b)(2), by striking “himself” and inserting “the individual’s self”; (K) in section 213(c)—(i) by striking “his” and inserting “the death of the taxpayer”; 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” and inserting “the death of the taxpayer”; (M) in section 213(d)(7), by striking “he” and inserting “the taxpayer”; (N) in section 217—(i) by striking “his, his spouse, or his dependents” in paragraph (2) and inserting “or the spouse or dependents of such member”; (ii) by striking “his” in paragraph (3) and inserting “the member’s”; (J) in section 217(i)(3)(A), by striking “his”;(F) 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”;

(E) in section 424(d)(1), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (F) in section 6012(a)(1)—(i) by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (J) in section 129(b)(1), by striking “himself” and inserting “the individual’s self”; (K) in section 3402(l)—(i) by striking “he” each place it appears and inserting “the individual’s”; (L) in section 4905(a), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (F) in section 7448(a)(8), 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 6103(e)(1)(A), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (BB) in section 2032A(e)(10), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; and (CC) in section 2053(b)—(i) by striking “his estate and inserting “the decedent’s surviving spouse”; (ii) by striking “his” and inserting “the decedent’s surviving spouse”; (DD) in subsections (a) and (b)(6) of section 2056, by striking “his” and inserting “the decedent’s surviving spouse”; (EE) in section 2233(b)—(i) by striking “or his heirs or assigns” or such person (or his heirs or assigns)” in paragraphs and inserting “or the donor’s heirs or assigns” or such person (or such person’s heirs or assigns)”;

(iv) by striking “him” in paragraph (2) and inserting “the donor”; and (v) 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(d), by striking “his” and inserting “the donor’s”; (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 3308(c)(5)—(i) by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; and (Z) in section 63(f)(4), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (K) in section 63(f)(4), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (L) in section 6012(a)(1)(A), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (M) in section 213(d)(7), by striking “he” and inserting “the taxpayer”; (N) in section 217—(i) by striking “his, his spouse, or his dependents” in paragraph (2) and inserting “or the spouse or dependents of such member”; (ii) by striking “his” in paragraph (3) and inserting “the member’s”; (O) in section 217(i)(3)(A), by striking “his”;

(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” and inserting “such person’s spouse”; (LL) in section 604(c), by striking “his” both places it appears and inserting “the individual’s”; (MM) in section 6103(e)(1)(A), by striking “him” and inserting “the individual”; (NN) in section 7448(a)(8), by striking “his” and inserting “the individual’s”; (OO) in subsections (d), (m), and (n) of section 7448, by striking “his” each place it appears and inserting “such judge or special trial judge”; and (QQ) in section 7448(c)—(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(c)(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.
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” printed 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.

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 is designed to 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 means 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 legalized 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.

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 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 Federal tax provisions respecting same-sex 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 the fact that California, 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 the 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 support of 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 the language in 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. CHU) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of the Promoting Respect for Individuals’ Dignity and Equality (PRIDE) Act, which I have been privileged to colead with Congresswoman CHU.

This bill, as I am sure you have all heard, 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 of this bill because this year, 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 is reflective of the law of the land, and 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 children 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 our 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 in bringing this bill to the floor, 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 as 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.

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. 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.

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 of the movement to marry 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 his term may continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

(c) 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.—(1) 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 entity 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.

(2) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Contract authority under paragraph (1) 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’.

“(b) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—(1) AMOUNTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO TREASURY BONDS.—There shall be credited to the Fund the amounts transferred under section 4 of such Act.

“(2) FOR 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 amount credited under such section for the payment of interest or principal on a loan under section 3 of such Act.

“(B) INTEREST.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘interest’ includes points and other similar amounts.

“(C) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts credited to or deposited in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

“(D) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund are available without further appropriation to the Pension Rehabilitation Administration 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(f) of such Code) and which—

(i) are in critical and declining status (within the meaning of section 412(b)(6) of such Code and section 4341(b)(6) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act) as of the date of 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 vested participants which is less than 2 to 5; or

(iii) are insolvent for purposes of section 418E of such Code as of such date, 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 of 1, the numerator of which is the current value of plan assets (as defined in section 203(g) of such Act) and the denominator of which is current liabilities (as defined in section 431(c)(6)(D) of such Code and section 305(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 information and data on which the decision to make the loan was based.

(b) LOAN AUTHORIZED BEFORE PROGRAM DATE.—Without regard to whether the program authorized under subparagraph (A) is in effect, a plan that meets the requirements of (A)(i) and (ii) of subsection (a) may apply for a loan under this section before 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.

(c) LOAN TERMS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms of any loan made under subsection (a) shall be—

(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));

(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)); 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 4018E 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); and

(iii) the plan sponsor shall agree to 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)(1)(A)(ii) thereof.

(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 insolvent 25-year-period description in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1) or, in the case of a plan which is already insolvent, to emerge from insolvent within and avoid insolvency for the remainder of such period; and

(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 insolvent 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 or entity to which any annuity contracts under subparagraph (B) or to implement a portfolio described in paragraph (3)(C) (or a combination of the two) sufficient to provide benefits 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 in which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 423(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. 1055(f)(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 be payable during the period of the suspension.

(3) 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, on a schedule of 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 paragraph (B) and paragraph (2), the amount of any loan under subsection (a) shall be, as demonstrated by the plan sponsor on the application, sufficient to purchase annuity contracts 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 in which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 423(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. 1055(f)(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.

(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 shall submit a loan application and the application for financial assistance jointly to the Pension Rehabilitation Administration and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation informing the directors 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 approved unless the Director, 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 the Administrative Procedure Act. The Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall make the loan pursuant to any application promptly after the approval of such application.

(A) CERTIFICATION.—The plan sponsor of any plan with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 423(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 section 4261(d) of such Act to the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall provide for such plan sponsors to use the simplified application under subsection (b)(2)(B).

The plan sponsor may elect at the time of the application to repay the loan principal, along with the remaining interest, on a schedule of 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.

(2) LOAN AMOUNT AND USE.—

(1) AMOUNT OF LOAN.—

(A) In general.—Except as provided in paragraph (B) and paragraph (2), the amount of any loan under subsection (a) shall be, as demonstrated by the plan sponsor on the application, sufficient to purchase annuity contracts 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 in which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 423(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. 1055(f)(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.

(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 shall submit a loan application and the application for financial assistance jointly to the Pension Rehabilitation Administration and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation informing the directors 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 approved unless the Director, 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 the Administrative Procedure Act. The Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall make the loan pursuant to any application promptly after the approval of such application.

(A) CERTIFICATION.—The plan sponsor of any plan with respect to which a suspension of benefits has been approved under section 423(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 section 4261(d) of such Act to the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall provide for such plan sponsors to use the simplified application under subsection (b)(2)(B).

The plan sponsor may elect at the time of the application to repay the loan principal, along with the remaining interest, on a schedule of 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.
participants and beneficiaries on behalf of whom annuity contracts are purchased or who are covered by a portfolio under this paragraph.

(c) COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 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 the coverage, interest rates, and timing of 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.

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON STATUS OF CER-}

(3) by adding at the end the following new

(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 after the close of 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—

(F) BILLS OF LOANS PURCHASED PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.—

1. COORDINATION WITH TAXATION OF UNRE-}

(i) by applying section 4219(c)(1)(D) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as of the first day of such plan year, and

(b) 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:

(iii) 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.

(g) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE RULES, ETC.—The Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration shall, in consultation with the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means of the Senate, a report identifying any plan that—

(3) the Director has determined is no longer reasonably expected to be able to—

(i) DETERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL LIABIL-

(b) AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYER RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—In the case of a plan which receives a loan 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—

(e) COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 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 the coverage, interest rates, and timing of 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.

SEC. 5. COORDINATION WITH WITHDRAWAL LI-

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

(iii) indebtedness with respect to a multiem-

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (i); and

(b) AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYER RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Section 305 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 105) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(1) by striking the first period preceding such plan year, and

(c) by striking the period at the end of clause (i)(1) and inserting “; or”, and

(iii) 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.

(j) CALCULATION OF 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—

(H) BILLS OF LOANS PURCHASED PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.—

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. 609A. REPORTS OF PLANS RECEIVING PENSION REHABILITATION LOANS.

SEC. 5. COORDINATION WITH WITHDRAWAL LI-

(b) 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:

(i) 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 REQUIRE-

(i) by applying section 4219(c)(1)(D) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as of the first day of such plan year, and

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) 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,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) 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,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) 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,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,

(2) the market value of the assets of the plan (determined as provided in paragraph (1) of the last subsection) as of the last day of the plan year preceding such plan year,
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 shall, in a single application under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019, and which is applying for a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 and which is insolvent for purposes of section 412 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1322), without regard to paragraph (2) thereof, indicate the amount of any financial assistance granted under this subsection as a lump sum if, at the time of approval, or at the beginning of the plan year in which the plan is approved for a loan under section 4(a) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019, the plan will still become (or re-main) insolvent within the 35-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 in accordance with section 4(c) of the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019 and provide guidance, under such rules or guidance not later than 90 days after the application is received for financial assistance under this subsection, to the plan sponsor regarding such determinations and demonstrations, the corporation shall prescribe any such rules or guidance as if the plan sponsor submitted such application in accordance with section 4(d)(2) of such Act. The application for financial assistance under this subsection shall be determined 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 re-main) insolvent within the 35-year period beginning on the date of the loan.

"(3) The information contained on the most recent annual return under section 6058 and actuarial report under section 6059 of the plan, and 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 collective bargaining reports, and such information concerning the plan as the corporation, in consultation with the Director of the Pension Rehabilitation Administration, may require.

(b) Penalties.—Subsection (c) of section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (c)(3)(B)(v) and substituting therefor—

"(1) by inserting "6059A (relating to reports of plans receiving pension rehabilitation loans)" after "deferred compensation"; and

"(2) by adding at the end the following:

"In the case of a failure under section 6059A, after "$25;" and

"(3) by striking the case of failures under section 6059A as "$25;" and

(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:

"6059A. Reports of plans receiving pension rehabilitation loans."
thereof shall only be treated as met if there is a certification that, as of such date, the period of disability 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 (D), any plan amendment described in clause (ii)(I) or (ii)(II) shall cease to be an eligible designated beneficiary as of the date the individual reaches majority and any remainder of the plan in effect on the date described in paragraph (D) shall be distributed within 10 years after such date.

(‘’IV’’ EXEMPTION OF DOUBLE 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 subsection, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to distributions with respect to employees who die after December 31, 2021.

(B) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements between employer representatives and 1 or more employees 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 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) December 31, 2019, or

(ii) December 31, 2021

For purposes of clause (1)(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 subsection 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 3(32) 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 any 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, an annuity means with respect to an employee, an annuity—

(i) which is a commercial annuity (as defined in section 4980B(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

(ii) under which the annuity payments are made to the life of the employee or over the joint lives of such employee and a designated beneficiary (in accordance with the regulations prescribed in section 401(a)(9)(A)(ii) of such Code (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act) 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) except as provided by the Secretary of the Treasury in regulations thereunder.

(5) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS 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 section 401(a)(9) of such Code; or

(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 (A) takes effect 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 is amended by striking “$535” and inserting “$435”.null
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. The extended 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 offer pensions for the 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 offered 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 more 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 billions of dollars.

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 130 of them, can apply for a government-authorized ‘‘blank check.’’ 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 pay promised 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—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 had 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).


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.

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.

Ma. 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 conjures up words like recovery, but 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 pension actuaries 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 hard and retired 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 hard, 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,

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 who receive the pension they have earned through years of hard work. On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, its retirees and working families, I urge you to pass 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 a retirement for millions of Americans and their families. Now, through no fault of their own, the earned pension benefits of millions of retirees threaten to be lost 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 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 PBGC have been buffeted by economic turbulence over the decades—from deregulation to financial distress and solvency. Importantly, the plans and provide a path forward for 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 retirees 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 was 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 distress and solvency. Pension liabilities and legislation are extraordinarily complex, none more so than multiemployer and Taft-Hartley pension plans. They are both unique in their structure, and the bills 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. The 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 forward-looking 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. As members of the workforce working American's are already anxious about an economy where one job seems to 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 American's. 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, 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, 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 the economic impact of these plans failing is too important of an issue to play politics with. I and others have been working to cross 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 hard-working 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 won’t blow 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? Unfortu-
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 who are trying to help in H.R. 397, and that is the reason 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 taxpayers.

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 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. NORTON). Mr. NORTON. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Chairman NEAL and Chairman SCOTT for bringing this bill to the floor, and my colleague, Dennis DINJELLI, and Dr. ROE who sat on the subcommittee 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 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, but the House 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.

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 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 Democrat plan 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 do not go to stand for this. To my surprise, the Democratic solution is Big Government and billions of dollars in new costs. Again, this bailout is an unsavory policy. It has a zero chance in the Senate, and I recommend a “no” vote.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, could you advise as to how much time is still available on each side.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam 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. 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. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 397. The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pension Act is nothing but 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. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.
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Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that retirees and workers in multiemployer 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, would simply reframe the 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 union 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.


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, Congress permitted underfunded multiemployer pension plans to cut the earned pensions of current and future retirees. Congress’ action broke the promise of the Social Security 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.

We commend the bipartisan group of sponsors on their bill’s proposed creation of a Pension Rehabilitation Administration, within the Treasury Department that will offer low-cost loans to qualified underfunded multiemployer pension plans. Plans would have up to thirty years to pay earned retiree benefits, the loan proceeds would be used to 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 fund interest, and accumulate sufficient funds to repay the loan principal when due. The loan proceeds would be used to re-pay the loans, and the plan would have to demonstrate that the loan would enable the plan to remain solvent, pay all retiree benefits and fund interest, and maintain the same level of benefit adequacy when due. During the loan period, 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 venerated 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 pension benefits. 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 on our communities and their employers.

The working men and women whose retirement income security is at risk have not forgotten 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 failure of these plans. 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.

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 Feder al assistance offered to these troubled plans comes from the PBGC and only after the plan has already failed. Given the numbers, the PBGC’s multiemployer pension insurance program is projected to become insolvent by 2025.

The Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act would provide a viable 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. In the event that failure is certain, the troubled plans would have up to thirty years to prudently invest the loaned funds and would use the investment earnings to pay earned 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 fund interest, and maintain the same level of benefit adequacy 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.

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,

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Robert Martinez, Jr., International President.

SEIU, AFL-CIO, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Service Employees International Union.
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.

Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation

Pension Rehabilitation Administration

United Steelworkers

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 national 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 the workers who pay into these plans work together 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, 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 multi-employer 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 forced benefit cuts.

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 growth in the 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.

I 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 vote on the floor 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 write 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 misyery, and saves the taxpayers money.

In fact, according to the CBO, this bill, over 30 years, will cost less than $600 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), who shall have an unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

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 committee 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 have 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 with 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. Rita Lewis is one of 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 circumstantial 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
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. That is bad. That is absolutely wrong.

This bill, I think, doubles down on promises that fund these new promises that are actually unfunded. It 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 union workers deserve better. The companies in these plans deserve better.

I give my commitment for the Ways and Means Republicans to work with the trustees.

I understand: Why are promises to folks who have been one-third of the pension promises in a way similar to insurance companies making those same promises. For example, I don’t understand why we would have to wave money to unions worth only one-third of the pension promises made to workers who are working for a single company? Arent’ union workers just as important, and aren’t those promises just as important for them as the same promise.

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 call 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.

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 not a 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 stockholders. 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 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 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 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 100 percent funded.

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 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 1960s.

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
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 knows 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. But 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's a lot of people 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 the 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 what was going on yesterday 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 this.

I am not saying it is anybody's fault on their own. But, collectively, you have got to look at it. 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 way that I thought 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 financially that we don't like.

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 from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENTHAUER).

Mr. BLUMENTHAUER. 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 talk on that. This isn't the last word. We have things to do, but this is, however, the first step to get us there.
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 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.

Unless 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. 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—talk—from $2,600 to $1,922. 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 created 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), 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 is a false savings plan that胠 over gases 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 that caused the economic crisis.

And nothing for hardworking American families.

In 2017, this Congress passed a 1 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 hardworking, 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. Scozzie).

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 for 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. We 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, if that is not 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 truth is 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 add 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 large 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.

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. We will rely on the 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.


Hon. Kevin Brady,
Ranking Member, 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 Pension Plans Act (previously known as the Butch Lewis Act). The bill would essentially bail out $250 billion of 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 government pension plans.

Politically, this is not an easy issue for many offices. Every member wants to assure their constituents that he or she is doing everything to protect their retirement security. But there are four important considerations representatives should take into account before voting on this bill: 1) Existing policies aimed at preventing pensions shortfalls have failed; 2) Private sector workers are promised their pensions by their employers and their unions, not by the government and has failed to meet its obligations. Efforts at properly funding the PBGC and establishing higher standard multiemployer premiums significantly to increase PBGC revenues, requiring term limits for insolvent plans and introducing a sustainability test for new beneficiaries; 3) There are alternative ways to ensure workers receive most or all of their pensions without a taxpayer bailout if action is taken quickly; and 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 plans), increasing PBGC premiums, placing reasonable restrictions on growth assumptions, and giving workers a bailout 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. Opposition opposes this legislation and urges all members of Congress to oppose it.

All the best,

GARRETT BISS
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.

Chairman Hatch and Ranking Member Brown: As the Joint Select Committee on Multiemployer Pension Solvency considers proposals to address the multiemployer pension crisis we understand neither the proposals nor the underlying notions are 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 pension plans 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 Government and has failed to meet its obligations. Efforts at properly funding the PBGC and establishing higher standard multiemployer premiums significantly to increase PBGC revenues, requiring term limits for insolvent plans and introducing a sustainability test for new beneficiaries. 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 plans to freeze accrual of new benefits and switch employees to 401(k) plans when seeking assistance from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. Multiemployer pension plans do not follow this standard. Despite approaching insolvency, multiemployer pension plans continue to promise higher benefits 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 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 pay off unfunded liabilities. Allowing multiemployer plans a substantially larger time period has allowed the funding shortfall to snowball. As several participating employers went bankrupt or withdrew over time, multiemployer plans 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 understand PBGC doesn’t receive unlimited PBGC 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 would signal to employees that their union representatives sufficiently advocated to protect them, when in reality their unions have underfunded and underfunded their pensions. To avoid a repeat scenario, this situation must be recognized as a pension crisis, not business as usual with a flawed piece of legislation.

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.

GROVER G. NORQUIST
President, Americans for Tax Reform

NATIONAL TAXPayers Union

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 $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]nvestments of cash from the Treasury with few restrictions tend to charac-

ter as irresponsible, unsustainable and non-taxpayer action." Unfortunately, this is exactly what H.R. 397 does, by providing 30-year loans to failing MPPs with few guardrails for taxpayers or pensioners. 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. Prior to PBGC’s operations have been 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 cost 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. Treasury Department loans. NTU has outlined three problems before: require PBGC to more fully embrace risk pricing and other management tools to safeguard against liability surprises in the future, and ensure that 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 solving the MPP crisis than H.R. 397.

Similarly, 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 cost 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. Treasury Department loans. NTU has outlined three problems before: require PBGC to more fully embrace risk pricing and other management tools to safeguard against liability surprises in the future, and ensure that 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 solving the MPP crisis than H.R. 397.

Similarly, 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 cost 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. Treasury Department loans. NTU has outlined three problems before: require PBGC to more fully embrace risk pricing and other management tools to safeguard against liability surprises in the future, and ensure that 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 solving the MPP crisis than H.R. 397.

Similarly, 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 cost 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. Treasury Department loans. NTU has outlined three problems before: require PBGC to more fully embrace risk pricing and other management tools to safeguard against liability surprises in the future, and ensure that 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 solving the MPP crisis than H.R. 397.
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 tried to address 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.

Mr. 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 co-sponsor H.R. 397. This bill provides financial assistance to financially troubled multiemployer 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 about 10 million, mostly working-class, Americans across the country.

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 Freight 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 Guaranty 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 want 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 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 the first 5 years and 9 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 loan, 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 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 massively underfunded, failing pension plans and allows loan principal forgiveness if the plans can’t be repaid. This is unbelievable. This proves the majority hasn’t believed that these plans 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 plans, 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 willing the plans. I am willing to do that. I have been willing to do that 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. GARCIA 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 Representative 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 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 dire pensions problems 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 left unaddressed, 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 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 grandchildren, 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 pension benefits, 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 worried if something happened to him.”

Now that pension risks being slashed to the core.

Workers, retirees, and survivors like Sam, Kenneth, and Rita are now forced to pay for 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 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 this 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.

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 in bailout costs.

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.
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 the 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 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 food and 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 RUÍZ, 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.  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
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 medical conditions, medical infectious diseases), nurse practitioners, other nurses, physician assistants, licensed social workers, mental health professionals, public health professionals, dieticians, interpreters, and chaplains.” 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, checkpoint for 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 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 to report to Congress and the public 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.

DHHS continues to see adults fraudulently pretending to be 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 provider to help with emergency triage decisions.

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 complex physical exam; 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.

Finally, the myth 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 Customs and Border Protection 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. 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 such determinations have been 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 chaplains, 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 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 served our country honorably, and who 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 California (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 cosponsored.

The humanitarian crisis at the southern border is greatly worsened by the separation of children from their parents by border patrol agents.

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 detention facilities and treatment of children.

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 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 humane treatment of non-citizen adult 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, write to you letter today 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.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, it is really our responsibility to protect the health and safety of individuals in CBP custody, 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. CASTRO of Texas. 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 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 treatment any way to do it. 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. 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 Trans- port, 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.

The judge 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 position 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 screenings will 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 strengthens H.R. 3239 by continuing to promote 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:

SEC. 2. INITIAL HEALTH SCREENING PROTOCOL.
(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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec. 1</th>
<th>Short title; table of contents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 2</td>
<td>Initial health screening protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 3</td>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 4</td>
<td>Food and nutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 5</td>
<td>Shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6</td>
<td>Coordination and Surge capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 7</td>
<td>Training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8</td>
<td>Interfacility transfer of care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 9</td>
<td>Planning and initial implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 10</td>
<td>Compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 11</td>
<td>Inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 12</td>
<td>GAO report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 13</td>
<td>Rule of construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 non-governmental 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 care screenings and 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 independent 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 described in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(3) shall include:

(A) a physical examination;

(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.

(4) TIMING.—

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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 Standards for 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 medically 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 required by the consultation provided to a child, with a licensed emergency care professional with a background in pediatric care.

(B) RE-EVALUATION 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) PSYCHOLOGICAL AND MENTAL CARE.—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.

(4) CHAPERONES.—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—

(a) establish guidelines for the presence of chaperones for all detainees during medical screenings and examinations possible, with an in-person or video 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 relative if a parent or legal guardian is unavailable.

(b) DOCUMENTATION.—To ensure that health screenings and medical care required under this section are carried out in the best interests of the detainee—

(A) the Commissioner shall establish guidelines for and ensure the presence of chaperones for all detainees during medical screenings and examinations possible, with an in-person or video 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 relative if a parent or legal guardian is unavailable.

(h) 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—

(i) 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 screening and medical 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 disease.

(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.

(5) Privacy.—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 wellness 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 practical nurses, nurses, nurse practitioners, other nurses, physician assistants, licensed social workers, mental health professionals, public health professionals, dieticians, interpreters, and chaplains, shall be located on site to the extent practicable, or if not practicable, shall be available on call.

(6) 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) food products for all age groups that are nutritionally balanced and prepared to the same extent as the same types of food 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) three meals per day including—

(i) for each individual age 12 or older, a diet that contains not less than 2,000 calories per day; and

(ii) 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;

(B) in the case of a child who is under the age of 12, a menu designed to be age-appropriate.

(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 a safety or security concern 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 necessary.

(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 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 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 detained people, 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 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. INTERFACTOR TRANSFER OF CARE.

(a) TRANSFER.—When a detainee is discharged from a medical facility or emergency department, the Secretary shall ensure that the responsibility of care is transferred from the medical facility or emergency department to an accepting licensed health care provider of CBP.

(b) PROVIDERS.—Such accepting licensed health care provider shall review the medical facility or emergency department’s evaluation, diagnosis, treatment, and 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; and

(2) the implementation of this Act.

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 under 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; and

(2) as contradicting the March 7, 2014, Department of Homeland Security Standards of Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities, which includes a zero tolerance policy prohibiting all forms of sexual assault of individuals in U.S. Customs and Border Protection custody, including in holding facilities, during transport, and during processing; and

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. 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; and

(2) the implementation of this Act.

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 under 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; and

(2) as contradicting the March 7, 2014, Department of Homeland Security Standards of Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities, which includes a zero tolerance policy prohibiting all forms of sexual assault of individuals in U.S. Customs and Border Protection custody, including in holding facilities, during transport, and during processing; and

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.
(A) 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, care of detainees, including the care of children, and has been convicted of a sex crime or other offense involving a child victim; or
(B) a material misrepresentation to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including those 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 and voice or written interpretation services.

(2) CHILD.—The term “child” means a person under 18 years of age.

(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 or temporary 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.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

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 “;”.

Page 16, insert after line 10 the following:
(4) the degree of compliance with part 115 of title 8, General 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 596, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. Kuster) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may have or even 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. Jackson Lee).

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 want to make a distinction to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including those being subject to any penalties, fines, or other sanctions.

I am proud of my colleague, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, and the Judiciary Committee and the leadership of Congressman ZOE LOFGREN for putting together a comprehensive piece of legislation that alleviates 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 violence are not being fully implemented.

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.

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 CBP and DHS 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 C.F.R. 10.5 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 CBP. The report further requires the OIG to conduct routine 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 gentleman 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 gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman, 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 themselves or even 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
I rise to support the Kuster amendment, and I rise to support the underlying bill, H.R. 3239.

I thank my good friend Dr. RAUL RUIZ. We have talked about the gentleman from California for her leadership, and I thank you for your leadership for the people of New Hampshire.

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 mothers 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 gentleman 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 aggregate data on complaints of sexual abuse at CBP facilities on its website on a quarterly basis, excluding any personally identifiable information that would compromise the confidentiality of individuals who reported abuse.

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 and 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 dangerously 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 against other aliens 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 harmfully 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 DHS 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 working 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 such abuse. 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 required response following a certain 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 wrongly 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 gentleman 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.

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. Chair. 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 care: 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 forced standing in the cold, 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 people.

Once we pass this bill—and our other legislation for the children—we will call on Senator MCCONNELL to immediately take them up.
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REHABILITATION FOR MULTIELDERLY 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.

A recorded vote was taken.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 186, no 245, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—186

[Names of Representatives voting yea]

NOES—245

[Names of Representatives voting nay]

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The question is on the engrossment and amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Speaker pro tempore. 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 (Mr. HAALAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARBAJAL, Chair of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the Committee of the Whole, 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 by 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?

No.

Is not the amendment on the question in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause (1) 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 reconsider on H.R. 397, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 397, if ordered.

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this cynical, partisan motion to recommit.

Yesterday, we spoke with a united voice in support of our ally. Let's do it again today in support of these workers and vote down this motion.

I 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.

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, is a non-starter.

We scratch our heads and ask, Why does it feel like we are on the hook, while the wealthiest Americans are being bailed out. It is a backstop. It is a solution to the multiemployer pension crisis, taxpayers will pay the price.

We need legislation that pays into their entire working life. 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.

Take it from me, my friends, I know what it is like to be working 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 ayes 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—aye 264, noes 169, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

[NOES—264]

As above recorded.

[AYES—264]

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 264, noes 169, not voting 0, as follows:

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—aye 264, noes 169, not voting 0, as follows:

So the motion to recommit was rejected.
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 custody act 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 Speaker read the title of the bill

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to reconsider this bill. 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 reads 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 this House 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.

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 to the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol that their efforts to save others. If you remove CBP, you will cost lives.

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 (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.

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.
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 American 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, every child has the right to live in safety and dignity.

This vote is about the power of grace. This vote is about loving and protecting children.

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. 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 needed.

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 faith 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,” 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 inhume conditions, who are also parents and suffer lifelong trauma when someone else’s child dies under their responsibilities.
So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed from further consideration of H.R. 962, and on April 23, 2019, the House passed the bill by unanimous consent after the Speaker asked unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment (H.R. 3239) offered by Ms. LOFGREN.

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.

So the bill was passed.

The request of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 (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 of 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,

SECT. 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT.

Title XVI 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 purposes 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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2019–2024</th>
<th>2019–2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Spending (Outlays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate Effects</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains intergovernmental mandates?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains private-sector mandates?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1—Estimated Increases in Direct Spending Under H.R. 1365

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Budget Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Outlays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 Guam. The Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act has only begun to address the injustice suffered by those who lived through those dark days.

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.
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 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 mass graves 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 from village to village, looking for residents, 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.

Through 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 forgoes its vanished 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 its 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 direct reference 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 50 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, 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.

While we struggle on Guam under inequities and supplemental security income, coming to grips with our resolve to have our 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 all 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 grateful victor who assumed the responsibility for postwar peace, the passage of H.R. 1365 represents an 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. 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 direct reference to 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 S gambelluri, 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:

SEC. 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 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 in the City of Houston, to begin their journey to 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 of this effort. Mr. 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 my colleagues, as I have indicated, and also thank Congresswoman HAAALAND, 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 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 Senate, 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 Service 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, 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 Southwestern 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 three 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 the 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 properties 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 historic district. Emancipation Park Conservancy, the Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, the Freedmen’s Town Preservation Coalition, the Kohville 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 Vanburen 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 Advisory Committee, the Emancipation Park Conservancy, the Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, the Freedmen’s Town Conservancy, the Freedmen’s Town Advisory Committee, the Emancipation Park Conservancy, the Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, the Freedmen’s Town Preservation Coalition, the Kohville 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 Vanburen University.

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 want 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 Community Advisory Committee, the Emancipation Park Conservancy, the Independence Heights Redevelopment Council, the Freedmen’s Town Preservation Coalition, the Kohville 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 Vanburen University.

Mr. Speaker, I include letters in support of H.R. 434.

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 History, Arts, and Cultural Development. 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 Historical Research Center in Houston’s Historic Fourth Ward or Freedmen’s Town. Freedmen’s Town was established in 1863 as the destination of former slaves 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 a museum for the black community in 1876. By 1872 most of the students and teachers who were at the Bureau schools, which were closing, left them to attend the 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 to Emancipation Park. The 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 African Americans. His announcement 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 historical recognition for the role African Americans played in the building of the day’s Houston and the state of Texas. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit the area that 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 PRECINCT 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.” This new trail will follow the migration route taken by newly freed slaves from Galveston to the vibrant settlement of Independence Heights, as I said, was the first city, and we have already discussed the importance of Emancipation Park.
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 Cemetery Association. 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,

CATHRYNNE STEWART,
President Kohrville Community Association.

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
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 Sub-committee 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 Cemetery, 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 with 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,

DORIS ELLIS ROBINSON,
Founder and President of the Freedmen’s Town Preservation Coalition.
DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE:

The Houston Association of Black Psychologists (HABP’s) endorses H.R. 491, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, which had a hearing before the Subcommittee on April 2, 2019.

As a group of mental health professionals, HABP’s 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. By honorable Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, the 18th Congressional District.

The passing of this bill will result in the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which extends approximately 51 miles from the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, to the Fourth Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.

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 untold story of many African Americans towns and places. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit this area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,
TANYA DEBROE,
Executive Director, Emancipation National Historic Trail, Inc.

EMANCIPATION PARK CONSERVANCY,
April 2, 2019.

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Chairwoman—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands National Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

HON. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands National Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN HAALAND AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: I write to express strong support for H.R. 434, the 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, to the Fourth 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. It would also bring awareness highlighting the untold story of many African Americans towns and places. In addition, the revenue generated by people who come to visit this area and walk this trail will result in tourism dollars to the city of Houston and the adjoining areas.

Sincerely,
TANYA DEBROE,
Executive Director, Emancipation National Historic Trail, Inc.

EMANCIPATION PARK CONSERVANCY,
April 2, 2019.

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Chairwoman—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands National Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

HON. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands National Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN 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, to the Fourth Ward of Houston, home to 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 100 acres 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 places 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 Conservancy.

FREEDMEN’S TOWN ADVISORY COMMITTEE, Houston, TX, July 20, 2019.

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Chairwoman—House Subcommittee National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands National Resources Committee, 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, to the Fourth Ward of Houston, home to the 18th Congressional District.
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.

This period is more than just a story about the end of slavery. 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 similar 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 African American-owned businesses existed there.

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 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 became the center of opportunity for freed slaves throughout the Houston area.

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 Congresswoman J.C. Watts reintroduced 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, Congresswoman Jack Golum became known, the public reaction was shocked at Ms. Ferguson’s rejection. In the 1980s the daughters of the African American Union veterans of the Civil War. Mrs. 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 Park 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 celebration. 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. Support for H.R. 434 and support for 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.
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, National 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, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows the migration 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, 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.

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, 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 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 would result in the restoration of ten historic buildings in the city of Houston and the surrounding area. I urge you to pass this bill to create the Emancipation National Historic Trail.

Sincerely,

**SYLVESTIR 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 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. The Kinder Foundation purchased 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 end of their emancipation (“Juneteenth”). The Kinder Foundation also actively supports the Emancipation Park Conservancy to further program opportunities and development of 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, 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.

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-TCPC, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows a migration route taken by newly freed slaves 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, on June 19, 1865, to announce the freedom of the last American slaves. His announcement belatedly freed newly 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 freedom. They were 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 and cultural tourist dollars for this trail will benefit the City of Houston and the State of Texas.

Sincerely,

**NANCY G. KINDER,**
President & CEO,
**RUTHERFORD B. H. YATES MUSEUM, INC.**
Houston, TX,

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.

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, and how they dedicated themselves to prosperous merchant families from Houston’s early days. 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 programs.

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-TCPC, then to Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas. This trail follows a 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 recognized as “Sites of Memory” as part of the UNESCO Slave Route Project. Obtaining international recognition to the Jack Yates House and 4th Ward Cottage 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 the Emancipation 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 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. SHILLA 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 29, 2019.

Owing to my research to document historic sites and markers from Galveston to Houston Freemen’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:

“You 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 pass. 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 a written statement 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 honor you as a Texas historian.

Your written testimony is welcomed and appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Shella 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 Galveston, Texas area experienced an economic boom, where formerly one of the only communal spaces for Blacks in Houston. Over the years, Emancipation Park’s immediate surrounding areas 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 all people to live free.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to remove our nation’s founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to remove our nation’s founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free. Freedmen’s Town is contained within the boundaries of the Emancipation National Historic District and as such, contains significant sites 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 a Negro public school for black students. Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, the oldest African American church in Houston (1876) whereby Jack the Emancipated and others still reside in the historic boundaries of Freedmen’s Town just east of the TIRZ boundaries.

Through the project plan that directs TIRZ #14 to allocate its funds to historical 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, FREEDMEN’S TOWN,
Houston, TX, April 1, 2019.

Re H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act.

HON. DEB HALAND, Chairwoman, House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN HALAND: 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 referred to as the Fourth Ward.

Freedmen’s Town is the most historic and culturally significant area in the Fourth Ward. It was founded in 1872 to purchase 10 acres of park land to host Juneteenth Celebrations. Emancipation Park is the only 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 areas have 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 all people to live free.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to remove our nation’s founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to remove our nation’s founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.

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 referred to as the Fourth Ward.

Freedmen’s Town is the most historic and culturally significant area in the Fourth Ward. It was founded in 1872 to purchase 10 acres of park land to host Juneteenth Celebrations. Emancipation Park is the only 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 areas have 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 all people to live free.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail designation would bring national recognition to the period of time when our nation took significant strides to remove our nation’s founding documents attesting to the rights of all to live free.
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.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA,

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 in preservation, and resources in the preservation and interpretation of sites and buildings."

With headquarters in Washington, D.C., nine field offices, 17 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 stewards 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 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 where 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 businesses, financial institutions and venues flourished in Houston's Third Ward.

Emancipation Park is significant, not only as a ritual of remembrance, 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 TIPS 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. 116-135) on the resolution (H. Res. 118) 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 214 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 “Ya-Sle-ta 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 106-88; 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 application 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.

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 Tribes of Texas Equal Rights of the 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 tribunals were not crafted to address the subject 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 our 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 1981, the 1985, and the 1986 general orders 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 other federally recognized Tribes, 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, 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, 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 County, Deep East Texas Council of Governments, Hardin County Commissioners Court, City of...
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 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 Greater Cleveland Chamber of Commerce 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 urges 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,
Vice President & Chairman of the Board.

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 attorneys 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 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.

DETFCOG RESOLUTION—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, 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 in revenue to the region; and

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas and all Deep East Texas; 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.


THE HONORABLE DAPHNE SHIVNESS,
President.
RESOLUTION—12–19

STATE OF TEXAS. §. COMMISSIONERS COURT.

COUNTY OF HARDIN, §. OF HARDIN COUNTY, TEXAS.

BE IT REMEMBERED at a meeting of Commissions Court of Hardin County, Texas, held on this 26TH Day of March, 2019, on motion by L.W. Cooper, Jr., Commissioner Precinct No. 1, and second by . . . Alvin Roberts, Commissioner of Precinct No. 4, the following RESOLUTION was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas is a Federally recognized Indian Tribe located in Polk County, Texas and is committed to the economic development and creation of jobs within Polk and surrounding counties of Deep East Texas; and

WHEREAS, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas’ Nasikila 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 being a good community partner contributed $500,000.00 in donations after Hurricane Harvey to affected counties, and purchased 30 mobile home units; and

WHEREAS, United State Congressman Brian Babin (R-Woodville) has filed H.R. 759 to clarify that the Tribe in my district to simply have the right to enjoy and exercise the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas’ governing body 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 RESOLVED, 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.

Jude 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 2.
COMMISSIONER, ALVIN ROBERTS,
County Commissioner, Precinct 4.

Mr. BABBIN. 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?
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 caretaker 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 and 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 algorithm for pediatric head injury rithm, 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 special care 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 rise today in support of H.R. 776, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019.

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 critically important 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 injuries in children.

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 close 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 equal access to 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 the 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 critically important 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 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 one 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”;
(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “; including re-engaging patients who have not received recommended follow-up visits;”;
(C) by adding at the end the following:
“(5) performance evaluation services to enhance—
(A) 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—
(B) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and
(C) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:
“(B) develop, maintain, and publish on a publicly accessible website consumer-friendly materials detailing—
“(i) the uniform screening panel nomination process, including data requirements, standards, and the use of international data in nomination submissions; and
“(ii) 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
“(L) technological and other infrastructure to facilitate the adoption of,” before “the guidelines and recommendations”;

SEC. 3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORN AND CHILDREN.
Section 111 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); and
(D) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:
“(B) develop, maintain, and publish on a publicly accessible website consumer-friendly materials detailing—
“(i) the uniform screening panel nomination process, including data requirements, standards, and the use of international data in nomination submissions; and
“(ii) 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
“(L) technological and other infrastructure to facilitate the adoption of,” before “the guidelines and recommendations”;

SEC. 5. LABORATORY QUALITY AND SURVEILLANCE.
Section 1116 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–16) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a), by striking “may” and inserting “shall” and—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(ii) by striking “or will use” and inserting “or will use”;
(2) in subsection (b) to read as follows:
“(B) FUNDING.—In carrying out the research program under this section, 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 Newborn 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 the accuracy of screening technologies are piloted and ready for use”; and
(3) in subsection (c)—
(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “$8,000,000” and inserting “$11,900,000”;
(B) by striking “2019" and inserting “2024”;
(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:
“(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and
(B) by inserting after the semicolon at the end—
“(i) by inserting “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) PUBLIC MEETINGS.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall hold not less than one public meeting to obtain stakeholder input on the research program described in this section referred to as “NAM” (or if NAM declines to enter into such an agreement, another appropriate entity), agrees to conduct a study on the following:
“(1) The uniform screening panel review and recommendations for systems that would 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 (c) to read as follows:
“(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;
(B) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”; and
(2) by inserting “or will use” and inserting “will use”;

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) by inserting “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:
“(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and
(B) by inserting “will use” and inserting “will use”;

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.
Section 1117 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–17) is amended—
(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking “$11,900,000” and inserting “$31,000,000”;
(B) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”;
(C) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”; and
(2) in paragraph (2)—
(A) by striking “$3,000,000” and inserting “$29,650,000”;
(B) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”;
(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. 9. NATIONAL 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 enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences (in this section referred to as “NAM”) (or if NAM declines to enter into such an agreement, another appropriate entity) to conduct a study on the following:
“(1) The uniform screening panel review and recommendations for systems that would 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 (c) to read as follows:
“(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and
(B) by inserting “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(2) by inserting “or will use” and inserting “will use”;
(3) by striking “or will use” and inserting “will use”;
(4) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(5) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(6) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(7) by striking “or will use” and inserting “or will use”;
(8) by striking “or will use” and inserting “or will use”;
(9) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(10) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;
(11) by striking “will use” and inserting “will use”;

SEC. 10. 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. 11. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated...
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.

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 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 2002, 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.

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 2008, while other States were screening for more than 25 conditions.

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 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 2002, 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 20 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 overhaul healthcare savings 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, 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.

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.

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 and 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 being proposed 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 reads 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 Tatics Act of 2019” or the “FAST 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 a limb of a horse in such a manner that it can—

1. rotate around the leg or slide up and down the leg, so as to cause friction; or

2. strike the hoof of the horse, 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 spec- 

(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 the following:

“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

Despite regulations intended 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.—Sec- 

tion 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 Sec- retary 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 “ap- pointed” and inserting “licensed’’;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) 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, horse sales or auctions, for hire by the management of such events, for the purposes of enforcing this Act.

(3) 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 sub- section, the Secretary shall give a preference to persons who are licensed or accredited veterinarians.

“(E) Licensing of a person in accordance with the requirements prescribed under this
subection 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 designee under subsection 4).

(2) Not later than 30 days before the date on which a horse show, horse exhibition, or other event 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 on its behalf to conduct inspections under this subsection and assign the Secretary to conduct inspections at such show, exhibition, or 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.

(4) By adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) 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 become aware if an individual is in violation of this Act."

(5) By amending—

(c) of section 4 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1824) as follows:

(1) by striking "the Secretary" and inserting "that the horse is sore"; and

(2) by adding a new paragraph before subsection 3:

"A person who knowingly brings a horse to a show, exhibition, or sale or auction for any purpose of compelling 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. SCHRAIDER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHRAIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include additional 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. SCHRAIDER. 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 TEO 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 other chemicals 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.

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 leg 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 horse-shoe.

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 placed on the horse in the position I showed in the photo, 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 these 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 iron to intentionally blister the horse’s legs so that they would react to these chains in an exaggerated manner. I saw that.

In addition to outlawing action devices and packaging, 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, as-sign, and oversee impartial inspectors—hopefully veterinarians, among others—who can detect and diagnose horses that have been sored.

If we put an end to 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 abuse 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.


HON. KURT SCHRADER, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Representative SCHRADER and YOHU: The American Horse Council (AHC) thanks you for your leadership and the 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 exaggerated gait during competition. The scope of the bill is limited. It lays out a specific framework that focuses enforcement efforts on three horse breeds—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 organizations and state and local organizations, supports the PAST Act. Also, AHC members have sent hundreds of letters 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. SCHRAEDER. 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.
Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume.

Mr. CARTER. I yield 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 do this. This weighs about 10 pounds. 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 is the Gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLUMENAUER). 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 cosponsorship.

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 bill, 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 together, a lot more patience 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. There is too much of a 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 happening. I am 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 that we 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.

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. 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 inspectors are being dismissed, 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. The state of the Tennessee Walking Horse industry, again, is 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 Walking Horse and Kentucky Farm Bureaus, have come out in strong opposition to the PAST Act.

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 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, and the most of us in here are wearing wristwatch or, of you may just use your smartphones now, but you wear those all day, and that doesn’t hurt you. If there is a soreing 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 address every sport.

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. SCHRAILS. 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 their votes. It should go back to committee and be transparent.

Mr. SCHRADEL. 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 they 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 99 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 pre-vet 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 strongly endorses the unequivocal opposition from 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 can 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 Tennessee Walking Horse, and the folks who 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 to me.

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.

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 issue and the aggregate opposition from the United States (HSUS) and the Prevent All Soring Tactics of the Kentucky Farm Bureau and the Tennessee Farm Bureau.

The PAST Act professes to end soring by banning hoof pads and action devices. It does accomplish this goal. These horses are already incredibly regulated, more so than any other horse, including those that end in rodeo, those that race, and those that address every sport.

And if, indeed, most of the industry is complying, then they 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 99 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 pre-vet lives treated a lot of horses, would see a lot of limb problems, would see a lot of coffin bone problems in their feet.

The Tennessee Walking Horse is the most respected horse in the world. The industry and its shows maintain a 92-95% 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
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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 marred 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 horrific 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 Amendment Act. Authored by my Tennessean 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 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. The owner 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 use x-rays 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 safety guard was 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 short-sighted 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 k e g 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.

I want to thank my good friend, the veterinarian from Florida, 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. The owner 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 use x-rays 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 safety guard was 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 short-sighted 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 k e g 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.

I want to thank my good friend, the veterinarian from Florida, 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. The owner 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 use x-rays 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 safety guard was 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 short-sighted 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 k e g shoe. A horse doesn’t need that. This is to win a blue ribbon.
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, sorning 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 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.

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 the 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.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3299

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A motion to refer 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 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. YARMOUTH 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. YARMOUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1327, 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. YARMOUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3299, the PRIDE Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

| Components may not sum to totals because of rounding. |
| Component | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 | 2042 | 2043 | 2044 | 2045 | 2046 | 2047 | 2048 | 2049 | 2050 | 2051 | 2052 | 2053 | 2054 | 2055 | 2056 | 2057 | 2058 | 2059 | 2060 | 2061 | 2062 | 2063 | 2064 | 2065 | 2066 | 2067 | 2068 | 2069 | 2070 | 2071 | 2072 | 2073 | 2074 | 2075 | 2076 | 2077 | 2078 | 2079 | 2080 | 2081 | 2082 | 2083 | 2084 | 2085 | 2086 | 2087 | 2088 | 2089 | 2090 | 2091 | 2092 |
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By fiscal year, in millions of dollars</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2019–2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By fiscal year, in millions of dollars</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2019–2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.


1756. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Rural Electric Housing, Refinance, and Guaranteed Loan Program (RIN: 0575-AD19) 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- Region 6; Docket No.: FRL-9996-3; FRL-9996-5 Region 6] 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-9999-15-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.

1766. 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.

1767. 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 Energy and Commerce.

1768. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final 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.

1769. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Automatic Consent to Change Methods of Accounting to Comply with Section 866 (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.
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S.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 an Intent To Operate as a Secu-

1501(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 Agency’s final rule — Notice: Additional Preventive Care Benefits Permitted to be Provided by a High Deductible Health Plan Under Sec. 223 [No-

1501(c)(6) Organization] (TD 9875) (RIN: 1545-BN26) 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.

REPTS 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 during a subsequent Calendar day.

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. 3353. A bill to amend title 5, 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. H.R. 3531. 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 program to conduct a study to assess the outcomes of integrating a substance use disorder and behavioral health treatment local- izing benefits for certain individuals with permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be preference eligible for pur- poses of appointments in the civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHWAB, Mr. BACON, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY, Mr. PANETTA, and Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that children of certain permanently disabled or deceased vete- rans shall be preference eligible for pur- poses of appointments in the civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ARM STRONG, Mr. CUERBOS, Mr. CREN SHAW, Mr. BACON, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY, Mr. PANETTA, and Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3959. 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 purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. GORE, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. WEVER of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 3952. A bill to cap nonprofit Federal Spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the government, grow the econ- omy, and balance the budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medi- cines relating to preventive health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Michigan):

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish State and In- dian tribe grants for community colleges and historically black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Univer- sities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. A R R I N T O N , Mr. BABIN, Mr. BACON, Mr. BUSCHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAR- TER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLO- RES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCH- ANT, Mr. McCaul, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAY- LOE, Mr. VALES, Mr. WEZER of Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. RICE of South Caro- lina, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend title II of the So- cial Security Act to replace the windfall elimination provision with a formula equal- izing benefits for certain individuals with non-covered employment, and for other pur- poses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for him- self, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. BUTLER of Georgia):

H.R. 3955. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for the con- tinuing 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. 3956. A bill to establish in the States of North Carolina and South Carolina the “Nathanial ‘Nat’ Washington Power Plant” Reserve”, to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 3957. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at Highway-115, Coulee Dam, WA 99116, as the “Nathanial ‘Nat’ Washington Power Plant”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ARM STRONG, Mr. CUERBOS, Mr. CREN SHAW, Mr. BACON, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY, Mr. PANETTA, and Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3958. 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 purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.
Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means. By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. MULLIN): H.R. 3946. 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 to the Army Corps of Engineers for flood control projects and storm damage reduction projects in areas affected by flooding in areas around Charleston, Georgetown, 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. SWEECKERT, and Mr. ARRINGTON): H.R. 3946. A bill to provide further means of accountability with respect to the United States Code, to 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, 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 promote fiscal responsibility, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Oversight, 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. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIM, Mr. COX of California, and Ms. CHAKA): 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. COX of Virginia): H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to require that funds deposited be available for withdrawal in real time by 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. TITUS: H.R. 3955. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Fort Collins, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform. By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. BILIRIS of New York, 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.R. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multemployer Pension Plans, to the Committee on Rules. By Mr. BURGESS: H.R. Con. Res. 55. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the need to inform American consumers with more balanced purchasing information for prescription medication, 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. 529. 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. 530. 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 to take action 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. RIGGLEMAN: H.R. 3926. 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, Clause 5 The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

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, Clause 5 The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD: H.R. 3932. 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. LEVIN of Michigan: H.R. 3933. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 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. 3934. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 8 The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan: H.R. 3933. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 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. 3934. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
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 I, 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. RUDD:
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 I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. Article I, 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, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 3942.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution.

By Miss GONZALEZ-COLON 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 the following:
Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or 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 . . . 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.

H.R. 3987.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 3947.
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 . . . among the several States . . . .”

By Mr. MEEKS:
H.R. 3948.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, 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 Mr. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 3951.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SCHRIER:
H.R. 3952.
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. 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. SENSENBRINNER:
H.R. 3954.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TIPPETT:
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 I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Alabama:
H.R. 3957.
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. 3958.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 3959.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 3960.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. adipiscing:
H.R. 3961.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHRIER:
H.R. 3962.
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. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:
H.R. 3944.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 3963.
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. SENSENBRINNER:
H.R. 3964.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TIPPETT:
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 I, Section 8.

By Mr. norcoss:
H.R. 3957.
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. 3958.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 3963.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHRIER:
H.R. 3962.
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. SENSENBRINNER:
H.R. 3964.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TIPPETT:
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.
H.R. 1873: Mrs. Brooks of Indiana and Mr. Neguse.
H.R. 1887: Mr. Ted Lieu of California.
H.R. 1923: Mrs. DelBene, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. Lance of New Hampshire, Mr. Luetkemeier, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Gooden, Mr. Merchant, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Slotkin, and Mr. Kennedy.
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Mr. Luetkemeier, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Merchant, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Slotkin, and Mr. Kennedy.

H.R. 1923: Mrs. Brooks of Indiana.
H.R. 2167: Mr. Schiff.
H.R. 2170: Mr. Yarmuth.
H.R. 2171: Mr. Cohen. 
H.R. 2200: Mr. Gottheimer.
H.R. 2201: Ms. Lofgren.
H.R. 2203: Mr. Hake.
H.R. 2207: Mr. Culver.
H.R. 2208: Mr. Vargas.
H.R. 2209: Mr. Stehman.
H.R. 2210: Mr. engineers.
H.R. 2211: 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. 2417: Mr. Spanberger.
H.R. 2418: Mr. Raskin.
H.R. 2419: Mr. Engel.
H.R. 2420: Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Hayes, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Kilmer, and Ms. Wild.
H.R. 2421: Ms. Pingree.
H.R. 2423: Mr. Phillips.
H.R. 2425: Ms. Scanlon.
H.R. 2454: Mr. Pocan and Mr. Payne.
H.R. 2455: Mr. McGovern.
H.R. 2456: Mr. Huffman.
H.R. 2458: Ms. Neguse, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Calvert, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Mrs. Axne, and Ms. Schrier.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, 34. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Commission of the City of Mann, FL, relative to Resolution H-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.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:
Let us pray.
Eternal God, our shelter in the time of storms, we thank You for this land we love. We are grateful for its history, government, discoveries, knowledge, creativity, and vision. As our lawmakers seek to keep our Nation strong, may they act and speak in ways that make us proud to be Americans. Use our Senators to banish hate and bigotry, inspiring our citizens to live together in peace. May the words of our legislators’ mouths and the meditations of their hearts receive Your approval.
We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Blackburn). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.
The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak in morning business for 1 minute.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement will be a very big boon to the American worker. In my State, one out of every four American manufacturing firms export to Canada and Mexico. Seventy percent of these are very small or medium-sized businesses. More than 25,400 Iowans depend on manufacturing jobs.
By encouraging auto manufacturers to use more U.S. content in our cars and high-wage labor, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will help American workers compete on a level playing field and benefit from selling to two of our largest trading partners.

IOWA
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, on another matter, at the website ThisIsIowa.com, you can view a video of people visiting a fake real estate office in New York advertising modern, spacious properties. You can see the astonishment, then, on the faces of New Yorkers as they are shown beautiful, modern apartments, as well as homes near art museums and award-winning restaurants.
The prices and the neighborhood amenities seem too good to believe. The details are real and so are the job opportunities real. Only the location is not New York. The location is Iowa. Check it out on ThisIsIowa.com. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUDGET AGREEMENT
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, earlier this week the Trump administration and Speaker PELOSI reached an agreement to avoid a government funding crisis and provide for our Armed Forces. In the tough circumstances of divided government, they achieved the kind of deal that our national defense actually needs. The 2-year funding agreement will secure the resources we need to continue restoring the readiness of our Armed Forces and modernizing them to meet the 21st-century challenges that face our country.
As I mentioned yesterday, I always find it curious when our Democratic colleagues take the negotiating position that funding critical Pentagon missions and providing for the common defense are partisan Republican priorities. They act like only Republicans want a modern, ready military, such that our spending on national defense needs to be matched up with other spending in order to make it palatable to Democrats.
In one sense, my Republican colleagues and I will probably say, “guilty as charged.” Yes, we absolutely prioritize the national defense and the U.S. military. Yes, we prioritize keeping Americans safe. This is the fundamental obligation of the U.S. government.
Over the past 2½ years, it has been a Republican President who has sought to reverse the previous 8 years of decline in defense. It has been Republicans in Congress who prioritized rebuilding our national defense after the Obama administration’s neglect and atrophy. Thanks to the Trump administration’s tough negotiating, this deal will secure a larger increase in defense funding than in nondefense programs relative to current law. Better than parity for defense.
I doubt Members need any reminding about why these investments are so critical, but if they do, every day’s newspapers make the case loud and clear. For years, our adversaries have methodically stepped up their incursions and their aggressions. They want to chip away at the peaceful, rules-based international order that American leadership has helped to establish and preserve.
Between 2009 and 2018, the Chinese Communist Party increased its military spending—listen to this—by 83

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Mr. Buescher would be an impartial judge capable of setting aside personal opinion."

Despite his objective qualifications and all this praise, our Senate Democratic colleagues were not satisfied. Here was the bombshell that offended some of our colleagues with respect to this nominee. Listen to this. The nominee is a practicing Catholic.

My goodness, imagine that—in the United States of America, a person of faith, serving in government. Really? In particular, some of our Democratic colleagues raked him over the coals in committee for his membership in the Knights of Columbus. It is shocking that a nominee for Federal district court would be a member of the Knights of Columbus.

Of course, we all know the Knights—a noted worldwide "extremist sect" of Catholics, which is about 2 million men strong, known among other things for their love of their Catholic faith, their unparalleled commitment to charitable work, ancillary fundraising barbecues and pancake breakfasts.

Outrageous. I can’t believe I need to repeat it in the U.S. Capitol, but there is nothing about living out one’s faith that is disqualifying for public service—nothing. To the contrary, what is disqualifying for public service is nothing about living out one’s faith. It is the Democrats’ opposition to this nominee’s faith, not his faith itself, that was limiting the grain of our Constitution. Fortunately, this tactic didn’t fly. Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee saw this tactic for what it is and voted to report Mr. Buescher favorably to the floor. I will be proud to vote to confirm him later today.

OPIOD EPIDEMIC

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, the epidemic of opioid and substance abuse has wreaked havoc throughout our country. More than 2 million Americans suffer from opioid addiction. For years, the situation only seemed to get worse and worse. Unfortunately, my home State of Kentucky saw the pain firsthand. We are among the hardest hit States by this crisis.

Last week, both Kentucky and the entire Nation received a glimmer of hope. Preliminary figures from the National Center for Health Statistics show that last year, 2018, saw the first—the first—nationwide decline in drug overdose deaths since 1999. For 28 straight years, overdose deaths climbed. But in 2018, that tragic number finally dropped. It was approximately a 5-percent decline nationwide.

In Kentucky, the Bluegrass State saw overdose deaths fall by nearly 15 percent last year, the largest drop in our State in more than a decade. After years of working and waiting, we are finally seeing progress in the fight to save lives. These numbers didn’t happen on their own. Our comprehensive response involves countless law enforcement officers, medical professionals, educators, community leaders, and family members and friends of those affected.

Outrageous. I can’t believe I need to repeat it in the U.S. Capitol, but there is nothing about living out one’s faith that is disqualifying for public service—nothing. To the contrary, what is disqualifying for public service is nothing about living out one’s faith. It is the Democrats’ opposition to this nominee’s faith, not his faith itself, that was limiting the grain of our Constitution. Fortunately, this tactic didn’t fly. Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee saw this tactic for what it is and voted to report Mr. Buescher favorably to the floor. I will be proud to vote to confirm him later today.

ISRAEL

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter yesterday, the Democratic House of Representatives took a small step—small—to denounce the scourge of anti-Semitism. They passed a symbolic resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and condemn the BDS movement.

It is too bad all of this, of all things, couldn’t have been a unanimous vote. It is too bad that 16 Democrats voted against condemning BDS. Sixteen Democrats voted against condemning BDS over in the House yesterday.

It is regrettable that some of the Democrats who claim to represent the
future of their party lobbed against the measure that should be completely without controversy.

Even more broadly, I am sorry the bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would actually do something about BDS—in other words, action, not mere rhetoric—is still languishing over in the Senate without a vote, bipartisan legislation that passed with the support of 77 Senators, including my friend the Democratic leader—77 votes in the Senate, thoroughly bipartisan, but the Democratic House has found a way to fumble the ball.

Several months back, it took days of throat-clearing and a whole lot of watered down before they could even halfway condemn anti-Semitic remarks by one of their own Members. Now this symbolic BDS resolution is held up as a major victory, while Senate-passed legislation that would actually take action—actually do something about BDS—doesn’t even get a vote. Either not even give it a vote over there in the House.

House Republicans have called for a vote on S. 1 over and over and over again, but the Speaker of the House doesn’t seem interested. I understand that picking fights with the President seems to be a higher priority across the Capitol than joining with the Senate to get bipartisan legislation actually made into law, but surely taking action to combat anti-Semitic efforts to delegitimize Israel shouldn’t be too much to ask. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week, Senator CARDIN and I introduced our S Corporation Modernization Act. That brings the total of tax reform bills I have introduced so far this year to six.

Obviously, 2017 was a banner year for tax reform. In December of 2017, we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, a historic, comprehensive reform of our Tax Code that put more money in American families’ pockets and helped spur growth for American businesses.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has been a great success for our economy and for hard-working Americans, but there are still things we can do to strengthen our Tax Code even further.

As I mentioned last week, Senator CARDIN and I introduced our S Corporation Modernization Act. S corporations are the most common formal business structure in the United States. There are nearly 5 million of these businesses throughout the United States, including large numbers in rural America. Despite the popularity of S corporations, however, there have been few S corporation-related changes to the Tax Code since this business structure was created.

There are things we can do to make it easier for these businesses to operate and raise capital. That is why Senator CARDIN and I developed the S Corporation Modernization Act. Our legislation makes pro-growth reforms that will make it easier for these businesses to grow and create new jobs and opportunities in their communities.

Change is a human constant, but with modern technology, the pace of change has seemed to accelerate. American workers and American businesses face very different situations than they did even a decade ago. It is important that our Tax Code keeps pace with the 21st century economy.

In February, I reintroduced my Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act along with Senator SHERROD BROWN. Today substantial numbers of workers travel to different States for temporary work assignments on a regular basis, and they end up subject to a bewildering variety of State laws governing State income tax.

Senator Brown’s and my legislation would create an across-the-board standard for mobile employees who spend a short period of time working across State lines. It would ensure that States receive fair tax payments while substantially simplifying tax requirements for employees and employers.

In March, I introduced two other bills focused on updating the Tax Code for the 21st century. For the last decade or so has seen the rise of the gig economy—services provided by individuals through apps and websites like Uber, Lyft, TaskRabbit, Postmates, Grubhub, and many others. These arrangements have stretched the boundaries of current tax law.

My New Economy Works to Guarantee Independence and Growth Act, or the NEW GIG Act, as we call it, updates our tax law to provide clear guidance on the classification of this new generation of workers. It will ensure that Uber drivers, Postmates, Taskers, and others are treated as independent contractors for purposes of tax law if they meet a set of objective criteria. The certainty my bill provides will benefit not only these workers but also traditional independent contractors like freelance writers and delivery drivers.

I also introduced the Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act in March with Senator WYDEN. Our legislation is designed to prevent consumers from being faced with multiple taxes for downloading digital products. For example, right now, a digital purchase of a television series could hypothetically be taxed in up to three States, depending on the circumstances of the purchase. The Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act would provide rules of the road for taxing digital goods and services and ensure that digital purchases could only be taxed in one State—the State in which the consumer resides.

We would also prohibit States and local governments from taxing digital goods at higher rates than tangible goods. In other words, under our bill, that season of “The Office” that you bought digitally shouldn’t be taxed at a higher rate than if you were purchasing the season on DVD.

We have a proud history of charitable giving in this country. Americans care about a lot of worthy causes and are committed to helping those in need. That is why I have routinely introduced amendments to the Tax Code to make charitable giving easier, several of which have been signed into law.

This year, I again introduced the Charities Helping Regularly Throughout the Year Act, or CHARITY Act, with Senator CASEY. This year’s version of our bill builds on some of the provisions we succeeded in getting passed over the past few years and will continue to help make it easier for Americans to give—and charities to receive—money.

Finally, this year I once again introduced legislation to repeal the punitive double or triple tax known as the death tax. I have worked a lot on the death tax issue over the years because of the way it affects family farms and ranches. The death tax can make it difficult or impossible to hand off the family farm or ranch to the next generation.

While we gave farmers and ranchers substantial relief from the death tax in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, that relief is only guaranteed for 15 years, which is why I am committed to passing a permanent death tax repeal.

I am proud of the progress we have made for American businesses and American families with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and I will continue working on these bills this year to further refine the Tax Code to spur economic growth and to address the realities of the 21st century economy.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN TJEERDSMA

Madam President, before I close, I would like to take a couple of minutes to recognize a staffer of mine who will be retiring at the end of this work period.
Lynn Tjeerdsma first came to work for me in 2007 to help out on the 2008 farm bill. After the bill passed, he headed back to the Farm Service Agency at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, but I asked him back in 2011 to work with me on the 2012—which actually ended up being the 2014—farm bill, and he has been with me ever since.

I suppose it is possible that there is someone who knows the ins and outs of farm policy better than Lynn, but I have yet to meet that person.

After working with Lynn in 2007 and 2008, I asked him back for the 2012 farm bill because I wanted the best for South Dakota’s farmers and ranchers, and Lynn is the best. There is a reason for that.

Lynn has an impressive farm policy résumé on both the administrative and legislative side. In addition to working for me, he worked for Senator Larry Pressler on the 1990 farm bill, and he has extensive experience in the executive branch of our government.

He asked to work for the Farm Service Agency at the Department of Agriculture for years as a county executive in Moody, SD; as a county executive in Cass County, ND; as a program specialist and later a branch chief; and then, as I mentioned, as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs. He also worked for the nonprofit Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership.

As impressive as his farm policy résumé is, that is not all Lynn has brought to the table. Lynn often says: “The best ideas for a farm bill come from a farm, not from behind a desk in Washington, DC.”

Lynn isn’t just an agricultural policy expert; Lynn is a farmer—not was a farmer—although he farmed a large spread for 15 years before going to work for the Department of Agriculture as a farmer. Lynn still owns and operates a corn and soybean farm near Platte, SD. So he has a deep insight into the challenges facing farmers and ranchers and how we can meet their needs here in Washington, DC.

I have talked a lot about Lynn’s agricultural expertise. I have relied on it for almost a decade. South Dakota’s farmers and ranchers are better off today because of the knowledge and insight Lynn has brought to the table. I also want to talk about Lynn personally.

Every one of us in the Senate wants smart and knowledgeable staffers, but in an ideal world, our staffers aren’t just smart and knowledgeable; they also have the kind of character that Lynn displays—dedicated, hard-working, cheerful, generous, humble, and unfailingly kind.

He is the kind of public servant we all aim to be and a gentleman in the very truest sense of the word.

I am not the only one who is going to miss Lynn. Every one of my staffers is going to miss him as well. He has been a mentor to many in the office, and, perhaps more importantly, he has been supplying the staff with doughnuts every Friday for years.

After a tough week, everyone looked forward to Lynn’s Friday morning email letting us know Krispy Kreme was in the office. The doughnut notification email always included a list of things Lynn was thankful for that week, whether it was the weather or the fact that South Dakota farmers had gotten all their soybeans in the ground.

Lynn and his wife Mary were generous hosts, as well, inviting staffers over for Easter egg hunts and cook-outs. We will miss other distinctly Lynn things, too, like his impressive cowboy boot collection or how we had to prevent him from biking home in a torrential downpour. Lynn has logged more than 5,000 miles on his bike while working for me, traveling from his home in Alberta to the Dirksen Building on a daily basis.

And, of course, everyone will miss Lynn’s stories—like the one about the day that a younger Lynn tried to bring a rattlesnake home in a burp bag. As you can imagine, the snake did not appreciate the accommodations, so he got loose, slithering under the driver’s seat of Lynn’s car. Lynn’s abrupt exit from the vehicle created quite a hazard that day, with the snake as the only occupant of the now driverless vehicle rolling down the gravel roads near his childhood home.

When I talk about missing Lynn, I also have to talk about the farmers and ranchers in my State who will miss having him here in Washington. More than once, agricultural groups in South Dakota have asked Lynn to keynote during annual banquets. On one occasion, I offered to give a speech but was told that Lynn was the preferred speaker.

Lynn will be sorely missed, but he has more than earned his retirement. I know how much he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife Mary and with their 5 children and 10 grandchildren. I know he and Mary plan to travel to Hawaii and Alaska and that it is a goal of Lynn’s to visit as many national parks as he possibly can.

I know he will enjoy sitting, watching the waves with Mary at their house in Arizona and, of course, continuing to farm his corn and soybeans in South Dakota.

Lynn, thank you for your service and your friendship. May God bless you in your retirement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
The union movement always protects its workers. We need them to be stronger in America. That is one of the reasons income is going up to the top and not going to the middle class anymore—because we don’t have as strong unions as we should. But the unions, when they get behind something, God bless them.

Finally, I want to thank the first responders who came here themselves and who delayed cancer treatments to testify. The heroes, who wheeled the Halls of Congress in their wheelchairs to chase down legislators, who gifted lawmakers their NYPD badges and FDNY patches—the sacred totems of their service—to remind those public servants to do the right thing. Many are no longer with us: James Zadroga, Luis Alvarez, and my dear friend Ray Pfeifer. Wherever they may now be, let them breathe a final sigh of relief knowing their friends are cared for and the job is well done.

THE MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, on another issue, all eyes are no doubt on the House Judiciary Committee, where, as I speak, former Special Counsel Robert Mueller is testifying. His testimony is unquestionably of great interest and importance to the Nation. But even without the special counsel’s testimony today, Congress must grapple with the report he has already written.

The principal conclusion of the first section of the Mueller report was that Russia interfered in our 2016 elections, in his words, in a “sweeping and systematic” fashion. What he described in that section of his report constitutes nothing less than an attack on our democracy. It is almost like going to war and hurting our men and women in the Armed Forces.

This administration and this Chamber frankly have done not enough—not nearly enough—to respond to that attack, or to prevent such an attack from taking place again.

I know we are going to have a great deal of debate on the obstruction of justice—I am appalled by what the President did there—but there should be no debate on. A. Russian interference in our election—that is unequivocal—and, B, that we must do something about it now! It’s not too late to prevent the political divisions. Let’s forget the pettiness of President Trump, who says: Well, my election was ‘fair and square’—no? The President didn’t even prove that the Russians interfered.

President Trump, the Russians have interfered, and every American knows it. Let’s not let it happen in 2020. Let’s work together on this. It is vital to the future of American democracy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the passage of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, be tabled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:
Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent. The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 37, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander Gardner Portman
Barasso Graham Risch
Blackburn Grassley Rounds
Blunt Hawley Romney
Boozman Hoeven Rounds
Braun Hyde-Smith Rubio
Burr Inhofe SAS
Capito Johnson Scott (FL)
Cassidy Jones Scott (SC)
Collins Kennedy Sinema
Cornyn Lankford Shelby
Cotton Lee Sinema
Cramer Manchin Sullivan
Crapo McConnell Thune
Cruz McSally Tillis
Daines Moran Toomey
Emmi Markowski Wicker
Ernst Paul Young
Fischer Perdue

NAVS—37

Baldwin Heinrich Schatz
Blumenthal Hirono Schumer
Brown Kaine Shaheen
Cantwell King Smith
Cardin Leahy Stabenow
Carper Menendez Tester
Cochs Merkley Udall
Cortez Masto Murphy Warner
Duckworth Murray Whitehouse
Durbin Peters Wyden
Feinstein Reed Wyden
Hassan Rosen

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet Harris Sanders
Booker Isakson Warren
Gilibrand Klobuchar

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 37. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Williams Bergner, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.


The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accord-

[Roll Call Vote No. 227 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander Fischer Portman
Barasso Gardner Risch
Blackburn Graham Risch
Blunt Grassley Rounds
Boozman Hawley Rounds
Braun Hoeven Rounds
Burr Inhofe SAS
Capito Johnson Scott (FL)
Cassidy Jones Scott (SC)
Collins Kennedy Sinema
Cornyn Lankford Shelby
Cotton Lee Sinema
Cramer Manchin Sullivan
Crapo McConnell Thune
Cruz McSally Tillis
Daines Moran Toomey
Emmi Markowski Wicker
Ernst Paul Young
Fischer Perdue

NAVS—39

Baldwin Heinrich Schatz
Blumenthal Hirono Schumer
Brown Kaine Shaheen
Cantwell King Smith
Cardin Leahy Stabenow
Carper Menendez Tester
Cochs Merkley Udall
Cortez Masto Menendez Tester
Duckworth Merkley Udall
Durbin Murphy Van Hollen
Feinstein Murray Warner
Hassan Peters Wyden

NOT VOTING—9

Bennet Harris Sanders
Booker Isakson Warren
Gilibrand Klobuchar Whitehouse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 39. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week, the administration and House Democrats reached a bipartisan budget deal to deliver on the President’s priorities and prevent a funding crisis this fall.

As our Armed Forces continue their global engagements, this agreement importantly secures the funding necessary to maintain readiness and modernize the force. It provides increased defense spending to recover from the depressed military readiness rates of the previous administration. It provides for our men and women in uniform with the resources, equipment, and training they need in order to defend our freedoms.

I know Congress deals with a lot of different topics, and all of them, by and large, are important, but there is nothing more important, nor is there anything more quintessentially a Federal Government responsibility than national security.

All other considerations aside, if this bipartisan budget deal did nothing more than fully fund our national security efforts, I would support it, but importantly, it also keeps other important elements of the congressional consensus intact—things like the Hyde amendment, which, as the Presiding Officer knows, since the late 1970s has ensured that no taxpayer dollars can be used to fund abortions. In addition, this agreement prevents our democratic colleagues from trying to block President Trump from using funds to strengthen border security.

The administration—Secretary Mnuchin—negotiated a tough deal and one that excludes any radical, leftwing poison pills—a difficult task in these times, to be sure.

We know they wanted to use policy riders—nearly 30 of them and counting—to try to implement elements of the Green New Deal to undo the President’s regulatory reforms or to write our immigration laws through the back door. Earlier this year, their far-left policy riders led to the longest government shutdown in history and almost prevented the enactment of bipartisan border supplemental funding. I saw the devastating impact that shutdown had on dedicated public servants across the country, especially in Texas. This agreement will prevent another senseless shutdown and ensure that the trains of government run on time.

We know that it is ever perfect. That is the definition of a negotiation—both sides give a little. It is the nature of compromise, which
is a necessary part of effective governing. There is no doubt that there are other priorities I would have liked to have seen included in the deal. I wish we had done something to reform our entitlement programs, which will continue to outpace inflation and increase deficits. Someday, we are going to have to deal with our deficits and debt; I just hope it is not during the time of a national emergency. But as a practical matter, Speaker Pelosi wasn’t going to agree with any of the sweeping reforms in the context of this spending deal and debt limit provision. Thankfully, the President was able to secure half of the spending cuts he asked for—roughly equal to next year’s increase in non-defense spending.

Above all, this deal carries out the most critical responsibilities of the Federal Government, which is to support our national defense and fully fund the government’s operation.

I want to recognize the President’s efforts here and particularly those in his administration who helped negotiate this bipartisan deal—particularly Secretary Mnuchin. I look forward to supporting it.

**Opioid Epidemic**

Mr. President, last week, the National Center for Health Statistics released preliminary data showing that drug overdose deaths in America declined by about 5 percent last year. Before everyone begins to applaud, let me point out that drug overdoses killed more than 70,000 Americans the year before. So a 5-percent reduction is welcome, but obviously it is still very alarming. This 5 percent decline is the first national drop in three decades, though, and for communities across the country that continue to battle the opioid epidemic, it is a small indication that our efforts here in Congress are having an impact. We certainly have a long fight ahead of us, but this is an encouraging trend.

If you look closer, the data shows that the decline is due almost entirely to a decrease in prescription opioid-related deaths. Those caused by other opioids—particularly fentanyl and heroin—remain on the rise.

The cruel reality is that the more we step up our efforts to limit prescription opioid diversion, the higher the demand is for other illegal drugs, many of which come across our southern border. We can’t limit our efforts to what can be done here at home. In order for our work to be successful and for us to save more lives, we have to stop this poison from entering our country in the first place.

I have the honor of cochairing the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control with Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California, where we are working on ways to do exactly that—to slow down the poison coming across our border.

If you look at many of the challenges we face here at home—whether it is the opioid epidemic, the humanitarian crisis at the border, the criminal gangs on our streets—much of that can be directly traced to the violence that exists in Central America and Mexico.

This morning, I had the pleasure of speaking at the Hudson Institute about my proposal to attack this crisis from every angle, and as I continue to advocate for this approach, something we call the New Americas Recommitment to Counternarcotics Operations and Strategy. As the Presiding Officer knows, we love a good acronym here in Washington, DC, and we can only refer to this initiative as the NARCOS Initiative.

First, it takes aim at the dangerous substances that are crossing our southern border. Customs and Border Protection officers are incredibly well-trained and equipped to find illegal drugs, and seize an average of 5,800 pounds of narcotics each day. By the way, on June 16, Customs and Border Protection seized 20 tons of cocaine—which is the largest seizure in the 230-year history of the Border Protection—with an estimated street value of $1.3 billion. So good for them. They are extremel y professional and well-trained law enforcement officers.

As we know, many of these drugs managed to make it into the interior of our country and into local communities, causing untold misery and grief. Stopping their production and movement is not a fight we can win alone. It will take a bipartisan, long-term commitment from the Federal Government, as well as our foreign partners. An important step is to strengthen law enforcement cooperation by improving intelligence-sharing and providing training for some of our foreign partners. It is an important force multiplier and a necessary component of our counternarcotics efforts.

In addition to attacking the drugs themselves, the NARCOS Initiative goes after the cartels and transnational criminal organizations that profit from this business. These groups are what I call commodity-agnostic. They really don’t care who they hurt or what they ply. The only thing they care about is making money. It is not just narcotics they are dealing; it is human trafficking, migrant smuggling, money laundering, counterfeit goods, public corruption. The list of crimes is long, indeed, and they do all of it.

These transnational criminal organizations turn an enormous profit from their corrupt dealings, and then they have to launder the money they use to finance their operation. We know that one of the most effective ways to suffocate criminal networks is to cut off the money, so that is precisely where we should aim.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently passed legislation to combat money laundering and other illicit financing, which includes a provision that I offered that has to do with the role of remittances. According to the United Nations, over $300 billion in illicit transnational crimes proceeds likely flows through the U.S. financial system. The provision included on remittances requires Treasury to submit an analysis of the use of remittances by drug kingpins and crime syndicates and develop a strategy to prevent them from using that remittance system in the United States.

It is also time for us to reevaluate our current strategy and to determine how to update the Bank Secrecy Act, which was enacted more than 50 years ago, and is the primary money laundering law regulating financial institutions.

In addition to fueling violence and instability, the conditions in Central America serve as a push factor. As human beings, we all understand people fleeing violence and poverty. So encouraging those countries to provide safety and stability for their own people so they can stay in their homes and live their lives ought to be one of the top priorities. If we focus on these push factors encourage migrants to take the same routes used by cartels and criminal organizations to reach the United States. As we know, some of them simply don’t make it. They die in the process. Your women are routinely sexually assaulted. It is a miserable alternative to staying at home and living in safety and security.

We know all of this has contributed to the humanitarian crisis at our southern border. We all know but have not yet had the political will to reform our broken laws and prevent these smugglers and criminal organizations from gaming the system.

I know the Presiding Officer was at the border earlier this week. I have tried to figure out how we crack this nut. How do we take this polarized environment and provide the tools necessary to begin to staunch the flow of humanity coming across our border? They are attracted by the easy access to the United States through our broken laws but also the push factors, like the violence and poverty in their countries.

I am working with a Democratic colleague of mine from Laredo, TX, HENRY CUELLAR. Together, we introduced the HUMANE Act, which made great strides to help fix our broken asylum system in a way that would give legitimate asylum seekers an opportunity to present their case on a timely basis in front of an immigration judge. It would also make sure the conditions of their custody while they are here in the United States are something we can be proud of. Specifically, what this bill does is close a loophole in the law known as the Flores settlement, which is often used by smugglers to gain entry into the United States. It would streamline the processing of migrants and improve standards of care for individuals in custody.

If we want to restore law and order and make it sustainable, we need to look at ways to invest in economic development to help these countries build...
stronger economies. But I share some of the concerns expressed by the President and others. We need some metrics. We need a strategy. We need reliable partners that can work with us. The one effort I can think of where we are successful in working with foreign partners and strong leaders to really affect a dramatic change is the nation of Colombia, so-called Plan Colombia. Obviously, Mexico and the region are much more complex, and Plan Colombia isn’t going to win it. But that of that region. I think the concept is a sound one, one in which we come together on a bipartisan basis, develop a strategy, help train our foreign partners, and seek out strong leaders who can help us work through these challenges, because there is a multiplicity of challenges, as I have indicated.

One of the things that would help is to ratify the new and improved NAFTA, known as the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or the USMCA. Obviously, a strong economy in Mexico means people don’t have to come to the United States in order to provide for their families. The International Trade Commission’s analysis of the agreement shows some positive indicators for North American workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses. About 5 million American jobs depend on the binational trade with Mexico alone, which is some indication of how important this is.

We need to strengthen public-private partnerships in other ways to help add to the effort to provide for investment, a clean environment, and a positive relationship with our colleagues in Mexico. One example is the North American Development Bank. For every one NAD Bank dollar that has been invested in a project, it has successfully leveraged $20 in total infrastructure investment in using both private- and public-sector dollars. To that end, I think Senator Feinstein, of California, that would authorize the Treasury Department to increase NAD Bank’s capital and provide additional authority that is specifically related to port infrastructure.

We know the ports of entry are not only avenues of commercial trade and travel but are where a lot of the high-end or expensive illegal drugs are smuggled through. We need to modernize those ports of entry. We need to expand the infrastructure and make sure they are adequately staffed, not only to facilitate the flow of legitimate trade and travel but also to stop these drugs from coming through the ports of entry.

I just want to say a few words about this NARCOS Initiative. I believe that we do need an all-government approach that would address the broad range of problems across Central America and Mexico, including successful working transnational criminal organizations themselves, with the products and services they provide, as well as with the corruption they fuel and the means by which they stay in business, but we are going to need responsible partners in this effort.

As our own experience with nation-building in the Middle East has demonstrated, we can’t want something for them, we have to do it for them, or they will do it for themselves. That is why it is so important to have a clear understanding about what the strategy is, what the goals are, and to have strong, reliable leaders in those countries who will work with us in a bipartisan way to accomplish our collective goal.

We have both the responsibility and the opportunity to make meaningful changes to stabilize the region, and I believe the time to act was yesterday. I hope our colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to promote a secure and prosperous Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

29TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to celebrate one of the seminal moments in American civil rights history. This week marks the 29th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act. On July 26, 1990, President George H. W. Bush signed a sweeping, bipartisan bill that acknowledged and affirmed the rights of people with disabilities.

The passage of the so-called ADA promised that people with disabilities would be included in the guarantee of fundamental rights—just by way of example, the right to petition the court when discriminated against; the right to apply for and be considered for a job; the right to have and having the access to voting and the right to live where you want to live.

Twenty-nine years later, our country is better because we agreed to make the opportunities of our country accessible to all. The ADA changed the lives of 61 million Americans with disabilities and has made our Nation more accessible. The ADA proclaimed that Americans with disabilities must have the right and the means to fully participate in their communities. The ADA offers a path toward a truly accessible nation and elevates the voices of millions of individuals.

One of those voices belongs to Jean Searle from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Jean works at Disability Rights Pennsylvania, where she protects the rights of people with disabilities so they may live the lives they choose—free from abuse, neglect, discrimination, and segregation.

As a child and young adult, Jean was forced to live in an institution. In that institution, she faced many indignities, the worst of which may have been having her infant child taken from her without her consent. Simply because Jean lived with a disability, it was often assumed that she was capable of making her own decisions, but she worked hard to find a way out of that institution. When she finally succeeded, she chose to live independently in her community and has found a fulfilling career in Harrisburg.

The rights affirmed by the ADA and the services and supports Medicaid and other programs have provided have made it possible for Jean and others like her to live a full citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, yes, even of the United States of America. Jean has dedicated her life to protecting the rights of people with disabilities.

During this ADA anniversary week, it is also fitting that today is Jean’s birthday.

So, Jean, in looking at your picture on my left, I say happy birthday. I believe she would wish the same if you were here in person on the floor with us. I am honored to share your birthday.

Let me pause here.

Almost 30 years after her infant son, whom I referred to earlier, was taken from her, Jean had the opportunity recently to meet him for the first time. Jean often says that to make the world a better place, we need to spend our time listening to people with disabilities and learning from the disability community.

Well said, Jean.

When I listen, I hear about the greatness of the ADA and, at the same time, also much more that still needs to be done. One of those things is to protect what we have. That includes protecting access to healthcare, preventing the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and ensuring that Medicaid remains intact.

We also need to combat threats to people with disabilities.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen a systemic and concerted effort to sabotage supports that are necessary for equality, opportunity, and the full participation of people with disabilities. What this administration has failed to do with legislation it is trying to accomplish through regulation and court cases. Cutting Medicaid is contrary to the ADA’s goals, and it makes it difficult—or even potentially impossible—for people with disabilities to work, to go to school, or to be engaged in their communities.

While we protect the hard-fought rights the disability community has earned, we can and must build upon the ADA’s promises. As we celebrate the ADA’s 29th anniversary, we can do at least three things—honor the great advances that have been made because of the ADA; remain vigilant to assure that those who have disabilities have gone through and are still going through today.
Mr. CASEY. Medicaid and what came out of that committee on the Finance Committee to make, on his support for Medicaid, on his support for disabled Americans and for children especially.

I just want to make a brief comment, for I know he has some other comments to make, on his support for Medicaid and on the efforts that we have made to ensure that disabled people who were disabled. I know that Pennsylvania is the same way. So I thank Senator Casey.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the senior Senator from Ohio, who makes the point broadly about the importance of Medicaid in the context of healthcare but especially with regard to Americans with disabilities. I thank him for his comments, and I thank him for his advocacy.

**BORDER SECURITY**

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a long ago. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator Casey’s advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

We should ensure that migrant children are cared for by child welfare workers and have their medical needs fully met. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

We know that some of the dollars recently appropriated will help on some of these priorities, but we have to make sure the dollars are spent wisely. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator Casey’s advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

**BORDER SECURITY**

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a long ago. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator Casey’s advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

We should ensure that migrant children are cared for by child welfare workers and have their medical needs fully met. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

We know that some of the dollars recently appropriated will help on some of these priorities, but we have to make sure the dollars are spent wisely. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a long ago. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator Casey’s advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

We should ensure that migrant children are cared for by child welfare workers and have their medical needs fully met. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

We know that some of the dollars recently appropriated will help on some of these priorities, but we have to make sure the dollars are spent wisely. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a co-sponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a long ago. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator Brown.
and value to what President Kennedy called us all to do—to not ask what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country. Robert Mueller has answered that call over and over again. He is a person of integrity and ability.

For just a few minutes before I yield the floor, I want to talk about some of his work.

One of the points then—Special Counsel Mueller made in a statement I guess back in May was—he first of all outlined how the Russian Federation interfered with our election and pointed to the serious consequences of that, but then he also talked about how—when the second volume of the report deals with obstruction, he reminded us in that statement—at least I took from it, my impression of the statement—of not just the seriousness of what Russia did but the seriousness and the gravity of obstructing that kind of an investigation.

So if someone wanted to read just a portion of the report—the almost 500 pages—if you wanted to just zero in on some key parts of volume II about obstruction, you could start on page 77. That is a section titled “The President’s Efforts to Remove the Special Counsel.” Then there are other instances—several instances of obstruction—alluded obstruction there. So if you read between pages 77 and 120 of volume II, you are going to learn a lot about obstruction. Let me read a couple of the lines that the report sets forth.

When the special counsel walks through the factual predicate of what happened in the first instance where the President calls the White House Counsel, Mr. McGahn, and says some things that the special counsel concluded were a directive to fire or have fired the special counsel, they say in the report on page—this is volume II, page 88:

Substantial evidence, however, supports the conclusion that the President went further and in fact directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the Special Counsel removed.

Page 89:

Substantial evidence indicates that by June 17, 2017, the President knew his conduct described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s report would, in the case of any other person not covered by the Office of Legal Counsel’s policy against indicting a sitting President, result in multiple felony charges for obstruction of justice.

I think those prosecutors—I believe those prosecutors are resting that determination that they each made individually on those areas of the report that begin with the words “substantial evidence indicates.” I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to advise my colleagues about a new rule that the Department of Homeland Security published in the Federal Register this very day to finally bring some needed reform to the EB-5 green card program.

As I mentioned in my remarks on this topic last week, this rule was first proposed in January 2017. Those of us who want to reform the EB-5 program have been waiting 2½ years for this rule to become final, and we have been collaborating more than that for some meaningful reforms to this fraudulent-laden program that we tried to get enacted into law in previous Congresses and couldn’t get done because of being up against these very powerful, moneyed interests. I think the President and his team deserve a lot of credit for pushing these reforms across the finish line and getting a big win for rural America.

As I have said on numerous occasions, Congress intended for the EB-5 program to help spur investment in rural and high-unemployment areas when this program was established in 1990. Unfortunately, over the last 30 years, big-moneyed interests have been able to gerrymander EB-5 targeted employment areas in a way that redirected investment away from our rural and economically deprived communities and towards major development projects in Manhattan and other big cities. Therefore, instead of providing much needed investment for rural America, as originally intended, EB-5 has become a source of cheap foreign capital for development projects in already prosperous areas.

For the first time, this rule will bring much needed change so that condition cannot continue. Under the rule, States will no longer be allowed to game and gerrymander targeted employment areas. The Department of Homeland Security will make targeted employment area designations directly based on revised requirements that will help to ensure rural and high-unemployment areas get much the investment they have been deprived of for far too long under this program, as it has been misdirected.

Again, this is a major win for rural America and high-unemployment areas, and I want to sincerely thank President Trump and the people in the administration who worked on this rule for making this happen and looking out for the interests of my constituents in Iowa and other rural States and for areas of high unemployment.

This rule also addresses the minimum investment threshold amounts that are required for the EB-5 projects around the country.

This is the very first time the investment thresholds have been adjusted since the program was created in 1990. Think of the inflation since that time. For projects that are outside of targeted employment areas, the threshold will be raised from $1 million to $1.3 million. For projects in targeted employment areas, the threshold will be raised from $500,000 to $900,000. The minimum investment amount will be automatically adjusted for inflation every 5 years.

It is ridiculous that our country’s major green card program for investors has been operating with investment amounts that haven’t been adjusted a single time in 30 years. That makes no sense, and I am glad the President and his team have taken necessary action to bring a little common sense to the EB-5 program.

There is more work that needs to be done on the EB-5 program, and we will
have to do that by legislation, but the President and his administration define a lot of credit for finally implementing these first reforms that I and several other colleagues have championed for years.

I think the most important thing is to understand the power and influence that these big-money EB-5 interests have historically had in Washington, and how they have used that power and influence to consistently thwart any attempt to reform this program in such an obvious way that has been causing heartache for millions of taxpayers for at least the past 6 months. The subject is known around Capitol Hill and Washington, DC, as tax extenders, things that come up every 2 or 3 years that we are due to finish with this job and bring further reform to the EB-5 program in the future. Thank you, President Trump.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

On another subject, for the past week there have been ongoing discussions between congressional leadership and the administration relating to an agreement on budget caps and raising the debt limit. Those discussions produced an agreement that was announced Monday night.

While some understand reaching an agreement was important to ensure the full faith and credit of the United States, I am disappointed the final agreement does not address a subject that has been causing heartache for millions of taxpayers for at least the past 6 months. The subject is what is known around Capitol Hill and Washington, DC, as tax extenders, things that come up every 2 or 3 years that need to be reauthorized.

For Congress, the bill has routinely acted on a bipartisan basis to extend a number of expired or expiring provisions. Typically, their extension would be included as part of a larger spending package or budget deal at the end of the year. Unfortunately, this never occurred at the end of last year. Now, here we are almost 7 months into the end of 2018 and 3 months after the close of the regular tax filing season, and taxpayers still have no answers.

The budget and debt limit agreement announced Monday night is yet another missed opportunity to provide answers for millions of taxpayers—both individuals and businesses—who are waiting on Congress so they can finalize their 2018 taxes and, in some cases, it may even mean whether or not they can stay in business.

While Finance Committee Ranking Member Wyden and I, working as a team, are willing to address tax extenders since early on in this Congress, the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has been reluctant to act. It seems as though the House Democrats are unaware of the historic bipartisan, bicameral momentum built over the years for extending provisions even though those provisions are currently expiring at the end of this month.

Their unrelenting efforts to stymie EB-5 reform over the years absolutely epitomize the swamp culture that so many voters rejected in the last Presidential election, and getting rid of that swamp culture is exactly what the President campaigned on. This is a perfect example of his carrying out a campaign promise.

They are also representative of a culture that is too often blind to the interests of the rich and the powerful. Again, I applaud the President and his team for working with us to bring further reform to the EB-5 program in the future. Thank you, President Trump.
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big business or big corporations. That is their accusation.

These provisions make a whopping 4.5 percent of the total cost of extending provisions that expired at the end of 2017. Most of these provisions have very minimal costs. I am going to take a few minutes to show you just how minimal. It is the most popular because it has such an overwhelming number of cosponsors in both bodies. That is the short line tax credit. This provision offers a tax credit to short line railroads for qualified maintenance expenditures. This credit isn’t available to the largest railroads, which we call the class I railroads. This credit benefits smaller railroads that are critically important for farmers and many manufacturers to get their products to market around the world. For example, in my State of Iowa, according to recent data from the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association, there are nine short line and regional railroads. This credit isn’t just supported by and important to the railroads themselves; it is also supported by the users of short line railroads who depend on these railroads to get their products to market around the world. For example, Midwest soybean farmers selling to the Asian market typically must ship their crop by rail to the Port of Seattle, and the short line railroads are part of that transportation network.

The fact is, this provision is far more than some sort of giveaway to business. It is a provision that is important to whole communities. This is probably a big reason why legislation making this short line tax credit permanent currently has 56 cosponsors in both the Senate and 226 cosponsors in the House of Representatives. I hope I have been able to clear up some of the misunderstanding regarding tax extenders for the new Democratic majority in the House, not only on the substance of these provisions but also on the fact that extending these tax credits has been both bicameral and bipartisan for at least a couple of decades. Extenders are not just a Democratic issue or corporatist agenda. This overwhelmingly benefits individuals—individuals. It benefits green energy and promotes job creation in urban and rural communities alike.

In order to provide certainty—and you need certainty in tax law. If you want to provide certainty to the people who relied on these provisions in 2018 and potentially this year, we should extend them at least through 2019 as quickly as possible. This could have been done as part of the bipartisan agreement. And that is what the Senate did. Unfortunately, I fear a misunderstanding of what extenders really are by the new Members in the House of Representatives and whom they benefit on the part of the same Democratic House majority contributed to these extenders being left out of the deal announced Monday.

I know there are those who question the need to extend these extensions in perpetuity. It is a provision that I agree with those points of view. That is why the Finance Committee, which I chair, created a series of task forces to examine these policies for the long term.

The task forces were charged with examining each of these provisions to determine if we can reach a consensus on a long-term resolution so that we don’t have to have an extended debate every 2 years about extending extenders or tax credits.

I look forward to receiving the summaries of the task forces that I have appointed later this week. Hopefully, these submissions will provide a basis for the Finance Committee to put together an extenders package before the end of the year that includes longer term solutions for as many of these temporary provisions as possible.

This is important so that we can stop the annual exercise of kicking the can down the road. However, in the meantime, I remain committed to acting as soon as possible so that taxpayers who have relied on these provisions in 2018 don’t end up feeling like Charlie Brown after Lucy pulls the football away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ALLOWING THE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION ON THE DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THIS ACT TO CONTINUE TO SERVE AS SUCH DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2249) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2249) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
newspaper, the Guardian, and it is enlightening. It says this: ‘‘NHS cancer scans left unread for weeks.’’ The cancer scans have been left unread for weeks.

The Guardian reports: ‘‘Cancer scans showing the presence or spread of the disease are going unread for as long as six weeks.’’ Think about that. You are a patient. It is cancer. It is ongoing, and it is spreading. You have had a scan and have been waiting 6 weeks to know what is happening with your own body.

Cancer scan reports used to take a week; then, about a month and now, 6 weeks. As a result, according to one of the right, American patients shouldn’t have to foot all of the bill for global cures. Still, U.S. patients will surely suffer if Washington bureaucrats start blocking new innovations.

As I said last week, the Congressional Budget Office came out and talked about their report on what Medicare for All would mean, and they said that there would be a delay—a delay in treatment, as well as a delay in access to cancer care. In the all-hospital system and 180 million Americans lost the insurance they get from work.

Patients in England have bureaucrats as judge and as jury weighing the value of every advancement, seeing if they can even have it in that country. What we see is that the bureaucrats are denying lifesaving treatment, much of it invented in the United States.

Meanwhile, Republicans are focused on real reforms—reforms that lower costs but not standards. America want that? That is exactly what the Democrats are proposing. Clearly, Democrats have taken a hard-turn when it comes to healthcare and when it comes to the role of imposing more government in our lives. They want to take away your freedom to choose your health insurance, the one you get from your employer, and in place of on-the-job insurance, they want one expensive, new, government-run program for everyone.

Democrats’ extreme scheme is expected to cost $3 trillion. It is so expensive, in fact, that even doubling everyone’s taxes wouldn’t cover it. That means Washington bureaucrats will be restricting your care. You will lose the freedom to choose your doctor. You will lose the freedom to choose your hospital. You will lose the freedom to make choices about your own life, and bureaucrats will limit your access to new treatments as well as cutting-edge technologies.

It is hard to know how many months you will have to wait for urgently needed care. We have seen it in Canada. We have seen it in England. We do not want to see it here in the United States. Delayed care becomes denied care.

Why should you pay more, which is what this so-called Medicare for All does? You will be paying more to wait longer for worse care. Why would America want that? That is exactly what the Democrats are proposing.

As I said last week, the Congressional Budget Office came out and talked about their report on what Medicare for All would mean, and they said that there would be a delay—a delay in treatment, as well as a delay in access to cancer care. In the all-hospital system and 180 million Americans lost the insurance they get from work.

Patients in England have bureaucrats as judge and as jury weighing the value of every advancement, seeing if they can even have it in that country. What we see is that the bureaucrats are denying lifesaving treatment, much of it invented in the United States.

Meanwhile, Republicans are focused on real reforms—reforms that lower costs without lowering standards. That is the key difference. We want to lower costs but not standards.

In England, they say: Well, it is free, but you are going to have to wait for a long time. As I reported last week, people have actually gone blind while waiting and others have died while waiting.

The Democrats’ proposal actually lowers standards while limiting your choices and raising your costs. It is time to reject the Democrats’ one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. Instead, let’s ensure our patients get the innovative care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, today is a good day for this body, for the State of Nebraska, and for every American who is committed to the rule of law, including our first freedom, which is religious liberty.

In a few minutes, we will be voting to confirm Brian Buescher to be the U.S. Federal district judge for the District of Nebraska. Brian is a born-and-raised Nebraskan. He is the father of five children, and he has served his home State admirably in the legal profession. His nomination is an honor for our State, and it is a testament to his integrity and to his tireless service. At the same time, Brian’s confirmation process provides an occasion for one of the most baffling displays of constitutional confusion and prejudice I have seen in my time here.

Brian is a Catholic, and he is a member of the Knights of Columbus. The Knights of Columbus is the largest Catholic fraternal organization in the world. The organization has 1.6 million members. It raises millions and millions of dollars every year for charity, and they contribute millions—literally millions—of hours of volunteer and charitable service for their neighbors.

Like a lot of Catholic men in Nebraska, Brian joined the Knights of Columbus as a way to give back to his community. This is actually just really basic—sometimes really boring—love of neighbor, but it is the kind of stuff that makes communities work.

According to some of my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Brian’s association with this extraordinary charitable organization—again, really mundane, the Knights of Columbus, the largest Catholic fraternal organization in the world—according to some of my colleagues, the Knights of Columbus is an extremist outfit. One of my colleagues suggested that Brian needs to resign his membership in the Knights if he were confirmed to the Federal bench to avoid the appearance of conflict and bias—really bizarre stuff.

To be clear, the Knights of Columbus is not some shadowy organization from a Dan Brown novel. The Knights is a bunch of guys who organize fish fries, and sometimes they sell Tootsie Rolls, but basically what they are doing is helping to fund organizations like the Special Olympics. That is what they do in Omaha, in Lincoln, across Nebraska, and across the country. It is really weird that we are talking about the Knights of Columbus as an extremist organization.

In this weird rebirth of McCarthyism, it seems that the Catholics are to replace the Communists. This isn’t just Brian. We have had other nominees before the Senate Judiciary Committee this year being asked questions laughably close to: Are you now or have you ever been involved in the organization of a fish fry? How are the questions that sound like they are going to be called to account for what their prayer may have been at the last pancake feed: Have you or your colleagues ever been
involved in any plot to overthrow the government at a fish fry.

One of our nominees was asked: How long has the dogma lived loudly within you, and if you had to rank the dogma on a volume scale from 1 to 10, just how loud is the dogma?

This stuff seems almost laughable, unless you pause and recognize that the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee is asking nominees questions like this.

This committee has a history.

Again, just so we are clear, a U.S. Senator, who has taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, asked Brian, as a faithful Catholic, to resign his membership in the Knights of Columbus to "avoid the appearance of bias."

The implication in these questions is really straightforward. It is that Brian's religious beliefs and his affiliation with his Catholic religious fraternal organization might make him unfit for service.

Let's put it bluntly: This is plain, unadulterated anti-Catholic bigotry. This isn't a new thing in U.S. history; it is just a new, new thing. John F. Kennedy, 60 years ago, was asked, as he was running for President, some really similar questions.

It is also plainly unconstitutional. Every Member of this body, all 100 of us, has raised our hands and took an oath to defend the Constitution, which in article VI states in language so clear that even a politician has to acknowledge that it does what it says: "No religious test shall ever be required as qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

I just want to say this again. This is just straight out of the Constitution, article VI. "No religious test shall ever be required as qualification to any public office or public trust under the United States."

That is why—because this was happening in the Senate Judiciary Committee—in January, I led a charge on the floor through a resolution to reaffirm our oath of office to the Constitution that rejects religious bigotry. I called on every Member of this body to affirm that we respect the freedom of every American to worship as he or she sees fit and to live out their faith in the public square.

Fortunately, the Federal Government and politics, more broadly, is not in the business of trying to resolve questions of faith and hell. This is not what we use politics for in this country. Here, we are only in this worldly business of trying to maintain the peace and the public order necessary so every individual can make their own decisions about ultimate matters, with the last things for themselves under the dictates of conscience, not trying to submit to the whims of politicians or political movements.

This is a great American blessing and we need to reaffirm it and we need to retell it every occasion we have that opportunity.

Happily, the unanimous support for that resolution was an encouraging step. Today, in a few minutes, when Brian Buescher is going to be confirmed as a U.S. district judge for the District of Nebraska, we will see another important step, which is a reaffirmation and a confirmation to the American people that people of every faith are or Protests and Catholics, Jews and Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists, agnostics, atheists, and otherwise—that in America, you have a place in the life of this Nation.

We don't have to resolve every conflict, every argument and debate about things more important than politics. We don't have to resolve every conflict to agree that we will live peaceably today in this colony. This should be a reaffirmation of the basic American belief that there is room in this country to disagree.

In fact, so much of what makes this country exceptional is that we do disagree about some of the most important things and some of the ultimate things. Yet we do it without severing all the temporal bonds that bring us together as friends, neighbors, citizens, and patriots.

Brian is a good man, and I am convinced Brian is going to be a great judge. I suspect that he and many of his other fellow Knights of Columbus in Omaha are going to be organizing fish fries together again next spring, and I look forward to joining them at those fish fries.

So today I am pleased to celebrate with Brian and his family and the whole State of Nebraska his confirmation to the Federal bench, and I celebrate, too, this victory for our principled American commitment to religious liberty for each and every American.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAAXE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, thank you for your accommodation today. I rise to talk about another responsibility we have in the Senate; that is, to fund the government.

Our Nation was built on debate and compromise. If you read what the Founding Mothers and Founding Fathers debated in Chambers just like this and then later in this Chamber throughout the first 100 years of our existence, there was hot debate and many disagreements, but somehow they found a way to find a compromise.

Our Founding Mothers and Founding Fathers believed rightly that to get the best results, both sides had to come to the table to make a deal. This week, the Trump administration and congressional leaders, including Speaker PELOSI, reached a critical 2-year compromise on spending levels and the debt ceiling.

Like any compromise, this funding agreement is not perfect. Neither side got everything it wanted. It accomplishes three important things, however.

First, it will provide certainty to our military. This is critical after the last decade, when 2 years ago, two-thirds of our F/A teams couldn't fly. Only 3 of our Army brigades could fight at that night out of the 58 Army brigades we have. Our readiness was terrible. This deal will continue to reestablish readiness for our military, provide our troops with the compensation and benefits they deserve, and take care of our veterans here at home.

Before this, three Democratic Presidents disinvested in the military. That is just historic fact. It was done in the seventies, it was done in the nineties. It was done by the prior administration.

Second, none of the liberal poison pills or riders actually ended up in this final bill. Going forward, President Trump and congressional Republicans will ensure that we keep those out but in the spirit of compromise and hard negotiation.

Third, and most importantly, this deal keeps the ball moving on the process of funding the government in time to avoid another devastating shutdown or continuing resolution. However, despite these benefits, this deal highlights two significant problems. These are not new.

Washington's funding process is broken. The current system is inefficient and time-consuming. It has actually only funded the government on time four times in the last 45 years since the 1974 Congressional Budget Act was put into place. We now have just 13 working days between now and the end of this fiscal year. We are supposed to have 12 appropriations bills and $1.3 trillion of funding appropriated by the end of this year, by September 30. Good luck with that.

So here we are in the eleventh hour. We just made a big agreement, and I believe now the pressure is on to get defense and some of the domestic spending appropriations done certainly by September 30 so we can avoid the draconian impact of continuing resolutions on our military.

The lack of time means that for the second year in a row, Congress has had to rush through a resolution in the last moments of the fiscal year. Last year, we stayed here in August during the work period, and we went from 12 percent funding to 75 percent funding, and this year we have the opportunity to do that again.

I believe the plan is in place, when we come back this September, that we can actually get upward of two-thirds done by the end of September, which would include the military, which would avoid a continuing resolution issue we have been talking about.

This process has been the norm in Washington for decades, however. This
is nothing new. Since the Budget Act of 1974 was put in place, we have only done this four times, as I said. We cannot allow this process to continue this way.

Last year, we had a joint select committee. I believe I have four things that we can move on this year in terms of bills and possibly change this going forward. The American people sent us here to get this job done. It is time we break through all this—this logjam of politics—and face the fact next year that our No. 1 priority is to fund the government.

The second problem this budget deal has highlighted is the most important issue facing our country, in my opinion—the $2 trillion debt crisis. While this deal provides for all discretionary spending, the current budget deal does not include mandatory spending, nor does any other prior spending bill include mandatory.

Mr. President, the budget does and all the appropriations do is deal with the discretionary budget, which is only $1.3 trillion of $4.6 trillion in total money that we spend as the Federal Government. So you say: Well, what is the difference? Well, we spend $1.3 trillion. Well, that is millions, Veterans' Administration, and all domestic discretionary spending. Well, what is in mandatory? Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, pension benefits, and the interest on the debt, which, by the way, has gone up over $450 billion in the last 2½ years.

Let me put this into perspective. This budget deal only increases discretionary spending from last year's level over the next 2 years by $54 billion. That is 2 percent per year for the next 2 years. That is lower growth in spending on discretionary items than the growth of our economy at the moment.

That means that in 2 years, the spending on discretionary spending items will be less as a percentage of our economy than it is today.

This is an incredibly important point and was a major goal of President Trump's going into this process. The problem is, the CBO projects that mandatory spending and interest payments will grow in that same period over the next 2 years by $420 billion. That is our problem. This is what is driving the huge increases on our debt over the next two decades. In these 2 years, ironically, the increase in the mandatory spending is in interest expense. Even with interest rates being historically low, that is the case. Imagine what we would have if interest rates were at their 30-year average of 5 to 6 percent.

Right now, 70 percent of what the government spends is made up of mandatory spending, as I said: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, pension benefits for Federal employees, and the interest on the debt. Many of these programs are in dire need of reform. The Social Security Trust Fund goes to zero in 16 years. The Medicare trust fund goes to zero in 7 years. It is imperative that we save these important programs. Yet nothing is being done when we deal with the discretionary part of this budget.

Instead, Congress has been wrangling over the discretionary budget, which makes up just over a third of all spending. The whole situation shows just how shortsighted Washington is. Rather than address the long-term problems facing the country, Congress keeps kicking the can down the road. Fortunately, there are five steps, ultimately, we can take to address this long-term fiscal problem.

First is we have to grow the economy. Check that box because the economy is moving. Regulatory work, energy, taxes, and Dodd-Frank have kicked-started this economy, creating 6 million new jobs. The economy is growing at about twice the rate it did under the prior administration, so the economy is growing.

Second is to root out redundant spending; third, fix the funding process; fourth, save Social Security and Medicare; and lastly, we have to finally address the underlying drivers of our healthcare costs.

Thanks to President Trump's leadership, we already have the first part covered. Unemployment is the lowest it has been in 50 years. Our energy potential has been unleashed. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has brought new investment to the Nation. In these 2 years, you can see the energy spending.

I want to highlight again the driver here. I am going to show a chart just as I close. Mandatory spending is the No. 1 problem we have with our debt crisis. The bottom line here is discretionary spending. The vertical dotted line is today, 2019. You can see, over the last decade or so, that discretionary spending has been relatively quiet. We have had some increase. The green line is total spending, but the orange line is the total mandatory line. You can see the explosive nature of growth from today forward.

That is why this conversation today is so timely because, in the past, while it was going up, it is going up geometrically in the next 20 years compared to what it has been. That is a function of the growth of the size of the debt itself and also because of the aging demographic of our population.

As more and more people retire and go into Medicare and Medicaid, you will see these numbers continue to rise. These are Congressional Budget Office numbers. This highlights how serious this is and why all the drama is on the 30 percent down here and why we have to change the rhetoric here, change the predicate of discussion and start talking about the mandatory expenditures and how we save them.

Solving the debt crisis is the right thing to do and the only thing to do. The world needs us to do this, and the time is right now. Given that, this budget does not have a compromise, and we now need to make sure we appropriate to avoid any continuing resolution for our defense funding.

Going into the next year, now that we have an agreement on a topline for discretionary spending for 2020, we need to expedite appropriations to ensure we avoid the unnecessary drama next year. This is one reason why I ran for the Senate. We have to get serious about the management of our debt. The world knows that. Our people know that. The problem is the political will has been missing in Washington.

I crossed one milestone, hopefully, with this agreement on the topline, and we will move to appropriations, but we have to move, starting immediately, to change the process so we don't have this drama next year and we begin the dialogue about how to save Social Security and Medicare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Nebraska.

NOMINATION OF BRIAN C. BUESCHER

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for Brian Buescher. President Trump's nominee to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska.

Near the end of 2017, both Senator Sasse and I were given notice that Chief Judge Laurie Caughey would assume senior status on Nebraska's Federal bench. Many people may not know this, but the case docket for the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska is among the busiest dockets in the country, which surpasses judicial districts that include New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles. That is why it is critical to both Nebraska and our Nation that the Senate delivers an exceptional judge to fill this vacancy without further delay.

In this spirit, both Senator Sasse and I worked quickly to begin the application process. Nebraska is the proud home of many brilliant legal minds, and we thoroughly studied every application and interviewed qualified candidates. After an extensive search spanning the course of a few months, Senator Sasse and I came to a conclusion. We would recommend to President Trump that Brian Buescher be nominated as the next judge on Nebraska's Federal district court.

Mr. Buescher is a proud husband and father of five children who have been his biggest cheerleaders throughout this confirmation process. He grew up in Clay County, NE. There he learned the importance of hard work at a young age on his family's farm, where they raised corn, milo, wheat, alfalfa, hogs and cattle. It is also from this upbringing that he developed a keen appreciation for how the law directly affects the everyday lives of Americans and even more so for those who live and work in America's heartland.

After receiving his undergraduate degree from the University of Nebras-
Ohio. Senator, Brian was accepted into law school at Georgetown University. He thrived both in and out of the classroom. He was editor-in-chief of the Georgetown Journal of Ethics and vice president of the Georgetown Law Student Association.

Mr. Buescher is currently a partner at Nebraska’s largest law firm, Kutak Rock. He is chairman of the firm’s asbestos litigation team, overseeing large, complex commercial litigation, which includes environmental law, food law, drug actions, product liability, and banking.

He has gained invaluable experience as a litigator, and his resume speaks for itself. His success includes favorable rulings in cases heard by Nebraska and Iowa’s State and Federal courts, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nebraska. Time after time, case after case, he has demonstrated his commitment to upholding the Constitution and the rule of law.

In 2017, the American Agricultural Law Association awarded him the award for Excellence in Agricultural Law in Private Practice. The American Bar Association rated Mr. Buescher as “qualified” by an overwhelming majority. His 20 years of litigation experience has unquestionably prepared him for his next life chapter as a U.S. district court judge.

Nebraska’s former secretary of State, John Gale, recruited Brian to serve on the Nebraska State Records Board. Secretary Gale noted that “Mr. Buescher reflects the highest level for the qualities needed for a district judge, ranging from intelligence, integrity, professionalism, attentiveness, character, and skilful articulation to a deep understanding of the rules and procedures of the courtroom.”

While everyone who has worked with him praises his legal acumen, those who know him on a personal level speak to his integrity and his character. One of his friends from college who has known Brian for a quarter of a century praised his commitment to serving the community and his qualities as a husband and father. His friend concluded: “I can say with complete confidence what kind of person Brian is and that there is nothing that should give you hesitation about his confirmation.”

By all accounts Brian Buescher has enthusiastic support in Nebraska for his superb legal work and fairminded disposition.

I was proud to introduce Mr. Buescher at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee last November. I sincerely hoped that my Democratic colleagues would see Mr. Buescher for who he was—a sharp legal mind and a man of high character. However, my Democratic friends on the Judiciary Committee have deployed unjustified, ungrounded, and inexplicable attacks using reason and open-mindedness. They could not criticize his solid record nor his judicial philosophy. So they reverted to attacking his personal religious beliefs. Both the junior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Hawaii questioned Mr. Buescher’s membership in the Knights of Columbus.

For anyone who may be unaware, the Knights of Columbus is not a radical interest group. It is not political at all. The Knights of Columbus is the world’s largest Roman Catholic fraternal organization. Their mission is “to serve one, to service all,” and they are founded on the core principles of charity, unity, and patriotism.

Over the last decade, the Knights of Columbus have donated $1.1 billion to charities and performed over 80 million hours of volunteer service. In 2017 alone, local councils donated and distributed over 105,000 winter coats for underprivileged children through their “Coats for Kids” program. They have held a million or more litigations in the past three decades to help groups and programs that support the intellectually and physically disabled. Whether it is providing food and shelter for refugees, rebuilding homes for families that are affected by natural disasters, volunteering at veterans medical facilities, or simply having pancake breakfasts to raise money for local schools, the acts of charity and kindness of the Knights of Columbus are truly inspiring.

That is why I was shocked to hear that Mr. Buescher received a letter from the junior Senator from Hawaii following his confirmation hearing that suggested he leave the Knights of Columbus to “avoid an appearance of bias.” The notion that being a Knight of Columbus member is disqualifying to serve on the Federal bench is disturbing on its own, but holding religious tests for our judicial nominees blatantly ignores the Constitution and tears at the fabric of our core American values—the freedom to worship and pray as we choose.

Fortunately, the Senate passed a resolution earlier this year that condemned unconstitutional religious tests for nominees.

President Kennedy endured anti-Catholic attacks throughout his 1960 campaign, and for me it was exceptionally troubling to see that rhetoric return to the Senate in 2019. Now we will have another chance here in the Senate to send a clear message that we share our Founding Fathers’ contempt for religious tests for public office by confirming Brian Buescher to the Federal bench.

In closing, I think it is important to reiterate that reverence for our Constitution and our laws is part of what it means to be an American. My friend Peggy Noonan characterized this best a few weeks ago in her Wall Street Journal column. She described a young politician in 1838 who gave a speech to a Midwestern youth group about public policy and the political institutions. My friend Noonan characterized this best a few weeks ago in her Wall Street Journal column. She described a young politi
cian in 1838 who gave a speech to a Midwestern youth group about public policy and the political institutions.

The Founders were a visual representation of American values and modeled our first principles in their behavior. After their deaths, these core values were being forgotten and mob rule began to rise, threatening our Republic. The young politician had a solution for people who would transfer reverence for our Founders to reverence to the laws that they created. He said: “Only reverence for our Constitution and laws” will protect our Nation’s political institutions and retain the “attachment of the people.”

The speaker that day, in 1838, was Abraham Lincoln, who was 28 years old at the time. He understood the delicate nature of our laws—that when our laws collapse, everything else in our Nation can crumble with it.

I believe that to love our country we must respect our Constitution and apply the laws fairly to all. When we do so, we not only honor our past, but we protect the future generations of this great Nation. We can do that here in the Senate by appointing exceptional judges to the Federal bench, and I can say with great confidence that Mr. Buescher will be one of them. He is a well-qualified nominee and a man who possesses high ethical standards. I have no doubt that Brian Buescher will honor his family, our State, and our Nation with his service on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of his nomination.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF WENDY WILLIAMS BERGER

Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. President, Judge Wendy Williams Berger has honorably served the State of Florida for several years, and I proudly support her confirmation as a district judge for the Middle District of Florida today. Throughout her distinguished legal career, she has committed to upholding the rule of law, prosecuting criminal offenses as an Assistant State Attorney for Florida’s Seventh Judicial Circuit, and subsequently presiding as a circuit court judge for that same judicial circuit. As Governor of Florida, I was honored to appoint Judge Berger to the Fifth District Court of Appeal in 2012, and I am proud to support her confirmation to the Federal bench, where she will continue her exemplary service to our State and Nation.

Mrs. FISCHER, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 10, as follows:

[Brief list of Senators voting yea and nay]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Buescher nomination? Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Ex.]

RECOGNIZING SHELDON WHITEHOUSE’S 250TH CLIMATE CHANGE SPEECH

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise in recognition of a friend and colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, on this special occasion of his 250th speech in his “Time to Wake up” series, a series of speeches, as far as I know, unparalleled in the history of the Senate for addressing a major national issue, a major world issue—the issue of carbon pollution and climate chaos.

As we take in a breath of air at this very moment, when you are sitting on the dais or at one of the desks or sitting on the benches, that breath of air contains air very different from the air when I was born. The air contains 33 percent more carbon. This has never happened over the lifetime of any individual in the history of the human species on this planet, and it means big changes because every molecule of carbon is grabbing heat and holding on to it.

Out in Oregon that means there are warmer winters, which is wonderful for the pine beetles and bad for the pine trees. It means there is a smaller snowpack that melts earlier. on average, resulting in less irrigation water for our farmers and ranchers. It also means less healthy streams for salmon and trout. It means that a lot of the carbon will be absorbed into the ocean and become carbonic acid, and now we have to artificially buffer the Pacific Ocean seawater in order for baby oysters to survive.

The list goes on, but the point is that these changes are happening not just in my State but all over our country, and not just in our country but all over the world. Most of these changes have manifested themselves within the last 10 years, that is, when we actually see what is happening. Just a couple of years ago, the sea started off the coast of Oregon started dying, and off the coast of Washington and off the coast of California. In fact, in some areas they have been completely wiped out. The result of that is that the blue sea urchins have exploded within the sea urchins to eat them. The result of that is the rapid disappearance of big kelp forests that harbor thousands of species. Who knows what impact that will have on...
the chain of life in the ocean or on the fisheries that are such an important part of our economy. In place after place, effect after effect, effects can be measured with a thermometer or with litmus paper for acidity or with a ruler. Recorded history, science by our ranchers, farmers, fishermen, and the forests and timber economy; effects that are felt by the 180 million Americans who suffered through an extraordinary heat wave in what is now expected to be the hottest month in human recorded history, this is how we measure.

So we face a huge challenge, but we cannot respond by saying: Oh, my goodness, it is overwhelming. I want to ignore it. Or it is such a large challenge that I cannot make a difference. Instead, we have to increase our efforts. We have to do a faster transition off of fossil fuels that are creating the carbon to renewable fuels, and, in so doing, create millions of jobs and make all of our friends—good-paying ones, and we race to the top with project labor agreements and high family wages and benefits. We need to make sure that we move forward in a fashion that puts jobs in places where they are needed, in our border communities, in our frontier communities, as I like to call them, and in rural parts of Oregon, in our rural communities, in our former fossil fuel communities. Our former fossil fuel workers who did the hard work, took the risks, and suffered black lung should be in line for new energy jobs in our economy.

But we have no time to wait. This needs to be bipartisan. This is not blue or red. This is the planet Earth. We are all on it together. We are all on this little remote planet, a long distance to our next planet, a long distance between our star and the next star. There are an estimated 2 trillion galaxies in the universe with perhaps a billion stars each, but a lot of them are the little blue-green orbs. So let's save it.

Can human civilization rise to the task? That hangs in the balance. We are not doing very well so far.

But my colleague from Rhode Island, Sheldon Whitehouse, has given his attention to this analysis, bringing everything to bear, saying: Pay attention and work hard. So I try to be a little more sparing. I mean you still have to be nice to people, but I try to be a little more sparing because this gets absurd. Sometimes we have come lunches, and there are probably 10 or 15 moments when we are all applauding each other. It gets crazy.

But I want to take this moment on the Senate floor to applaud someone who has really displayed extraordinary leadership. Whatever one may think about the U.S. Senate and how it functions, these are 100 pretty impressive people. They have accomplished something probably prior in their life and just to get to this job is a remarkable achievement. But Sheldon Whitehouse is the single most fearless individual in politics that I ever have met. He is the single most tireless individual in politics that I ever have met, and it is not just with speechmaking.

Today is a marker because he made 250. Is it 250 or did the Senator already do it?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. This is 250.

Mr. SCHATZ. He made 249, and he is about to do 250, and I will let him get to it. But it will be 250 individual speeches on the Senate floor. Sometimes there are people in the Chamber, and sometimes it is empty and you are talking to these incredible young men and women, those 250, and the Presiding Officer, who has no choice but to sit there politely. But Sheldon Whitehouse will give his 250th speech on climate. Sometimes there are people in the Chamber, and it is not most of what he has done. It is a small part of what he has done, with absolute moral, scientific, political, and pragmatic clarity.

I will just say a couple more things about my partnership with Sheldon. You know, I was a very happy Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii, and I was leading the Hawaii Clean Energy Initiative, which is our effort to get to 100 percent clean energy by the year 2040. The very unfortunate death of Daniel K. Inouye made a vacancy in the Senate seat, and I decided to pursue this Senate seat because I wanted to do something about climate. I didn’t know most of the Members except for the famous ones.

When I came to the Senate, everybody told me to talk to Sheldon Whitehouse, and we became fast friends. He comes from the Ocean State, even though that sounds weird to me. I come from the Aloha State, and he comes from the Ocean State, and we have been working together ever since.

But I want to report to whomever is watching that I never felt such momentum on this issue. It is because of the young people who have sort of stormed on this issue. It is because of the young people who—when change happens and our storms are getting more frequent and more severe. Public opinion is moving. Now you have a majority of young people who believe that climate change is an issue or a long-term future issue; climate change is now. It is happening across the country. It is not just happening to conservation areas or places where you might enjoy the outdoors; it is happening to communities from coast to coast and everywhere in between. There are record heat waves, record floods, record snowstorms, coral bleaching events. It is very difficult to describe something as a 100-year flood or a 500-year flood—which means it is supposed to happen, statistically speaking, about every 100 or 500 years—if that flood is happening every year.

It is very difficult to ignore the reality of climate change when the last 8 hottest years on record were over the last 9 years. The weather is absolutely getting weirder and more unpleasant, and our storms are getting more frequent and more severe.
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began: ‘I know that many in Washington would prefer to ignore this issue, but nature keeps sending us messages—messages we ignore at our peril.’

It was a cry of frustration—frustration that the Supreme Court’s infamous Citizens United decision had killed the bipartisan work that I saw here on climate for 3 years; frustration that the fossil fuel industry’s death grip had tightened around this Chamber, preventing action; frustration that our Democratic administration had abandoned leadership on climate change and would barely even talk about it.

It has been a run, and here I am, still at it, 7 years on. Some things have changed; some things have not.

Let’s start with what has not changed. What has not changed is the scientific certainty about what is happening right now. Where we are—and where we have been—Scientists have understood that burning fossil fuels has caused our planet to heat up since the days when Abraham Lincoln was riding around Washington, DC, in his top hat. This is not new news.

Nearly four decades ago, Exxon’s own scientists reported to Exxon management that there is “little doubt” that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were increasing due to fossil fuel burning. They said back in 1982 that the resulting greenhouse effect “would warm the Earth’s surface, causing changes in climate affecting atmospheric and ocean temperatures, rainfall patterns, soil moisture, and possibly even melting the polar ice caps.”

There was no legitimate debate over the science when I started in 2012, and there is no legitimate debate over the science today. Indeed, the science has only strengthened. With each passing year, as Senator MERKLEY said, we rely less on complicated climate models and on scientific forecasts and, unfortunately, more on straightforward, real-time measurement of the changes. Today, with our own eyes what recently was predicted: glacial collapse and retreat, sea level rise, arctic warming, and increasingly extreme weather.

Another constant since 2012 is the fossil fuel industry’s remorseless campaign. A, to block climate change and B, to do this while hiding its hands behind front groups. I have delivered dozens of speeches about the dozens of climate denial front groups. Indeed, we have had whole groups of Senators come to the floor to talk about the web of denial that the fossil fuel industry has constructed to propagate fake science, to hide that it is the fossil fuel industry that is stringing front groups. Indeed, we have killed the big oil and the Koch brothers. They set up these groups up, and they set them up to sow doubt or debate about real climate science and to obstruct, obstruct, obstruct here in Washington.

They have spent—at a minimum—hundreds of millions of dollars on this anti-climate campaign. With that money, they have talked up some seriously ridiculous notions, such as carbon pollution is good for us all because carbon is plant food. They have taken out billboards comparing climate scientists to the Unabomber. It is false and ugly stuff powered by hidden money.

Oil giants still spend huge amounts to infect America’s corporate lobbying with their obstruction message. Among them, the biggest anti-climate lobbying force in Washington is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a trade group that purports to represent typical patriotic American businesses. It should, more properly, be called the “U.S. Chamber of Carbon.” There is at the rock bottom, side by side with the National Association of Manufacturers, in a statistical tie for worst obstructer of climate action in America.

Why wouldn’t Big Oil go to all this trouble? They are defending a $650 billion per year threat to the United States alone, according to the International Monetary Fund. So it is logical, but it is still shameful.

There is a vast majority of American companies that have a different view and the beginning of a new era of climate action. Yet in Congress, that vast majority is a silent majority. When I say “silent,” I mean they are not showing up in Congress—not to push back, not to correct the record, not even to seek serious climate battle of the century solutions, like government, like a carbon dividend, like carbon capture, like carbon capture and storage. They were AWOL in Congress in 2012, and they are AWOL in Congress now. Corporate America’s silence was deafening then, and it is deafening still today.

So what has changed since that first speech 7-plus years ago? First of all, the economics of renewable energy changed in a big way. In 2012, wind and solar weren’t cost-competitive with fossil fuels. Storage and electric vehicles were nowhere. That year, the average cost was $1,000 per megawatt hour. Today, it is one-quarter of that. The cost of wind power is down, and offshore wind is emerging. Battery storage now competes on price with gas-fired, peak-demand plants in many areas. Automakers around the world are making more and more electric vehicles, driving costs down and performance up for consumers. Even with that massive subsidy for fossil fuel renewables are starting to win on price.

Another new area is that we are starting to capture carbon. This little cube that I have in my hand is CO₂ that was pulled out of the air by direct air capture technology and can be turned into tiles, blocks, bricks. There it is. It is the beginning of a new era of carbon capture. The group that did this is competing in Wyoming this summer for the XPRIZE for carbon capture.

Another big thing that has changed since 2012 is that economists, central bankers, Wall Street bankers, real estate professionals, and asset managers are all recognizing the major risks that climate change poses to the global economy. It is not free to ignore it, and the costs could come in the form of crashes. Back in 2012, these economic warnings—these crash warnings—were uncommon. Today, they are coming from everywhere.

Freddie Mac predicts that rising sea levels will prompt a crash in coastal property values greater than the housing crash that caused the 2008 financial crisis.

First Street has shown how sea level rise is already affecting coastal real estate values up and down the east coast. It found that rising seas have already resulted in $16 billion in lost property values in coastal homes from Maine to Mississippi.

Moody’s warns that climate risk could trigger downgrades in coastal communities’ bond ratings. Just last week, the mayor of Honolulu testified at Senator SCHATZ’s Climate Committee’s first hearing that the credit rating agencies are already grilling him about this.

BlackRock has estimated that some coastal communities face annual average losses of up to 15 percent of GDP from climate change by the end of the century. Heads up, Florida.

Climate property was the only financial risk. The Bank of England, Bank of France, Bank of Canada, San Francisco Fed, and European Central Bank—all along with many top-tier, peer-reviewed economic papers—are all warning of systemic economic risk. That is central banker speak for something that poses a risk to the entire economy, all from stranded fossil fuel assets called the carbon asset bubble.

One other thing I have spent a lot of time on is oceans—the heating, the acidification, the lost and shifting fisheries, the collapse in coral and expanding dead zones, and, of course, the rising sea levels. Our terrestrial species needs a lot more attention to the oceans. There has been a real shift in attention in these intervening years.

Then you have Standard & Poor’s, Moody’s, Citi group, and more economists warning that the costs of climate change will not be measured in the hundreds of billions or even in the trillions but will be measured in the tens of trillions of dollars. That is a penalty worth avoiding and worth the attention in the Senate.

So here I am, 7-plus years later, giving my 256th speech on this between persistent, tiresome, and, I suppose, foolhardy is where you will find me.

I never thought I would still be at it well into 2019, but the fossil fuel industry, with all of its wretched dark money, is still carrying the torch in Congress while the rest of corporate America still sits on its hands. The U.S. Senate still is not seriously considering any legislation to reduce carbon pollution, and I am still frustrated, but I am optimistic because the denial wall is cracking.

Bankers and asset managers and financial titans recognize the massive
economic risks of a fossil fuel-based economy and see the huge economic potential of a low-carbon economy. They now see real business incentive to push back on the fossil fuel denial apparatus. They now see real business peril in allowing the fossil fuel denial apparatus to continue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the “Economists’ Statement on Carbon Dividends” that was published in the Wall Street Journal, which illustrates that exact point.

I am also optimistic because people are talking about climate change again, and colleagues are talking about climate change. Americans everywhere are talking about climate change. Most Republicans want action on climate change. Voters are engaged on climate change, and more than anyone else, young people especially are engaged. From young hero Greta Thunberg to kids all across this country, to the young people of the Juliana suit, young plaintiffs in the Juliana suit, kids all across this country, to the young people especially are engaged.

As for me, I can’t wait to stop giving these speeches. These speeches chronicle the continued failure of this body and the continued failure of our country to grapple with an evident climate crisis, and these speeches chronicle the fake science and the political mischief and malfeasance that has caused the current climate crisis.

As we move forward, we are doing so at a time when the voice of truth has been heard. Why is it important for him to be this incredible leader? It is that climate change—or the climate crisis—is the national security, economic, environmental, health, and moral issue of our time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the “Economists’ Statement on Carbon Dividends” that was published in the Wall Street Journal, which illustrates that exact point. I am also optimistic because people are talking about climate change again, and colleagues are talking about climate change.

Global climate change is a serious problem calling for immediate national action. Guided by sound economic principles, we are proposing the following policy as recommendations.

I. A carbon tax offers the most cost-effective lever to reduce carbon emissions at the scale and speed that are necessary. By correcting a well-known market failure, a carbon tax will send a powerful price signal that harnesses the invisible hand of the marketplace to steer economic actors towards a low-carbon future.

II. A carbon tax should increase every year until emissions reductions goals are met and be revenue neutral to avoid debates over the size of government. A consistently rising carbon price will encourage technological innovation and large-scale infrastructure development. It will also accelerate the diffusion of carbon-efficient goods and services.

III. A sufficiently robust and gradually rising carbon tax will replace the need for various carbon controls and be less efficient. Substituting a price signal for cumbersome regulations will promote economic growth and provide the regulatory certainty companies need for long-term investment in clean-energy alternatives.

IV. To prevent carbon leakage and to protect U.S. competitiveness, a carbon border tax should be established on imported goods. This system would enhance the competitiveness of American firms that are more energy-efficient than their global competitors. It would also create an incentive for other nations to adopt similar carbon pricing.

V. To maximize the fairness and political viability of a rising carbon tax, all the revenue should be returned directly to U.S. citizens through equal lump-sum rebates. The majority of American families, including the most vulnerable, will benefit financially by receiving more in “carbon dividends” than they pay in increased energy prices.


Paul Volcker is a former Federal Reserve chairman.

Martin Baily, Michael Baskin, Martin Feldstein, Jason Furman, Austan Goolsbee, Glenn Hubbard, Alan Krueger, Edward Lazear, N. Gregory Mankiw, Christina Romer, Harvey Rosen and Laura Tyson are former chairmen of the president’s Council of Economic Advisers.

Ben Bernanke, Greenspan and Janet Yellen have chaired both the Fed and the Council of Economic Advisers.

George Shultz and Lawrence Summers are former Treasury Secretaries.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, what an honor it is to be out here with the great leader from the State of Rhode Island, Sheldon Whitehouse, who has come onto the Senate floor 250 times to say to the Senate and to say to our country that it is time to wake up. His voice is inspiring. His voice cuts through all the obfuscation that has been paid for by the fossil fuel interests. It ensures that we hear the truth about the danger climate change poses to our country and to the planet.

I came out here just to say how special it is for me, another Member who partners with Sheldon Whitehouse on this issue. This is somebody who has dedicated his career to solving this problem. He knows all issues go through three phases—political education, political activation, and political implementation. He has been a one-man tutor in his educating of the American public and the U.S. Senate on not only the technical aspects of climate change but on the political aspects of it because, ultimately, it is a political problem; it is a political problem we have. The technologies are ready to go.

What Senator Whitehouse has done is to have served as this inspirational center point. He has ensured that the voice of truth has been heard. His voice is inspiring. His voice has been saying is something that, in my opinion, is going to wind up putting him in the history books for the incredible leadership he has shown. There are a lot of times in which you can be right but too soon. People are not ready to hear it. Yet what we are finding across the country is that more and more people are ready to hear it, especially the younger generation, especially people who recognize right now that they are going to live their entire lives with this crisis. How do we know that? Back in November, our scientists—13 Federal agencies—who were mandated by a 1990 law, had to present a report to the President on climate change. All 13 agencies—the Department of Energy, the EPA, the Department of State—had to come together. Here is what they concluded. If we do not change course, we are going to be heading upward of—get ready for this—an 11-foot rise in the ocean in the Northeastern part of the United States. Think about that—
11 feet higher. The impact would be catastrophic. Our pages will live through this entire story unless we change what we are doing in our country, unless we change what the U.S. Senate does to put preventive measures in place.

What Senator WHITEHOUSE is saying is: Wake up. The science is clear, and it is unchallengeable.

Our problem is that too many Republican senators are the deniers in chief who sits in the Oval Office—are nolaic for a time that never existed. They pretend, somehow or other, that all of these climate-related problems are going to magically be solved by policies that don’t exist and perhaps we are just in some kind of cycle on our planet that will go away and that these young people will not have a legacy of climate change to have to deal with in their lives. Of course, every scientist in America, with the exception of those who are bought by the Koch brothers, bought by ExxonMobil, bought by the fossil fuel companies, agrees that this is going to happen.

From my perspective, what we are seeing is something that is deadly—the forest fires, the extreme heat waves, the supercharged hurricanes, the Biblical flooding. All of it is happening as a result of what human beings are doing to our own planet. Global temperatures are rising like a runaway freight train. This month is on track to be the hottest month on Earth ever recorded. May I say that again? The month of July in 2019 is on track to be the hottest month on record for that history of our planet. Last month was the hottest June in recorded history. Every month so far in 2019 has been in the top five hottest on record. The last 5 years have been the hottest 5 years ever recorded, and 20 of the last 22 years have been the hottest ever recorded.

This is not a drill; this is an emergency, and it is an emergency that has an impact on people living wind and solar and new batteries and all-electric vehicles and energy efficiency and investing in new technologies that can accelerate the solution even more. It is all there for us to do.

Right now we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo mission to the Moon. President Kennedy felt there was an existential threat to our planet that the Soviet Union was posing. He actually said at Rice University that we knew we were behind. The Russians had already sent up Sputnik. The Russians had already sent up Yuri Gagarin. He said we were behind but that we would not be behind by the end of the decade. He made it quite clear that we had to invent materials that did not exist, invent alloys that did not exist, invent propulsion systems that did not exist; that we would have to return from the mission from the Moon through heat that was half the heat from the Sun and we would have to do so within a decade so we would control that existential threat.

The U.N. scientists and our scientists have each now said that climate change poses an existential threat to our planet—not ours, not Senator WHITEHOUSE’s and mine. Those are the words of the scientists of the planet and our own country.

So we have to respond in the same way that President Kennedy asked our Nation to respond back in the 1960s. And the young people in our country—they are ready to go. They are ready to do whatever is necessary. But in order to do so and to encourage us to take the kinds of actions that are necessary.

The U.N. special report said that if emissions are not cut by 100 percent by 2050, climate change will lead to natural disasters costing $54 trillion over the next 80 years.

A lot of people say: Can we afford to take on this challenge? What our scientists are saying is that we can’t afford not to take on this challenge. We can’t afford the highest price of all when we can create millions of jobs saving the planet in wind and solar and new all-electric vehicles and buildings, technologies, energy efficiency. We can save all of creation by engaging in massive job creation. It is all there for us.

We just did it with the telecommunications revolution. We moved from black, rotary dial phones to the young people who are here in the well of the Senate and the young people that they walk around with. Those iPhones have more computing power than the computers on the Apollo mission. How did we do that? We are Americans. We take on these challenges, and we revolutionized the telecommunications industry to move from the black, rotary dial phone. And these young people don’t even know what that is.

We have moved from having no fax machines in our country 40 years ago to today. There are no fax machines in America. That is how quick the revolution goes when you put a plan together to accomplish it.

Well, the same thing is true in the clean energy sector, and what Senator WHITEHOUSE has been leading us on is this explication to the Senate that we can do it. You can’t let the special interests dictate it, though. You can’t let the dark money control it. That is his legislature today. They are more important for us to ignore it. In the same way we ignored the monopolies in telecommunications, we have to ignore the monopolies and the duopolies that exist in the energy sector as well.

So I thank the Senator from Rhode Island again, and I will repeatedly do so because he will reach 300 speeches out here on the floor and 500 speeches out here on the floor. You might as well put an infinity sign behind the number because that is how many speeches he has already given on the Senate floor to wake up this institution. That day is going to come, and I just wanted to come out here and thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his incredible leadership and to let him know that I am honored to be his partner in this effort.

I will be by your side the entire time it takes for us to get a solution for the young people in our country that they deserve and they expect from this institution.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE, May you propose to my wonderful colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, that the Good Lord forbid that I have to get to 500 such speeches before we solve this problem.

Mr. MARKEY. The Good Lord and MITCH MCCONNELL.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I would note that if we look back to 2009, there are some very important signs of optimism.

On the legislative side, Senator MARK-WAXMAN—Representative Waxman with his colleague Representative Waxman—successfully ushered, with significant industry and popular support, a serious climate bill through the House of Representatives, proving that it can be done, proving that real climate legislation can pass in this body.

In that same year, in 2009, a gentleman named Donald Trump—the same Donald Trump who is President now at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House—took out an advertisement in The New York Times, and in his advertisement, Donald Trump and his children—Donald, Eric, and Ivanka—as well as the Trump Organization, all said that the science of climate change was incontrovertible. They further said that if we did not act, the consequences of climate change would be catastrophic and irreversible.

So we have the living experience of legislation passing, led by then-Representative Waxman and Representative Waxman, and all we need, really, is to bring back that 2009 Donald Trump. Come on back, buddy. We want you because you were right in 2009.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, you know, Massachusetts is the Bay State, and Rhode Island is the Ocean State.

Back 240 or so years ago, Paul Revere got on his horse, and he went riding with warning of great danger. From my perspective, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is a latter-day Paul Revere, and he is warning that the climate crisis is coming and that it is going to be much worse than it is today.

So from my perspective, this latter-day Paul Revere, who is SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, represents the best of New England and the best of our country and the best of our planet because we have to be all in this together, and we can’t be leaders by sitting on the sidelines, which is where Donald Trump wants to have us. The Indians, the Chinese, and others—they won’t
listen to us. You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You can’t tell the rest of the world to do something while you have a cigar in one hand and a beer in the other. That is where we are now with pollution under President Trump.

We have to be leaders, not laggers. That is what SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is all about. That is why it is my great honor to be up here with him, and for as long as it takes, he will be out here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cramer). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—VETO

Mr. McNIELLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto messages on S. J. Res. 36, 37, and 38 be considered as having been read en bloc, that they be printed in the RECORD and spread in the RECORD on the Journal en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNIELLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message with respect to S. J. Res. 36, S. J. Res. 37, and S. J. Res. 38 be considered at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader prior to August 2; that they be debated concurrently for up to 2 hours, with 15 minutes reserved for each amendment and ranking member, respectively; that the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolutions, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, in the order listed; and, finally, that the unanimous consent order of June 19 for the remaining joint resolutions of disapproval of arms sales remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in April of this year, Border Patrol agents in South Texas, in McAllen—one of the most crossed areas for illegal traffic in the entire southern border—saw a group of individuals walking north who had already crossed the border, and they broke and ran. They assumed these individuals were illegal present in the U.S. and started moving to try to interdict them. They searched through a very large and very overgrown field.

I can tell you that that area is very, very rough terrain. It is very isolating, and the brush is exceptionally heavy. On a day in April, even in South Texas, it is extremely hot.

As they searched through the field looking for individuals, they happened to hear a child crying in their search. They encountered a 3-year-old boy who had been abandoned by human smugglers when they broke and ran. This young boy, 3 years old, had these shoes on, and on his shoes were written a name and a phone number across them. That is the only identifying thing they have. They tested the phone number, by the way, and the phone number didn’t work.

Those human smugglers—moving people from Central America with children as the vehicle—are prone to just cast that child aside if they slow them down.

The Border Patrol agents who encountered this child wearing those shoes, took him to the office. Those Border Patrol agents personally bought him new clothing. The fellow agents entertained him. You can see him playing PAW Patrol back in the station. They spent time comforting him and trying to figure out who he was and where he was from. Border Patrol agents alternated taking care of him, personally buying supplies for him until they can transition him into Health and Human Services’ care. That is what is really happening on the border every day.

Border Patrol agents are dealing with children that cartels are using to move adults into the United States. Yes, there are some family units who are moving in, but every single family that is entered in the United States is being ushered in by a cartel that works the border, and they are choosing the time and the place to move those individuals.

These officials are risking their lives every single day. They are working with families every single day to try to figure out who is a family unit and who is a child that is just being smuggled to be used as a vehicle to get across the border and how to separate the two. Then, once they identify the child, they try to figure out this: What do we do now with this child that we have? Where are you from?

Several months ago, most of the children who were moving across were 10, 11, and 12 years old, and they could interview those children. The cartels have figured that out now, and they are sending more and more children who are infants, 1, 2, and 3 years old, who don’t know where they are from and don’t know their names or their background or any other details. It is becoming more and more difficult for the Border Patrol agents to figure this out. In fact, Border Patrol agents just like this are now actually bringing their cars, seats or finding other places that would donate car seats because when HHS needs to transport them out of a bus, they don’t have car seats there. So they are paying for car seats to help some of these abandoned children be able to get to a place of safety.

These are the folks who are being criticized. These are the folks who some of my colleagues, even as recently as the unaccompanied children they need to get 40 hours of sensitivity training because they are so insensitive to what is happening on the border. These are the folks putting their own personal fi-

nances and their lives on the line and who are working every day to solve some of the problems that we have.

For the past several years, there have been disagreements on the solutions and wide disagreements on Federal law enforcement and on the President. Instead of actually trying to figure out what the problem is at the border, Why is this happening? Why have our numbers so rapidly accelerated?

This past weekend, I visited the border with some of my colleagues. I went with Senator JONI ERNST of Iowa and Dr. BILL CASSIDY of Louisiana. We went to the Rio Grande Valley Sector. That area of the border is a thin slice of the border between the United States and Mexico, but in that area, in that one zone, 40 percent of all illegal traffic moves across the border. The most heavily trafficked area of that zone is the McAllen Sector, and that is where we went.

Across that one area, in that one small segment of the border, they have between 1,500 and 2,000 individuals illegally crossing the single day. That is one small sector of a 2,000-mile-long border. Just this year, in that one small sector, they have had individuals from 63 different countries cross the border illegally—63 different countries.

I hear a lot of folks say: It is all people from Central America who are crossing across the border to flee. That is not true. There are 63 countries just this year, just around McAllen, TX, not including the whole rest of the border. You see, the cartels sort individuals by country and by background. They send Indians in one direction. They send Pakistanis in another direction. They send individuals from Bangladesh in another direction. They send folks from Honduras and Guatemala in another direction.

When I walked into one of the five stations that we visited all through that area this weekend, just to do a quick pop-in to see who was there at that moment, half of the adults who were there—these were single adults—were there from Venezuela and half of them were from Cuba, because that is how the cartels sort individuals. That one weekend in McAllen, we have had individuals from Pakistan, Yemen, China, Venezuela, Bangladesh, and Syria, in addition to many countries from Africa and Asia, and obviously much of Central America as well. Those individuals are moving across the border in very large numbers. Ninety percent of the apprehensions that have happened this year—90 percent—have been from countries other than Mexico. Even the newest recently as 2014, only 1 percent of men who crossed the border had a child with them. Now the number is 50 percent of the men crossing the border have a child with them—50 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further discussion?
The numbers have dramatically changed, and what is happening along our border is significant.

The men and women who are actually working every single day to protect what is happening at the border are at the trade that is happening. These same individuals are processing 650,000 trucks coming into this area, 2.2 million pedestrians, and 9.3 million passengers coming across in different personal vehicles. There is a lot going on there. So when I went down to the border this weekend and visited the five different facilities and then spent much of the evening and deep into the night riding along with Border Patrol, where one set of agents switched vehicles to go with a separate set of agents to ride along through the border just to get a feel for what was happening, what I experienced was exceptionally painful. What I saw were places that were crowded, spartan situations, and in my mind it echoed that for months the administration and the committee that I serve on—members of the Homeland Security Committee—have said for months that there is a humanitarian crisis on this border. But it didn’t seem that anyone was listening until recently because I had to find out if all of this had been created recently.

Now, suddenly, people are turning their attention to what is happening along this border and saying that there is a serious humanitarian problem. And we as committee, the Democrats because we have been saying it for months.

Cartels are making millions and millions of dollars exploiting children. They are smuggling children and families across the border. It now costs $8,000 to cross a single individual through the border. You pay a toll to the cartels, both to the traffickers and smugglers who are moving people—that $8,000 and, then, an additional fee to actually cross the border. That is the time of the cartels choosing in that area. But if you bring a child with you, it is half price. It is $4,000. The incentive now is that it is cheaper to cross this area if you bring a child because the cartels know they don’t have to spend you over the wall. All they have to do is get you to the border and drop you off.

We watched as a family unit and a group of Border Patrol interdicted them, and then a mile away, three single adults made a sprint for the border. They went to the wall with a makeshift ladder and started working their way up the ladder, but because it took extra time for them to do that, Border Patrol was able to get to their location, interdict, and arrest them.

Cartels time it to move a set of families one direction to get all the Border Patrol gathered around them to hope fully sneak in people who most likely have a criminal record who can’t just go through the normal system. They can’t just match up a family with them. They have to move them separately and, at the same time, moving large quantities of drugs across the border not far away from there.

On the date I was there, this picture was taken along the border not far from where I was. This was taken at 3 o’clock in the afternoon where a group of four individuals carrying large bags and boxes across the border. Now, I can’t tell you for certain what is in those, but I have a pretty good guess that at 4 o’clock in the afternoon, four individuals bringing almost identical bundles across it is a pretty good guess those are drugs.

This still photo that was snapped at 3 o’clock in the afternoon during a weekend was a reminder again of actually what is happening at the border. As cartels line up, families go this direction, single individuals with a criminal record go this direction, and then we move drugs a different direction to see if we can’t work our way through it.

Why is this happening? This is happening because Customs and Border Protection is spending all their time on humanitarian work now. Now 60 percent of the work of each individual agent is spent on humanitarian work processing families. They are doing the work; they are engaged in the process; and they are committed to taking care of people.

When 60 percent are in town taking care of the humanitarian work, that leaves 40 percent to patrol the border. Where there used to be literally 60 people who would travel in this region of the border, now there are 20 to cover all of those miles. The cartels know it. So the more they can send families up through this section and the more they can cause chaos inside, the greater likelihood they can move drugs across the border freely.

How does this happen? This happens because the cartels can work to get a group of people across Central America and say, ‘We have a way to get you into the United States, and we can get you in quickly. Bring a child with you—you pay them $3,000 or $4,000 if you bring a child—and we will work you up. They make promises to them of what will happen. Many of these people are from high poverty areas of Central America, and they will work them toward the border and drop them off at that spot.

It costs even more if you are not from the Central American area. Chinese individuals who have been moved across our border paid as much as $30,000 to the cartels—$30,000 to pay the price to move them through Mexico and then cross the border at a time of their choosing.

This is something that is making a tremendous amount of money for the cartels, and if we don’t engage on solving this issue, we are allowing it. We need to realize our laws are broken. They are not only broken for immigration; what is happening, they are also not only breaking our hearts for what is happening with the humanitarian crisis and what is actually occurring, but it is becoming a critical issue that we have to respond to, and we should.

Let me show you this next shot. This is what it looks like now along the border. As I traveled through the different locations, some of them are gut-wrenching and difficult because for the Border Patrol, they are a police station, basically, along the border.

What does that look like, and how will things work? When you check in at the Border Patrol station, wherever it may be, whether it is in the central processing facility that is so overcrowded or whether it is out at the
soft-sided facility, when you get there, the first thing they do is they actually swap clothes with you. They have clothes they bought with their budgets. They allow you to pick different types of clothes to wear. The Border Patrol and their families take the clothes to those individuals. They had washing machines there set up, and they will personally wash all their clothes for them while they get a shower and they get cleaned up because many of these folks have not showered and don’t have clothes to wear.

So the first step is, they help them get all cleaned up and put fresh clothes on, a fresh shower, and hot meals. They have hot meals every single day. They also have snacks and supplies. This is, again, in that same soft-sided facility. This is just one of their supply rooms where you get a feel for snacks and drinks and water and toiletries. Back over in this area are large quantities of hygiene products and clothes—all kinds of clothes are all piled up that they have gathered to help take care of individuals.

One of the things I heard so many times is, these kids can’t even brush their teeth because Americans are so mean and because the Border Patrol is so ruthless to them. I went to five different facilities, and in every facility, I asked to see their supply room. In every facility, I saw these. That looks like toothbrushes to me. In fact, in the central processing facility that had so much attention in the media, I asked the director there, and they said they actually have had 87,000 toothbrushes there. There has always been toothbrushes and toothpaste. There has always been soap and water and ways to clean up.

The challenge is, some of these folks come from very remote villages, and guess what, they are not used to brushing their teeth every day. That is not a normal hygiene habit for all people in some places they come from. So when the media comes to them and says: Have you brushed your teeth today, and they say no, it is not because they didn’t have a toothbrush available. It is because, no, they didn’t brush their teeth today.

I actually watched an interview where they went to a child and said: Have you brushed your teeth, and they said no. Their response on Twitter was: "I am watching an interview when the child said: Have you brushed your teeth today? She didn’t say no."

I am tired of hearing people say President Trump has never taken so much heat for is actually a facility in McAllen, TX, they call the central processing facility. It was stood up in 2014 and 2015 when President Obama was facing a rush of children coming across the border with no place to put them. So President Obama’s team, Jeh Johnson, as the Secretary of DHS, went there to tell them to hold children there. That is the facility President Obama is getting blamed for—I am sorry, President Trump is getting blamed for—that President Obama and his team actually designed and built.

Now, is it a great facility for children? No, I don’t think it is, nor is it the Border Patrol’s fault, though, that it is a bad facility. They are using what they have to manage the crisis that is happening in front of them.

I am tired of hearing people say President Trump is trying to throw all these kids out and treat them so miserably, when that is not the case. They are scrambling to figure out what they can do to safely manage and take care of the kids and the families they have and how they can sort out and try to figure out what to do.

So let me talk through the solutions here. How do we solve this crisis that is going on currently with thousands and thousands of people who are illegally crossing the border every day?

Well, some of them, we can start getting the message out, which has already happened, that America is open and built for immigration if you do it legally. We have 1.1 million people who go through the legal permanent residence process every single year. We have 700,000 people every single year who become citizens of the United States through a naturalized system. We have 500,000 people every day who legally cross the border from Mexico into the United States. Half a million every day legally do it.

One of the places I stopped to see was the legal processing facility right at the international bridge, and I watched individuals drive in and show their papers and go through the simple process. They show a passport, show their visa, whatsoever it may be, and drive across the border. Thousands of people line up to do it and millions a year in each facility.

I watched as people crossed the border on a pedestrian bridge, and as they crossed it with their paperwork, they would get blamed for that, and we would up to the bridge, they say: “I am asking for asylum.” They walk across the border on the international bridge and are taken into an air-conditioned room to start processing their asylum request. That is happening every day right now.

Yet everyone in the media is saying that is not happening. The first thing we can do is start getting out accurate information of what is actually occurring at the border.

The second thing we can do is—one of the primary issues the Border Patrol asked for over and over again, fund ICE. Now, why would the Border Patrol ask for more funding for somebody else? Because ICE is the primary entity that actually does detention. Border Patrol is the police station. ICE does detention.

When individuals are picked up at the border by Border Patrol, they are processed and immediately delivered to ICE. ICE then does detention for those individuals. They have facilities scattered all over the country where they can house individuals in consistent housing, with plenty of space and set up perfectly for that with well-trained individuals to detain folks to go through that process.

Border Patrol’s No. 1 request is: Please stop asking us to do detention. We don’t have facilities for it. Clearly, that is why everyone is packed in. Allow ICE to do this.

Now, why doesn’t ICE have funding? Well, because it has been one of our biggest battles with our Democratic colleagues who are obsessed with defunding ICE. Over and over again they say they want to abolish ICE, defund ICE, and get rid of ICE. What is really being stated there is there is no place to do detention when that occurs.

Let me give you an example. In 2018, the request for ICE was $3.6 billion. Actually, what we could get at the end of it was just over $3 billion. They were $600 million down from what they said they needed. In 2019, the request was $3.5 billion. They got $3.1 billion—again, much less than what they needed.

When the crisis began to hit in its highest proportion and we finally got a humanitarian relief package to these individuals on the border to try to get additional support, including building the soft-sided facility, my Democratic colleagues held out and refused to do any funding for ICE. In the humanitarian package, there was zero funding for ICE detention—none.

Border Patrol said what is the prime thing we need to actually solve this problem. What we need, more than anything else, is to allow these folks to move out of these temporary facilities
into long-term facilities so we can actually get them in better housing situations, but when we debated our way through this, our Democratic colleagues held firm and said: No funding for ICE detention. That perpetuates this problem on the border.

We have to solve this. They should be able to have the additional funding that they need so that we can get these kids and families into better locations for their housing and not temporary, stopgap locations.

The next issue we need to address is, we should move asylum officers to the border. This is one of the prime things that Border Patrol wanted. Many of these individuals come and say: I want asylum. Let’s walk them through the process. Let’s get there. The problem is that the vast majority of individuals who request asylum do not qualify for asylum. They come into the United States because they want to connect with family members who are here or for economic or other opportunities. I completely understand that. We have a legal process to do that. But someone can’t just come across the border and say: I have a cousin who lives here and I want to come, and that qualifies as asylum.

Additionally, we have to deal with the problem that a family with a child or a child can only be held for 20 days. They can be held for only 20 days, and after that, they have to be released into the country. The cartels and human smugglers know that rule, and that is why we have seen an increase from 2014 from only 1 percent of the people crossing the border who are asking for asylum actually qualify, but individuals wait up to 2 years for a hearing to find out if they qualify. So the legitimate individuals who genuinely need asylum but have to get through that process as rapidly as they can, cannot do so because 85 percent of the people are clogging up the system, asking for things that are not asylum.

We should move asylum officers closer to the border to do faster processing so we can help individuals who are seeking asylum to get it and also identify people who are gaming the system and say: You cannot just game the system. You have to go through the process legally.

Additionally, we have to deal with this 20-day release issue. Right now, the rule is that a family with a child or a child can only be held for 20 days total. They can be held for only 20 days, and after that, they have to be released into the country. The cartels and human smugglers know that rule, and that is why we have seen an increase from 2014 from only 1 percent of the men bringing a child to now 50 percent of the men bringing a child because they know that if they bring a child, they will be released within 20 days.

Here is what is different, though. In 20 days, we can do our record checks in the United States to see whether this person has a criminal record, but when we contact any of the 63 other countries that these individuals are coming from, just in that sector, most of those countries can’t respond to us with their country’s criminal record within 20 days.

What is really happening on the border is individuals are coming across with a child. They are being detained for 20 days while we request criminal records from their home country. They are still there when on the 21st day we have to release them, and 10 to 15 days later, we get word that the individual actually had a murder warrant in their home country. That really happened just a few days ago.

Also, a few days ago, we released an adult with a child and then found out a few days later that their home country was seeking them because they were a pedophile in their country. But we had just released that adult with a child into our country because we have a 20-day restriction and we can’t wait until we get criminal records from another country. That is absurd.

We are encouraging the trafficking of children by saying that you can get into our country no matter what if you just bring a child, and we are encouraging people with a criminal record to come in and bring a child because they know that if they bring a child, they will be able to get in, because their home country can’t fulfill our request fast enough. Why would we do that as a country? Why would we knowingly, willingly do that?

We can solve this problem. It is a horrible humanitarian crisis. We need to pay attention to it and be logical about this. Stop saying “abolish ICE” when what we really need is the ICE facilities to help us to detain people in the best possible of environments while we find out who they are, what their records are, who is related to whom, and what their background is.

Stop ignoring the obvious things. We have some people coming due to poverty. We have some people coming to smuggle drugs. Until we can sort that out, we should figure out who is who. That doesn’t seem irrational to me.

We should also find a way to process asylum requests faster than we are so that individuals pursuing asylum can go through the system and get processed and individuals who are gaming the system do not get to game the system.

We can do better, and we have to do better. I would encourage us to be serious about immigration in the days ahead. This Congress can solve this issue, but it won’t because it is just a political game. When it is about scoring political points rather than solving a humanitarian crisis, people in this body have to decide which one they want to do more.

I will never forget last year, sitting with a bipartisan group of my colleagues and asking solutions to immigration, one of my Democratic colleagues said out loud: I haven’t decided what I want to do on this yet. There is an angel on one shoulder saying this problem needs to be solved, and there is a devil on my other shoulder saying this is the greatest political issues for the President. Why would I give that up? And I haven’t decided which way I am going to go yet.

I looked at them and said: Here is a basic rule of thumb I live by. When there are an angel and a devil talking to you, go with the angel every time.

This is something we should do, and we should stop playing political games and trying to hurt the President and ignoring the obvious solution we all should see. This is not a partisan issue; this is a humanity issue. Let’s solve it together.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the message be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 36—Veto

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 37—Veto

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 38—Veto

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the message be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 36—Veto

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 37—Veto

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the message be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Providing for Congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services—S. J. Res. 38—Veto

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate having received the veto messages on S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 37, and S.J. Res. 38, the messages are considered read and spread upon the Journal in full, en bloc.

The veto messages are ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of certain licenses with respect to several proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of
Spain, and the Italian Republic. This resolution would weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 36 would prohibit the manufacturing in Saudi Arabia of Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies, Computer Control Groups, Airfoil Groups, Aircraft Umbilical Interconnect Systems, Fuses, and other components to support Paveway II, En- hanced Paveway II, and Paveway IV munitions. The misguided licensing prohibitions in the joint resolution directly conflict with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting relationships with Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Italy, the joint resolution would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities. S.J. Res. 36 would also signal the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel hosted there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against Iran.

In addition, S.J. Res. 36 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 36 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict. I share the concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 36 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2019.

To the Senate of the United States:
I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 37, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for Paveway II kits to the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France. This resolution would degrade America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies in the region.

In particular, S.J. Res. 37 would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for Paveway II kits to the UAE, the United Kingdom, and France. The misguided licensing prohibitions in the joint resolution directly conflict with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting our bilateral relationships with the UAE, the United Kingdom, and France, the joint resolution would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities with those partners. S.J. Res. 37 would also damage the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats. The UAE is an active partner with the United States in combatting terrorism in Yemen and elsewhere. The licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance the UAE’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend the thousands of United States military personnel hosted there. Third, the UAE is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region. It is also an active partner with the United States in combating terrorism in Yemen and elsewhere. The licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance our partner’s ability to deter and defend against those threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 37 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 37 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 37 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2019.
To the Senate of the United States:
I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data for the manufacturing of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program in regard to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom. This joint resolution would usurp the Congress’s sole authority to direct the United States’ foreign policy and weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 38 would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data for the manufacturing of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program in regard to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom. This joint resolution directly conflicts with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships against malign threats, building a global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting our bilateral relationships with Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom, the joint resolution would undermine the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities. S.J. Res. 38 would also damage the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is in America’s national interest to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens, such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade the United States military’s reputation and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel stationed there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against these threats. In addition, S.J. Res. 38 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 38 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without the precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 38 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2019.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2242
Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in a moment, I will ask unanimous consent for the Senate to take up and pass legislation I have introduced to help protect our democracy from foreign interference.

Earlier today, Special Counsel Robert Mueller testified that the Russian Government’s efforts to undermine our elections are “among the most serious challenges to our democracy”—a challenge he says that “deserves the attention of this country’s military”—and that “the American people should have a right to know before they head to the polls.” Mr. Mueller’s testimony should serve as a warning to every Member of this body about what could happen in 2020—literally, in our next election—if we fail to act. When asked if he thought that Russia would attack our democracy again in 2020, Mr. Mueller said: “They’re doing it as we sit here.”

Think about that for a moment. The special prosecutor spent 2½ years looking into Russian intervention in our elections in 2016 and says not only are they going to do it, but they are doing it as we sit here.

If this were just coming from the special prosecutor, some folks might be willing to dismiss it, but this is exactly the same message we heard earlier this week from FBI Director Wray. It is a message that all of us have heard, and being on the Intelligence Committee, I have heard repeatedly from Director of National Intelligence Coats, and we have heard from the leaders of law enforcement and our intelligence community. Again, I point out that the leaders who have sounded the alarm about the ongoing Russian threat to our elections were all appointed by this President.

Unfortunately, in the nearly 3 years since we uncovered Russia’s attack on our democracy, this body has not held a single vote on stand-alone legislation to protect our elections. I am not here to reiterate the 2016 election or, for that matter, to second-guess the special counsel’s findings. This is more a question of how we defend our democracy on a going-forward basis.

The reason we need to do this—amongst a host of reasons—is that just a month ago, the President of the United States sat in the Oval Office, and by dismissing this threat, effectively gave Russia the green light to interfere in future elections. Since then, unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have done nothing to prevent further future attempts at undermining our democracy.

Let me be clear. If a foreign adversary seeks to do damage to your campaign, your response should not be thank you; your response should be a moral obligation to tell the FBI. Mr. Mueller, the former FBI Director and marginally the straightest arrow in public service, said as much this afternoon.

So if the President or other members of his family or his campaign can’t be trusted to do the right thing and report their foreign contacts and foreign offers of assistance to their political activities, then we need to make it a legal requirement.

That is what my legislation, the FIRE Act, is all about. The FIRE Act is a simple, narrowly targeted bill. All it does is make sure that attempts to interfere in future Presidential elections are promptly reported to the FBI and the FEC.

Let me be clear. The FIRE Act is not about prohibiting innocent contacts or exercise of American rights. Contrary to some of the mistaken rhetoric we have heard, it does not require the reporting of contacts with foreign journalists or with Dreamers or of official meetings with foreign governments. It is simply about preserving Americans’ trust in our democratic process. If a candidate is receiving or welcoming help from the Kremlin or its spy services, I think the American people should have a right to know before they head to the polls.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 2242, the FIRE
UNAMMUNOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 1247
Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator WARNER, and we will hear shortly from Senator WYDEN.

These two great colleagues are championing election security. Senator WARNER, at the helm as vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, has done as much as any American and any Member of this body to uncover the serious Russian threat to our election system. It is a threat not just from Russia but from other countries as well. I have time in hand and will ask unanimous consent for the passage of S. 1247, the Duty To Report Act.

This legislation, like Senator WARNER’s, is based on a very simple idea: If you see something, say something. The Duty To Report Act would require campaigns, candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and the Federal Election Commission any offers of illegal foreign assistance. It differs in some technical aspects—for example, with regard to family members—from Senator WARNER’s proposed FIRE Act. Yet it is the same idea because it codifies into law what is already a moral duty, a patriotic duty, and basic common sense. It is already illegal to accept foreign assistance during a campaign. It is already illegal to solicit foreign assistance during a campaign. All this bill does is require campaigns and individuals to report such illegal foreign assistance directly to the FBI.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller came before Congress today to answer questions about his very comprehensive and powerful report that documents the sweeping and systematic interference in our elections, the sweeping and systematic interference in our democracy. The Russian Government’s efforts to interfere in our election is among the most serious. As I said on May 29, this deserves the attention of every American.

Equally important is that, just yesterday, FBI Director Christopher Wray came before the Committee on the Judiciary and warned that the Russians are still actively trying to interfere in our election, which is what Mueller said today when he was asked about some of the remarks and some of the efforts in the Trump campaign. He was referring to Donald Trump, Jr., when he said, “I love it,” in welcoming Russia’s offer of assistance to the Trump campaign in the June 9 meeting, Director Mueller said, “I would take it.” That is why we need the Duty To Report Act. If that kind of assistance is offered, there is an obligation to report it, not to take it.

The election of 2016 was simply a dress rehearsal. With the 2020 election upon us, we must stop this kind of foreign interference and ensure that it is the American people, not Russia or any other foreign power like China or Iran, who decide who the leaders of this country will be and the direction of our democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 1247, that the Senate report its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I yield to another great colleague who has been a champion of this cause of election security, Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNAMMUNOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 890
Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator WARNER, who have spoken strenuously on the issue at hand, which is to protect our great country and our extraordinary 200-year experiment in self-governance. To do it, we have to add a new tier—a strong protection—for the sanctity of our elections.

I thank Senator BLUMENTHAL. He is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, where he is doing important work on these issues. I thank our colleague Senator WARNER, who is the vice chair of the Intelligence Committee, on which I serve. I also thank my colleague who is still on the floor, Senator BLUMENTHAL, for all of his leadership. I look forward to partnering with Senator WARNER in the days ahead.

In a moment, I will ask for unanimous consent to adopt a bipartisan bill that I have proposed with Senator COTTON. It is S. 890, the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act. Before I ask, however, for that unanimous consent request, I will give some brief background as to why Senator COTTON and I are working on this issue and putting forward this effort.

In the 2016 election, obviously, the Russians inflicted damage on our democracy by hacking the personal accounts of political parties and individuals and then by dumping emails and documents online. In doing so, they generated massive amounts of media coverage that was based on those stolen documents. It is clear, in my view, that the Russians and other hostile foreign actors are going to continue to target the personal devices and accounts, which are often less secure than official government devices. You don’t have to take my word for it. Top national security officials in the Trump administration have said virtually the same thing.

Last year, the Director of National Intelligence—our former colleague, Senator Coats—told the Senate Intelligence Committee: “The personal accounts of political officials can contain information that is useful for our adversaries to target, either directly or indirectly, these officials and the organizations with which they are affiliated.” Likewise, in a letter to me last year, the then-Director of the National Security Agency, MIKE ROGERS, said that the personal devices and accounts belonging to senior U.S. government officials “remain prime targets for exploitation.”

These foreign intelligence threats are not just aimed at the executive branch. Last year, a bipartisan Senate working group examined cybersecurity threats against Senators. In its 2018 report, the working group revealed there was “mounting evidence that Senators are being targeted for hacking, which could include exposure of personal data.” Likewise, Google has publicly confirmed that it has quietly warned specific Senators and Senate staff that their personal email accounts were targeted by state-sponsored hackers.

Unfortunately, the Sergeant at Arms—the office that is tasked with protecting the Senate’s cybersecurity—is currently barred from using its resources to protect the personal devices
and accounts of Senators and their staff, even if Senators and their staff are being targeted by foreign spies and hackers.

That is why, on a bipartisan basis, I and Senator COTTON, who also serves on the Intelligence Committee with me and with Senator WARNER, who spoke earlier, introduced legislation to permit the Sergeant at Arms to provide 100-percent voluntary cybersecurity assistance to Senators and their staff. Our bill is modeled after a provision in the recently passed Senate Intelligence Authorization bill, which permits the Director of National Intelligence to provide voluntary cyber help to protect the personal devices and accounts of intelligence community employees.

Fighting against foreign interference means securing every aspect of our democracy, including the personal accounts and devices of elected officials. I feel strongly that the majority leader, our colleague from Kentucky, must speak this common-sense legislation and allow this body to better defend itself against foreign hackers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 890, the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I note again there has been an objection.

I would only state that I don’t see how anyone could consider what I have proposed to be a partisan issue. I and our colleague from Arkansas, Senator COTTON—a military veteran—have joined in an effort, which I would just say to the Senators who are on the floor, is going to be one of the great threats of our time.

We know that hostile foreign actors are going to target the personal accounts and devices of government officials. Russia clearly demonstrated the opportunities for meddling in the last election. Now, we know that those same opportunities are going to grow exponentially in the days and months ahead. So I only want to pass on that I think this is regrettable, and there has been an objection, and I just hope we will be able to pass this bill before more people are hacked and their stolen data is exploited by hostile foreign actors.

I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING EVA YEH CHANG

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I am sorry to note today the recent passing of a dear friend to many and the ending of her quintessentially American story.

On July 13, Mrs. Eva Yeh Chang of San Francisco died peacefully at the age of 100. Eva was born in 1919 in Shanghai during a different era for China itself. She put it into service for others. Eva built a new life for her children. She became a pillar of her community, and she used her resources to help a number of her relatives back in China complete the same journey she had started and follow in her footsteps to America.

What followed was the kind of entrepreneurial “start-up life” that would sound impossible in today’s hands but has been the building block of our Nation from the beginning. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in one of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

Eva didn’t just keep what she had built for herself. She closed the doors of the Chang family, her first and only for-profit business, and devoted herself to helping others.

This remarkable woman may have left us, but the positive effects of her life continue to ripple out. For example, though she was born into a family that grew its fortune in the banking and real estate business, the Chang family has been a foundation of help to Chinese-Americans in California. To this day, the Chang family supports educational and cultural programs for the community.

Eva didn’t just keep what she had built for herself. She closed the doors of the Chang family, her first and only for-profit business, and devoted herself to helping others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 100th anniversary of the American Legion be printed in the Record.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 226, the motion to invoke cloture on Wendy Williams Berger to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mr. President: I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 226, the motion to invoke cloture on Brian C. Buescher to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the American Legion. I appreciate the opportunity to speak about this truly significant milestone in the history of our veterans and this organization.

The centennial celebration is a historical benchmark for the State of Michigan, as well as the entire Nation. Established in 1919 in Paris, France, the American Legion was founded to bolster the morale of American troops as they awaited their return home as quickly as possible. Discharged veterans following the Great War.

In September of the same year, the American Legion was federally chartered by Congress. By November 1919, the American Legion had 2,500 paid members and hosted its first national convention in Indianapolis, which then became the permanent home of the American Legion National Headquarters.

With local posts in each State, various territories, and overseas, the American Legion is our Nation’s largest wartime Veterans’ service organization. The Legion embodies its commitment to upholding the Constitution of the United States of America and promoting peace and goodwill through its volunteerism in the communities it represents.

The Legion’s grassroots involvement has shaped legislation at all levels of government. Within its inaugural year, Legionnaires across the country advocated for better conditions for disabled veterans in Washington, DC. Within a week, Congress passed the Sweet Bill which included provisions that would more than double the compensation disabled veterans were receiving at the time. In 1921, the American Legion claimed another legislative victory with the consolidation of three Federal agencies into the Veterans Bureau, which would later become the Veterans Administration.

The American Legion created various organizations to support the Nation’s veterans and youth, including the Veterans and Children Foundation and Sons of the American Legion. Since its creation, the legion has given over $30 million in financial assistance for disabled veterans and military families. Through scholarships and programming, the Legion also invests in the future of our Nation’s youth.

Today, with 386 posts in Michigan and more than 12,000 posts nationwide with nearly 2 million members, the American Legion continues to grow to meet the needs of our veterans. Whether it is drafting the first version of the GI Bill, organizing our flag code, or donating to the construction of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, the Legion has been at the forefront of monumental changes to our military and veterans policy and overall patriotism.

It is my great pleasure to congratulate the American Legion on the lasting impact it has made throughout our Nation’s history and for the work it continues to do. As the American Legion celebrates this centennial milestone, I ask all my colleagues to join
me in congratulating its members its growth and prosperity in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT MAJOR DANIEL A. DAILEY

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize SMA Daniel A. Dailey, the fifteenth Sergeant Major of the Army, SMA, for his extraordinary 30 years of faithful service to our Army and our Nation.

Sergeant Major Dailey’s impressive and distinguished career has been characterized by his diligent work, compassionate leadership, and focus on taking care of and advocating to improve the lives of soldiers and their family members.

In the next few weeks, Sergeant Major Dailey will transition his responsibilities as the U.S. Army’s senior enlisted leader, and he will retire from the army after a long and distinguished career of military service at home and abroad. While Sergeant Major Dailey may transition his official duties, his heart and soul is that of a soldier. I know that, as a Soldier for Life, Sergeant Major Dailey will continue his life’s work to improve our Army and to take care of our soldiers.

A native of Palmerton, PA, Sergeant Major Dailey began his journey of service when he enlisted in the Army in 1989. He successfully completed basic training and advanced individual training as an infantryman at Fort Benning, GA. During his career, Sergeant Major Dailey has held every enlisted leadership position in the mechanized infantry, ranging from Bradley Fighting Vehicle commander to command sergeant major.

Sergeant Major Dailey has served with the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Infantry Divisions stateside and overseas. In March 2009, he was selected as the 4th Infantry Division command sergeant major, where he served as both the command sergeant major of Fort Carson, CO, and U.S. Division-North, Iraq. In 2011, Sergeant Major Dailey was selected to serve as the Command Sergeant Major of the United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, TRADOC.

In addition to four deployments supporting Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and NEW DAWN, where he earned the Bronze Star for his leadership during the 4th Infantry Division’s 2-month “Battle for Sadr City” in 2008, he also deployed in support of Operations DESERT STORM and DESERT SHIELD during the first Gulf War.

Sergeant Major Dailey’s tenure as the 15th Sergeant Major of the Army began on January 30, 2015. As Sergeant Major of the Army, Sergeant Major Dailey serves as the senior enlisted advisor to the Army’s Chief of Staff on all matters affecting enlisted soldiers and the NCO corps. In addition to being the soldier’s voice through his membership on multiple councils, boards, and commissions and frequently testifying before Congress, Sergeant Major Dailey has also traveled the world to hear and tell the soldier’s story, spearheaded initiatives to enhance Army readiness and increase soldier opportunity, and routinely met with business and industry leaders, and State and local government officials to improve Dailey’s quality of life for Soldiers and their families.

Sergeant Major Dailey is the public face of the U.S. Army’s noncommissioned officer corps, representing the corps to the American people in the media and through business and community engagements. Sergeant Major Dailey is a shining example of Army values, and he exemplifies the noncommissioned officer’s creed. He has remained technically and tactically proficient, and he has consistently provided outstanding leadership. He is the personification of what it means to be a professional soldier, and his service is an example of how the Army’s NCO corps is the “Backbone of the Army.”

It has been a pleasure to know Johny, and serve with Sergeant Major Dailey during his time as the Sergeant Major of the Army. On behalf of a grateful Nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Sergeant Major Dailey and his family. I wish Sergeant Major Dailey and his family the very best in all of their future endeavors as he and they begin this new chapter, May God continue to bless Sergeant Major Dailey, his family, and the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GILLIAN AIKEN

- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Al for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Ali is a native of New Jersey. He is a student at the College of William and Mary. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Al for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO JAYME CHANDLER

- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jayme for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jayme is a native of California. She is a student at the University of California, Berkeley, where she is studying history. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jayme for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO AVERY DOUGLAS

- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Avery for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Avery is a native of Florida. She is a student at the University of South
Carolina School of Law. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Patrick for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO GARRETT HARTIGAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Garrett for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Garrett is a native of Cheyenne. He is a student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying history and business. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Garrett for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO PRESTON GROMER

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Preston for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Preston is a native of Casper. He is a student at Pepperdine University, where he is studying economics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Preston for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO CHANDLER PAULING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Chandler for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Chandler is a native of Laramie. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying political science and Spanish. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Chandler for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.
science and communication. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Chandler for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO BRIANNA SIMS

- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Root Negative One, Springdale’s Don Tyson School of Innovation Robotics Team, on qualifying for the FIRST Global Challenge in Dubai, Arkansas is proud to have a team from our State represent the United States in the robotics competition in October.

Root Negative One has achieved much success in the team’s 4-year history. It won the Inspire Award, the top award given at the FIRST Tech Challenge tournament, in its first year. During the 2017–2018 season, the team earned the Inspire Award at the Arkansas FIRST Tech Challenge Championship, and it was an Inspire Award Finalist at the FIRST Tech Challenge World Championship in Houston, TX. This past season, the team won the Inspire Awards at the Alabama FIRST Tech Challenge Championship and the FIRST Tech Challenge World Championship in Houston. This award recognizes Root Negative One as one of the top two teams worldwide.

For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology—FIRST—empowers students to develop skills in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and provides opportunities for youth to make connections with professionals in these areas. University of Arkansas College of Engineering professors Richard Cassidy and Chase Rainwater volunteer as team coaches, serving as excellent mentors to the students. Since day one, the team has worked hard to build a world-class, high-school robotics program to compete at the most elite level.

The numerous benefits these Springdale students get from participating in the FIRST program will have a long lasting impact on team members. By having the opportunity to learn from professional engineers and master STEM skills before they enter college, they are well on their way to successful futures.

I am very proud of the team’s accomplishments as its members continue their journey to develop such relevant, in-demand skills. Congratulations to Root Negative One Robotics Team on all of these accomplishments on earning a spot to compete in the FIRST Global Challenge. I wish the team the best of luck as it represents our country in the fall.

TRIBUTE TO ANNELIESE TAGGART

- Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Anneliese Taggart, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done on behalf of myself, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Tim is a graduate of Mitchell High School in Mitchell, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he studies political science and journalism. Tim is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tim for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO TIM MORGAN

- Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Tim Morgan, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work he has done on behalf of myself, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Tim is a graduate of Mitchell High School in Mitchell, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he studies political science and journalism. Tim is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tim for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE


The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was ordered to be printed in the Record, spread in full upon the Journal, and held at the desk:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of certain licenses with respect to several proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic. This resolution would weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 36 would prohibit licensing for manufacturing in Saudi Arabia of Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies, Aircraft Control Groups, Airfoil Groups, Aircraft Umbilical Interconnect Systems, Fuses, and other components to support the production of Paveway II, Enhanced Paveway II, and Paveway IV munitions. The misguided licensing prohibitions in the joint resolution directly conflict with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting our bilateral relationships with friendly countries around the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets, these restrictions would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities. S.J. Res. 36 would also damage the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000
United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens, such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel hosted there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against these threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 36 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 36 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 36 to the Senate without my approval. Donald J. Trump.

could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by reasserting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 38 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relations, deterring the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to reduce civilian casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the continuing illegal bombardment of innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 38 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2019.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE
ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED
At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House in my name as President, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export of certain defense articles and services from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France to certain defense articles and services.

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. Grassley).
At 12:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3277. An act to provide for the Central Intelligence Agency's 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. Grassley).

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 34. An act to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 36. An act to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 617. An act to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1665. An act to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1837. An act to make improvements to the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1950. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2050. An act to recommend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3135. An act to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on addiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2088. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Jefferson County Definitions and Federally Enforceable District Origin Operating Permits” (FRL No. 9992–15–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2089. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Maryland: Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9994–03–OCRSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2090. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Virginia: The Purcellville D. C. Air Plan Program” (RIN1547–AE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2091. A communication from the Chair, Metropolitan Council of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–79, “Fiscal Year 2020 Local Budget Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2092. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approval of retirement of General Robert B. Brown, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2093. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Steven L. Kwast, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2094. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Janet C. Wolfenbarger, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2095. A communication from the President of the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2096. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Protection of Human Research Subjects” (FRL No. 9996–48–ORD) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2097. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Jefferson County Definitions and Federally Enforceable District Origin Operating Permits” (FRL No. 9996–02–OCRSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2098. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Maryland: Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9994–03–OCRSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2099. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Virginia: The Purcellville D. C. Air Plan Program” (RIN1547–AE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2100. A communication from the Chair, Metropolitan Council of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–78, “Fiscal Year 2020 Local Budget Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2101. A communication from the Chair, Metropolitan Council of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–79, “Adelaide Alley Designation Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.


EC-2103. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2104. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of
of Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsec-
dary Education, Department of Education, 
received in the Office of the President of 
the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee 

EC–2105. A communication from the 
Chief Financial Officer of the National Tropical 
Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to 
law, an audit of the Garden for the period 
from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 
2018; to the Committee on 
Transportation.

EC–2106. A communication from the Dep-
uty Chief, Auctions Division, Federal Com-
 munications Commission, transmitting, pur-
suant to law, a report of a rule entitled 
“Auction of Construction Permits for Low 
Power Television and TV Translator Sta-
tions Scheduled for September 10, 2019; 
Notice and Comment, Schedule of Minimum 
Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other 
Procedures for Auction 101” (DA 19–477) 
received in the Office of the President of 
the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee 
on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2107. A communication from the Direc-
tor, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adminis-
 tration, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mailows Bay-Poto-
mac Estuarine Reserve Marine Sanctuary Designation” (RIN0648–BG2) received in the 
Office of the President of the Senate on 
July 22, 2019; to the Committee on 
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2108. A communication from the Deputy 
Assistant Administrator for Regulatory 
Programs, National Marine Fisheries Serv-
dice, Department of Commerce, transmitting, 
pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone 
Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specification for Groundfish (RIN0648–BG19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2109. A communication from the Deputy 
Assistant Administrator for Regulatory 
Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, 
Department of Commerce, transmitting, 
pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Vessel and Aircraft Discharges from United States Coast Guard in Greater Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries” (RIN0648–BG73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of 
nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on 
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. 
Todd C. Wiemers, to be Rear Admiral (Lower 
Halt).

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on 
Homeland Security and Governmental Af-
fairs.

*William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under 
Secretary for Science and Technology, De-

*S. 2248. A bill to amend title 10, United 
States Code, to redesignate and expand the 
Troops-to-Teachers Program, and for other 
purposes; to the Committee on Armed Ser-
vices.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2249. A bill to allow the Deputy Adminis-
trator of the Federal Aviation Administra-
tion on the date of enactment of this Act to 
continue to serve as such Deputy Adminis-
trator, without regard to terms of office; to 
the Committee on Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, 
and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2250. A bill to amend the Higher Edu-
cation Act of 1965 to establish State and In-
dian tribe grants for community colleges and 
grants for Historically Black Colleges and 
Universities, Tribal Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on 
Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and 
Mr. PAUL):

S. 2251. A bill to permanently extend the 
exemption for the aging process of distilled 
spirits from the production period for pur-
poses of capitalization of interest costs; to 
the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and 
Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2252. A bill to amend title XIX of the So-
 cial Security Act to expand the permitted 
uses of drug price information disclosed to 
States under the Medicaid drug rebate pro-
gram; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. 
SHARER, Mr. BRANDT, Mrs. GILLIBAND, 
and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2253. A bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 
36, United States Code, to provide pay equity 
for amateur athletes and other personnel, 
and for other purposes; to the Committee on 
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALD-
WIN, Mr. WARKER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUR-
BIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. 
HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. 
KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. 
MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. 
PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. 
SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. 
STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. 
WHIT 

thouse):

S. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Re-
venue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Reha-
 bilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension 
Rehabilitation Administration within the 
Department of the Treasury to make loans to 
multiple-employer defined benefit plans, and 
for other purposes; to the Committee on Fi-
nance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. 
BROWN): 

S. 2255. A bill to amend title XIX of the So-
cial Security Act to expand the requirement for States to suspend, rather than terminate, 
an individual’s eligibility for medical assist-
ance under the State Medicaid plan while 
the individual is an inmate of a public institu-
tion, to apply to inmates of any age; to the 
Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ 
MASTO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KAIN, 
Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. MAR-
KEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. 
WYDEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, 
Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. 
Baldwin, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. 
MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. 
BOOKER):

S. 2256. A bill to protect children affected 
by amputation and other disabilities; to the 
Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALD-
WIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. 
BOOHER, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. COONS, 
Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBAND, 
Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms.
SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DAINES):
S. Res. 283. A resolution expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements”; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 178
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 206
At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the “Hello Girls”.

S. 327
At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to amend the Federal Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability.

S. 551
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 551, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require manufacturers of single-dose and multidose vials of drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide rebates with respect to amounts of such drugs discarded, and for other purposes.

S. 569
At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 684
At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 931
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 1116
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1119
At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes.

S. 1247
At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1247, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require reporting to the Federal Election Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of offers by foreign nationals to make prohibited contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements, and for other purposes.

S. 1267
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1416
At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1608
At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1608, a bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2017 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1609
At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1609, a bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans.

S. 1685
At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1685, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for the research, development, and demonstration of commercially viable technologies for the capture of carbon dioxide produced during the generation of natural gas-generated power.

S. 1728
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer’s semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1769
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1769, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an offshore wind development training grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1822
At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut
public record
I hope my colleagues will consider and urge reports to Congress on their compensation by women in sports, including amateur sports must provide equitable treatment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, or national origin.

Unfortunately, the disparate treatment of women in sports is not limited to pay. Megan Rapinoe, a captain of the Women’s National Soccer Team, said in a recent interview with CNN: “It’s really more about the investment in the game. Is the investment equal? We’re talking marketing dollars and branding, investment in the youth development in the players, investment in the coaching staff. I don’t think that’s ever been there.”

It is clear that we must do more to promote and protect women in sports. This legislation is a step towards that goal by making critical updates to the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act.

First, the bill would require the U.S. Olympic Committee to provide female athletes with wages, investment and working conditions equal to their male counterparts.

Second, the bill would clarify that national governing bodies for amateur sports must provide investment, working conditions, wages and other compensation for amateur athletes, coaches, trainers, managers, administrators and officials that is free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age or national origin.

Third, the bill would further clarify that national governing bodies for amateur sports must provide equitable support and encouragement for participation by women in sports, including investment, working conditions, wages, and other compensation.

Finally, the bill would mandate that national governing bodies submit regular reports to Congress on their compensation practices by race and gender. I hope my colleagues will consider and support this legislation.

I thank the chair, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURUMETHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Ms. KLO-BUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2257. A bill to reform the financing of Senate election campaigns by making critical updates to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE VI—FAIR ELECTIONS QUALIFYING PERIOD—SENATE CAMPAIGNS"

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS. In this title:

"(1) ALLOCATION FROM THE FUND.—The term 'allocation from the Fund' means an allocation of money, elections, and for other funds to a contributing candidate pursuant to section 322.

"(2) COMMISSION.—The term 'Commission' means the Federal Election Commission.

"(3) ENHANCED MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'enhanced matching contribution' means an enhanced matching payment provided to a participating candidate for qualified small dollar contributions, as provided under section 524.

"(4) ENHANCED SUPPORT QUALIFYING PERIOD.—The term 'enhanced support qualifying period' means, with respect to a general election, the period which begins 60 days before the date of the general election and ends 14 days before the date of the election.

"(5) FAIR ELECTIONS QUALIFYING PERIOD.—The term 'Fair Elections qualifying period' means, with respect to any candidate for Senator, the period:

"(A) beginning on the date on which the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a); and

"(B) ending on the date that is 30 days before:

"(i) the date of the primary election; or

"(ii) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

"(6) FAIR ELECTIONS START DATE.—The term 'Fair Elections start date' means, with respect to any candidate, the date that is 180 days before:

"(A) the date of the primary election; or

"(B) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

"(7) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Fair Elections Fund established by section 502.

"(8) IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—The term 'immediate family' means, with respect to any candidate:

"(A) the candidate's spouse;

"(B) a child, stepchild, parent, grandparent, brother, half-brother, sister, or half-sister of the candidate or the candidate's spouse; and

"(C) the spouse of any person described in subparagraph (B).

"(9) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'matching contribution' means a matching payment provided to a participating candidate for qualified small dollar contributions, as provided under section 523.

"(10) NONPARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term 'nonparticipating candidate' means a candidate for Senator who is not a participating candidate.

"(11) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term 'participating candidate' means a candidate for Senator who is certified under section 514 as being eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund.

"(12) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'qualifying contribution' means a contribution made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution for the purpose of section 512.

"(C) is made during the Fair Elections qualifying period; and

"(D) meets the requirements of section 512(b).

"(13) QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'qualified small dollar contribution' means, with respect to a candidate, any contribution (or series of contributions):

"(A) which is not a qualifying contribution (as defined in section 512);

"(B) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution for the purpose of section 512; and

"(C) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed the greater of—

"(14) SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'small dollar contribution' means, with respect to a candidate, any contribution (or series of contributions):

"(A) which does not include a qualifying contribution; and

"(B) for which the candidate qualifies for a matching contribution.
Fair Elections Fund start date and ending on the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period.

(2) The candidate meets the qualifying contribution requirements of section 512.

(3) Not later than the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate files with the Commission an affidavit signed by the treasurer of the candidate’s principal campaign committee declaring that the candidate—

(A) has complied and, if certified, will comply with contribution and expenditure requirements of section 513;

(B) if certified, will not run as a non-participating candidate during such year in any election for the office that such candidate is seeking; and

(C) has either qualified or will take steps to qualify under State law to be on the ballot.

(b) GENERAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for a general election or a general runoff election unless the candidate’s party nominated the candidate to be placed on the ballot for the general election by the candidate otherwise qualified to be on the ballot under State law.

**SEC. 512. QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirement of this section if, during the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate obtains—

(1) a number of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

(A) the sum of—

(i) $2,000; plus

(ii) $500 for each congressional district in the United States in which the candidate seeks election; and

(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

(2) a total dollar amount of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

(A) 10 percent of the amount of the allocation such candidate would be entitled to receive for the primary election under section 522(c)(1) (determined without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) if such candidate were participating; or

(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—Each qualifying contribution—

(1) may be made by means of a personal check, money order, debit card, credit card, or electronic payment account;

(2) shall be accompanied by a signed statement—

(A) the contributor’s name and the contributor’s address in the State in which the contributor is registered to vote; and

(B) an oath declaring that the contributor—

(i) understands that the purpose of the qualifying contribution is to show support for the candidate; and

(ii) has made the contribution willingly; and

(iv) has not received anything of value in return for the contribution; and

(3) shall be acknowledged by a receipt that is sent to the contributor with a copy kept by the candidate for the Commission and a copy kept by the candidate for the election authorities in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election.

(c) VERIFICATION OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall establish procedures for the auditing and verification of qualifying contributions to ensure that such contributions meet the requirements of this section.

**SEC. 513. CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirements of this section if, during the election cycle of the candidate, the candidate—

(1) except as provided in subsection (b), accepts no contributions other than—

(A) qualifying contributions;

(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

(E) matching contributions under section 523;

(F) enhanced matching contributions under section 524; and

(G) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 525;

(2) accepts no expenditures from any amounts other than from—

(A) qualifying contributions;

(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

(E) matching contributions under section 523;

(F) enhanced matching contributions under section 524; and

(G) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 525;

(3) makes no expenditures from personal funds or the funds of any immediate family member (other than funds received through qualified small dollar contributions and qualifying contributions);

(4) for purposes of this subsection, a payment made by a political party in coordination with a participating candidate shall not be treated as a contribution to or as an expenditure made by the participating candidate.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS FOR LEADERSHIP PACS, ETC.—A political committee of a participating candidate which is not an authorized committee of such candidate may accept contributions other than contributions described in subsection (a)(1) from any person if—

(1) the aggregate contributions from such person for any calendar year do not exceed $2,000; and

(2) no portion of such contributions is disbursed in connection with the campaign of the participating candidate.

(c) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be treated as having failed to meet the requirements of this section if any contributions that are not qualified small dollar contributions, qualifying contributions, qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions, or contributions that meet the requirements of subsection (b) and that are accepted before the date the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1) are—

(1) returned to the contributor; or

(2) submitted to the Commission for deposit in the Fund.

**SEC. 514. CERTIFICATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after a candidate for Senator files an affidavit under section 511(a)(3), the Commission shall—

(1) certify whether or not the candidate is a participating candidate; and

(2) notify the candidate of the Commission’s determination.

(b) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may revoke a certification under subsection (a) if—

A candidate files with the Commission a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate under this title during the period beginning on the
"(B) a candidate otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this title, including any regulatory requirements prescribed by the Commission.

"(2) CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—If certification is revoked under paragraph (1), the candidate shall repay to the Fund an amount equal to the value of funds received under this section for such election (as determined by the Commission) on any such amount received.

"Subtitle C—Benefits

"SEC. 521. BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For each election with respect to which a candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 514, such candidate has the following benefits:

"(1) an allocation from the Fund to make or obligate to make expenditures with respect to such election, as provided in section 522;

"(2) matching contributions, as provided in section 523;

"(3) enhanced matching contributions, as provided in section 524; and

"(4) for the general election, vouchers for broadcasts of political advertisements, as provided in section 525.

"(b) USES OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—Allocations from the Fund received by a participating candidate under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, and enhanced matching contributions under section 524 may only be used for campaign-related costs.

"(c) REMITTING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 45 days after an election in which the participating candidate appeared on the ballot, such participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Fund an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of money in the candidate’s campaign account; or

"(B) the sum of the allocations from the Fund received by the candidate under section 522, the matching contributions received by the candidate under section 523, and the enhanced matching contributions under section 524.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a candidate who qualifies to be on the ballot for a primary runoff election, a general election, or a general runoff election, the amounts described in subparagraph (A) may be retained by the candidate and used in such subsequent election.

"SEC. 522. ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make allocations from the Fund under section 521(a)(1) to a participating candidate—

"(1) in the case of amounts provided under subsection (c)(1), not later than 48 hours after the date on which such candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 514;

"(2) in the case of a general election, not later than 48 hours after—

"(A) the date of the certification of the results of the primary election or the primary runoff election; or

"(B) in any case in which there is no primary election, the date the candidate qualifies to be placed on the ballot; and

"(3) in the case of a primary runoff election or a general runoff election, not later than 48 hours after the certification of the results of the primary election or the general election; or

"(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall distribute funds available to participating candidates under this section through a qualified electronic funds exchange or a debit card.

"(c) AMOUNTS.—

"SEC. 523. MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to each participating candidate an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate who are residents of the State in which such participating candidate is seeking election after the date on which such candidate is certified under section 514.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate payments under subsection (a) with respect to any candidate shall not exceed $100.

"(c) BASE AMOUNT.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount which the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary election.

"(d) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to or greater than 25 percent of the amount which the participating candidate would be entitled to receive under this section for such election if this paragraph did not apply.

"(e) BASE AMOUNT.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the base amount for any candidate in an amount equal to the greater of—

"(1) the sum of—

"(i) $750,000; plus

"(ii) $150,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election; and

"(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

"(2) INDEXING.—In each even-numbered year after 2025—

"(A) each dollar amount under paragraph (1)(A) shall be increased by the percent difference between the price index (as defined in section 3306(b)) for the 12 months preceding the beginning of such calendar year and the price index for calendar year 2022;

"(B) each dollar amount so increased shall remain in effect for the period beginning on the first day following the date of the last general election in the year preceding the year in which the amount is increased and ending on the date of the next general election; and

"(C) if any amount after adjustment under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $100, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

"SEC. 524. ENHANCED MATCHING SUPPORT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the payments made under section 523, the Commission shall make an additional payment to an eligible candidate under this section if the candidate meets each of the following requirements:

"(1) The candidate is on the ballot for the general election for the office the candidate is seeking election; and

"(2) The candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to the election.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A candidate is eligible to receive an additional payment under this section if the candidate meets each of the following requirements:

"(1) The candidate is on the ballot for the general election for the office the candidate is seeking election; and

"(2) The candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to the election.

"(3) Enhanced support qualifying period, the candidate receives qualified small dollar contributions in a total amount of not less than the sum of $15,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election.

"(4) Enhanced support qualifying period, the candidate submits a request for the payment which includes—

"(A) a statement of the number and amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate;
only if it discloses the value of the voucher used as an expenditure under section 315(d).

"(2) EXCHANGE WITH POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating candidate who receives a voucher under this section may transfer the right to use all or a portion of the value of the voucher to a political party committee of the individual is a candidate (or, in the case of a participating candidate who is not a member of any political party, to a committee of the political party of such candidate’s choice) in exchange for money in an amount equal to the cash value of the voucher or portion exchanged.

"(B) CONTINUATION OF CANDIDATE OBLIGATIONS.—The transfer of a voucher, in whole or in part, to a political party committee under this paragraph shall not release this candidate from any obligation under the agreement made under subsection (b) or otherwise modify that agreement or its application to that candidate.

"(C) PARTY COMMITTEE OBLIGATIONS.—Any political party committee to which a voucher or portion thereof is transferred under subparagraph (a) shall account fully, in accordance with such requirements as the Commission may establish, for the receipt of the voucher; and (1) may not use the transferred voucher or portion thereof for any purpose other than for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertising under this title, and (2) shall provide to the candidate only funds subject to the requirements of title III of this Act; and

"(D) VOUCHER AS A CONTRIBUTION UNDER FECA.—If a candidate exchanges a voucher or any portion thereof to a political party committee under subparagraph (a), (1) the value of the voucher or portion thereof transferred shall be treated as a contribution from the candidate to the committee, and from the committee to the candidate, for purposes of sections 302 and 304; (ii) the committee may, in exchange, provide to the candidate only funds subject to the prohibitions, limitations, and reporting requirements of title III of this Act; and (iii) the amount, if identified as a voucher, shall not be considered a contribution for the purposes of sections 315 and 316.

"(3) REDEMPTION.—The Commission shall redeem vouchers accepted by broadcasting stations under paragraph (2) upon presentation to the Federal Election Commission of such documentation as it may require.

"(4) EXPIRATION.—

"(A) CANDIDATES.—A voucher may only be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on the day before the date of the Federal Election in connection with which it was issued and shall be null and void for any other use.

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—A voucher held by a political party committee may be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on December 31st of the odd-numbered year following the year in which the voucher was issued by the Commission.

"(5) VOUCHER AS EXPENDITURE UNDER FECA.—The use of a voucher to purchase broadcast airtime for political advertisements shall be an expenditure as defined in section 301(9)(A).

"(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) BROADCASTING STATION.—The term ‘broadcasting station’ has the meaning given that term by section 302(9) of the Communications Act of 1934.

"(2) POLITICAL PARTY.—The term ‘political party’ means a major political party as defined in section 902(2) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 902(2) or (4)).

Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

"SEC. 531. DUTIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

"(a) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

"(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The Commission shall have the power to administer the provisions of this title and shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title, including regulations—

"(A) to establish procedures for—

"(i) verifying the amount of valid qualifying contributions with respect to a candidate;

"(ii) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the raising of qualified small dollar contributions;

"(iii) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on individual contributions to qualified accounts of multicandidate political committees;

"(iv) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the use of per- sonal funds by participating candidates;

"(v) monitoring the use of allocations from the Fund and matching contributions under this title through audits or other mechanisms; and

"(vi) the administration of the voucher program under section 525; and

"(B) regarding the conduct of debates in a manner consistent with the best practices of States that provide public financing for elections.

"(2) REVIEW OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—After each general election for Federal office, the Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Fair Elections financing program under this title, including—

"(i) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(13);

"(ii) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(12);

"(iii) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate may receive to obtain under section 512 to qualify for allocations from the Fund;

"(iv) the amount of allocations from the Fund to be received by candidates who may receive under section 522;

"(v) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523;

"(vi) the maximum amount of enhanced matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 524;

"(vii) the utilization and usage of vouchers under section 525;

"(viii) the overall satisfaction of participating candidates and the American public with the program; and

"(ix) such other matters relating to financing of Senate campaigns as the Commission determines are appropriate.

"(B) CERTIFICATION.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider the following:
"(i) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS AND QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall consider whether the number and dollar amount of qualifying contributions and qualified small dollar contributions strikes a balance regarding the importance of votes and the need to allocate incentives for participating, and fiscal responsibility, taking into consideration the number of primary and general election participants, and the electoral performance of those candidates, program cost, and any other information the Commission determines is appropriate.

(ii) REVIEW OF PROGRAM BENEFITS.—The Commission shall consider whether the total amount of funds allowed to be raised by participating candidates (including through qualifying contributions and small dollar contributions), allocations from the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 313) and other information for each Senate and State Small Dollar Contribution Program, the Commission shall assess a civil penalty against the candidate in an amount that is not more than 3 times the amount of the contribution or expenditure. Any amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited into the Treasury.

(b) REPAYMENT FOR IMPROPER USE OF FAKE ELECTIONS FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission determines that any contribution not made available to a participating candidate under this title was not used for provided for in this title or that a participating candidate has violated any of the spending limits for the dates for which amounts are contained in this title, the Commission shall notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay to the Commission the amount equal to

(A) the benefits so used or not remitted, as appropriate; and

(B) interest on any such amounts (at a rate determined by the Commission).

(2) OTHER ACTION NOT PRECLUDED.—Any action by the Commission in accordance with this subsection shall not preclude enforcement proceedings by the Commission in accordance with section 309(a), including a referral by the Commission to the Attorney General in the case of an apparent knowing and willful violation of this title.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.

Section 302(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 302(e)) is amended by striking at the end the following new paragraph:

(6) No authorized committee of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501) may establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than an authorized committee of a candidate.

SEC. 103. EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES BY POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES WITH PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 315(b)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 311(b)(1)) is amended by striking at the end the following new paragraph:

(6) The limitation under paragraph (3)(A) shall not apply with respect to any expenditure from a qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund.

(b) In this paragraph, the term ‘qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund’ means a fund established by a qualified political party or a State committee of a political party, or a committee of a political party, including any subordinate committee of a State committee, for purposes of making expenditures in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section 501), that only accepts qualified coordinated expenditure contributions.

(b) In this paragraph, the term ‘qualified coordinated expenditure contribution’ means an expenditure by a joint fundraising committee of a political party or a State committee of a political party, including any subordinate committee of a State committee for purposes of making expenditures in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section 501), that only accepts qualified coordinated expenditure contributions.

(1) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution under this Act; and

(2) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed $500 per election.

TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION

SEC. 201. BROADCASTS RELATING TO ALL SENATE CANDIDATE.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE; NATIONAL COMMITTEES.—Section 315(b)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to such office” and inserting “the term”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:
(3) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—In the case of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), the charges made for the use of a broadcasting station for a television broadcast shall not exceed 80 percent of the lowest charge described in paragraph (1)(A) during—
(A) the 45 days preceding the date of a primary or primary runoff election in which the candidate is opposed; and
(B) the 60 days preceding the date of a general or special election in which the candidate is opposed.

(4) RATE CARDS.—A licensee shall provide to a candidate for Senate a rate card that discloses—
(A) the rate charged under this subsection; and
(B) the method by which the licensee determines to charge the rate charged under this subsection.

SEC. 203. FCC TO PRESCRIBE STANDARDIZED FORM FOR REPORTING CANDIDATE CAMPAIGN AIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish a standardized form to be used by each broadcasting station, as defined in section 315(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(f)) (as redesignated by section 201(b)(1)), to record and report the purchase of advertising time by or on behalf of a candidate for Federal elective office, or for election to Federal elective office.

(b) CONTENTS.—The form prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission under subsection (a) shall require a broadcasting station to report to the Federal Communications Commission and to the Federal Election Commission, at a minimum—
(1) the station call letters and mailing address;
(2) the name and telephone number of the station’s sales manager (or individual with responsibility for advertising sales);
(3) the name of the candidate who purchased the advertising time, or on whose behalf the advertising time was purchased, and the Federal elective office for which he or she is a candidate;
(4) the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person responsible for purchasing broadcast political advertising for the candidate;
(5) notation as to whether the purchase agreement for which the information is being made available is a draft or final version; and
(6) with respect to the advertisement—
(A) the date and time of the broadcast;
(B) the program in which the advertisement was broadcast; and
(C) the length of the broadcast airtime.

(c) INTERNET ACCESS.—In its rulemaking under subsection (a), the Federal Communications Commission shall require any broadcasting station required to file a report under this section that maintains an Internet website to make available a link to each such report on that website.

TITLe III—RESPONsibilities of the FEDERAL ELECTIoN CoMMISSION

SEC. 201. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 307(a)(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(8)) is amended by inserting “(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)” after “appeal.”

SEC. 202. ELECTRONIC FILING OF FEC REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(a)(11)) is amended—
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “under this Act—” and all that follows and inserting “under this Act shall be required to main-

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS


Mr. COONS (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DAINES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas, on December 30, 2017, the United Nations General Assembly designated 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements” (referred to in this resolution as the “International Year of the Periodic Table”), recognizing that—
(1) the development of the periodic table was one of the most significant achievements in science; and
(2) the periodic table is a unifying scientific concept with broad applications and implications in astronomy, chemistry, physics, biology, and other natural sciences;

 Whereas the International Year of the Periodic Table will coincide with the 150th anniversary of the development of the periodic table by Dmitri Mendeleev in 1869;

 Whereas the periodic table is a unique tool enabling scientists to predict the appearance and properties of matter on Earth and in the universe;

 Whereas the American Chemical Society, founded in 1876 and chartered by Congress in 1938, is committed to—
(1) improving the lives of people through the transformative power of chemistry; and
(2) advancing the broader chemistry enterprise and the practitioners of that enterprise for the benefit of Earth and people around the world; and

 Whereas the American Chemical Society and other chemical societies and associations around the world are encouraging the members of those societies and associations to work with colleagues to organize outreach activities that will instill public appreciation of—
(1) the periodic table; and
(2) the contributions of the periodic table to the betterment of life on Earth; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and applauds the United Nations for proclaiming 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements” (referred to in this resolution as the “International Year of the Periodic Table”); and
(2) commends the global community of chemists for their efforts—
(A) to advance the transformative power of chemistry; and
(B) to recognize the International Year of the Periodic Table; and
(C) to participate in events marking the International Year of the Periodic Table as—
(i) an important scientific milestone; and
(ii) a global celebration.

RESOLVED, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and applauds the United Nations for proclaiming 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements” (referred to in this resolution as the “International Year of the Periodic Table”); and
(2) commends the global community of chemists for their efforts—
(A) to advance the transformative power of chemistry; and
(B) to recognize the International Year of the Periodic Table; and
(C) to participate in events marking the International Year of the Periodic Table as—
(i) an important scientific milestone; and
(ii) a global celebration.

Whereas, on December 30, 2017, the United Nations General Assembly designated 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements” (referred to in this resolution as the “International Year of the Periodic Table”), recognizing that—
(1) the development of the periodic table was one of the most significant achievements in science; and
(2) the periodic table is a unifying scientific concept with broad applications and implications in astronomy, chemistry, physics, biology, and other natural sciences;

 Whereas the International Year of the Periodic Table will coincide with the 150th anniversary of the development of the periodic table by Dmitri Mendeleev in 1869;

 Whereas the periodic table is a unique tool enabling scientists to predict the appearance and properties of matter on Earth and in the universe;

 Whereas the American Chemical Society, founded in 1876 and chartered by Congress in 1938, is committed to—
(1) improving the lives of people through the transformative power of chemistry; and
(2) advancing the broader chemistry enterprise and the practitioners of that enterprise for the benefit of Earth and people around the world; and

 Whereas the American Chemical Society and other chemical societies and associations around the world are encouraging the members of those societies and associations to work with colleagues to organize outreach activities that will instill public appreciation of—
(1) the periodic table; and
(2) the contributions of the periodic table to the betterment of life on Earth; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and applauds the United Nations for proclaiming 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements” (referred to in this resolution as the “International Year of the Periodic Table”); and
(2) commends the global community of chemists for their efforts—
(A) to advance the transformative power of chemistry; and
(B) to recognize the International Year of the Periodic Table; and
(C) to participate in events marking the International Year of the Periodic Table as—
(i) an important scientific milestone; and
(ii) a global celebration.
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), the rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland Security, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, and Ashley Jay Elizabeth Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS
The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Elizabeth H. Haaland, to be Secretary of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland Security, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, and Ashley Jay Elizabeth Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR
Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow, Dan Becerra, have privileges of the floor for the balance of his fellowship and that Luchanna Sagoo, my intern, have privileges for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow, Michele Bustamante, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2258
Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2258) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I again ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF 2019 AS THE “INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE PERIODIC TABLE OF CHEMICAL ELEMENTS”
Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 283, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 283) expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 283) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 375; that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the nominee be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; the President pro tempore notified of the Senate’s action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2019.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 25, further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

WENDY WILLIAMS BERGER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

BRIAN C. BURNS, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STEPHEN M. DICKSON, OF GEORGIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS.
RECOGNIZING THE BENEFITS OF OVER-THE-COUNTER CONSUMER HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS

HON. DIANA DeGETTE OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. DeGETTE. Madam Speaker, each year, July 24th, is recognized as “International Self-Care Day,” an annual opportunity to put a spotlight on behaviors that safe and effective self-care provide to advance public health. Consumer healthcare products such as over-the-counter (OTC) medicines, consumer medical devices, and dietary supplements play a critical role in self-care. Americans enjoy easy access to consumer healthcare products at thousands of retail locations nationwide and online, and they recognize the tremendous value that consumer healthcare products provide for individuals and healthcare systems. In fact, OTCs alone save the U.S. healthcare system over $146 billion annually. For every $1 consumers spend on OTC medicines, the healthcare system saves $7 by reducing the need for more expensive types of healthcare. That’s why I was so proud to introduce H.R. 3443 with my colleague from Ohio, Mr. Latta.

HONORING HIS HOLINESS SRI SRI RAVI SHANKAR
HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor his Holiness Sri Sri Ravi Shankar, a Hindu spiritual leader and humanitarian who has devoted his life to eliminating violence and spreading compassion throughout the world. I also wish to acknowledge the America Meditates guided meditation conducted today in Denver, Colorado by His Holiness as part of the National Summit for Mental Health and Mental Fitness, an event that will be livestreamed nationwide and joined by thousands of His Holiness’ devotees.

His Holiness’s teachings emphasize the close relationship between spirituality, compassion for others, and concern for the environment. According to his beliefs, spirituality is open to all people regardless of religion or culture, because the bond that all humans share is stronger than any characteristics that may divide us.

His Holiness has taken part in extensive humanitarian work around the world. Volunteers from his many service organizations have distributed food and emergency supplies, and provided spiritual support and counseling, to victims from natural disasters including Hurricane Katrina in the United States and the 2004 tsunami that devastated Southeast Asia. Sri Sri Ravi Shankar is a champion of peace, and has actively sought to assist in efforts to mediate conflicts in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, South America and on the Indian subcontinent. His Holiness has dedicated himself to social initiatives all over the world and especially in India, where he has worked to increase voter awareness and establish free health camps, and address social problems ranging from drug abuse to the rehabilitation of prison populations. His Holiness has also worked to protect our environment with an assortment of water and river rehabilitation projects, and through efforts ranging from programs to help small farmers in creating seed banks to building waste management facilities.

In recognition of his decades of service, His Holiness has been honored with awards from countries including India, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Russia and the United States. In 2016, the Government of India awarded him the “Padma Vibhushan”, its second highest civilian honor.

His Holiness continues his work throughout the world to bring peace and understanding through meditation and spiritual growth. Madam Speaker, I want to recognize His Holiness Sri Sri Ravi Shankar for the good work he has done through his spiritual leadership and humanitarian service, and commend him for his continued efforts to make a more just and peaceful world.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH
HON. RASHIDA TLABIB OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. TLABIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Calvary Baptist Church, a house of worship in Detroit, Michigan, as its members celebrate the church’s one hundredth anniversary, as well as twenty-five years under the leadership of Pastor Lawrence T. Foster. Born and raised in San Francisco, California, Pastor Foster arrived in Detroit to lead the flock at Calvary Baptist Church in 1994. Pastor Foster is a proud graduate of Morehouse College, completing his theological studies at Harvard University Divinity School. Outside his duties attending to the spiritual needs of his congregation, Pastor Foster has worked to advance causes such as fair housing as a member of the Virginia Park-Henry Ford Hospital Non-profit Housing Corporation Board of Directors, as a board member of the Michigan AIDS Coalition, as well as an advocate for economic and agricultural development in west Africa as a member of the Progressive National Baptist Convention’s Missionary Ministry.

Calvary Baptist Church was founded in 1919 by Reverend Henry James Mastin as a place of refuge in its surrounding communities. More than that, Calvary welcomed the migrating masses of African Americans who possessed little social status, providing an environment of prayer, praise, fellowship and mutual aid where everybody was somebody. This legacy lives on in the longevity of Pastor Foster’s service.

Please join me in tribute to Pastor Lawrence T. Foster and the members of Calvary Baptist Church as we recognize its one hundredth anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAVERLY TOWNSHIP AND THE WAVERLY COMMUNITY HOUSE
HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Waverly Township, Pennsylvania and the Waverly Community House. The first cornerstone for the Waverly Community House, the hub of community activity and affectionately known as ‘the Comm,’ was laid in 1919.

Waverly found its humble beginning as a few settlers homesteading in a small area of a forest, but as more businesses and settlements began to populate the area, local resident and philanthropist Margaretta Belin and her children saw the need for a space for their community to gather. The idea was a tribute to her beloved husband Henry Belin Jr. who passed away in 1917. As the director of the Scranton Lace Company, Henry was steadfastly dedicated to emphasizing the importance of recreation to his staff. The Belins incorporated the memory of their dear father into the mission statement and purpose of the Waverly Community House as a place for residents to gather, learn, and play together. In 1919, under the direction of architect George M.D. Lewis, the Comm was built, and in 1920 the building and the portion of the land were deeded to Abington Township.

In the century that followed, the Comm faithfully embodied the spirit of the Belin family’s mission to promote civic engagement and recreational activities for the Abingtons and beyond. The original building included a bowling alley, a gathering area, a post office, a library, and the first kindergarten in Lackawanna County. The Comm offered activities such as an annual fair, classes, tennis tournaments, and movie. During World War II, the Comm was pivotal in support the war effort on the home front by organizing volunteer efforts, sending regular newsletters to soldiers stationed abroad, holding defense meetings, and collecting book donations.

As the Comm flourished, the Belin children dedicated two additional wings to the building in honor of their mother to accommodate its growing community events. The rooms are still in use today and house spaces for camps, education, arts programs, and a welcome center which features Destination Freedom, a Walking Tour of the Underground Railroad in
Waverly. The Comm continues to be the center of community life in Waverly. Special events like the annual Antiques Show and Sale, the Artisans’ Marketplace, the House and Garden Show, Summer Music Concerts, and seasonal children’s parties.

It is an honor to recognize Waverly Township and the Waverly Community House on their centennial. The Comm has been the heartbeat of community life in the Abingtons since 1919, and I wish them another hundred years of growth and prosperity in the tradition of service to others, recreation, and civic engagement.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I will vote in support of H. Res. 246, a resolution opposing the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement against Israel.

While it will be a difficult vote, I support this resolution because individuals leading the BDS movement have engaged in anti-Semitic rhetoric and actions and have questioned the right of Israel to exist. While not perfect, this resolution sends an important message that anti-Semitism is unacceptable.

Let me be clear: anti-Semitism, as with any other form of racism or discrimination, is anti-ethical to the values and aspirations of the American people. I am disturbed by the rise of anti-Semitism in the United States and other parts of the world, and I am troubled by the fact that the genocide that took place during the Holocaust is fading from memory.

That’s why I have taken substantive actions to combat anti-Semitism, including joining the House Bipartisan Task Force for Combating Anti-Semitism, voting in support of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism Act of 2019, and voting in support of a resolution condemning anti-Semitism and other forms of bigotry and intolerance. I am also a cosponsor of the Never Again Education Act, which would help address the rise in anti-Semitism by granting teachers across the country the resources and training necessary to teach our children the lessons of the Holocaust and the horrific consequences of hate and intolerance.

At the same time, I agree with this resolution’s statements that boycotts and related actions are legitimate forms of free speech protected under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. That’s why I am cosponsoring H. Res. 496, a resolution affirming that all Americans have the right to participate in boycotts, as protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution. I have also consistently opposed—and will continue to oppose—any legislation that would punish or criminalize individuals’ constitutionally-protected right to free speech.

I also agree with the stated support for a two-state solution in H. Res. 246, and I have consistently supported a two-state solution throughout my time in Congress, and I am once again a cosponsor of legislation stating that any U.S. plan or proposal for peace in the Middle East must include and center on a two-state solution. A two-state solution will not only secure Israel’s future as a democratic, Jewish state, it will also advance U.S. security interests in the region and enhance our ability to confront the threats posed by Iran, Hezbollah, Hamas, and other dubious actors in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, this resolution does nothing to address the fact that the Trump administration and the Israeli government under Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have engaged in actions that severely undermine a two-state solution. The Trump administration’s decision to recognize the city of Jerusalem as the Israeli capital, to relocate the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, to greenlight the continued expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank, and to discontinue U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) and bilateral assistance to the Palestinians—all decisions which I strongly oppose. Regrettably, the Trump administration’s actions have undermined the confidence among Palestinians and Arab countries in the region that the U.S. desires to play a productive role as a neutral mediator in the Middle East peace process.

As an ally of Israel, the United States invests more than $3 billion in aid to Israel annually. Accordingly, I believe it is only appropriate that lawmakers voice their legitimate concerns with Israeli policies in a constructive way, as I have done throughout my time in Congress and will continue to do. That’s why I have joined my colleagues in urging the Israeli government not to demolish Palestinian communities in the West Bank, cosponsored legislation such as the Promoting Human Rights by Ending Israeli Military Detention of Palestinian Children Act, and continued to urge President Trump to restore vital aid to the Palestinians. Protecting human rights, regardless of any ongoing tension between Israelis and Palestinians, should be a fundamental American value.

It is only through thoughtful, respectful, nuanced debate that Congress can productively contribute towards resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and addressing the legitimate needs of both. At the bottom line, it is critical that the U.S. pursue policies that will move Israelis and Palestinians towards a negotiated, two-state solution, and I will continue to push the Trump administration and Congress to do so.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION SUPPORTING KINDNESS

HON. LUIS CORREA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, remembering the Holocaust, it is crucial that we remember the Holocaust, and affirm our commitment to fostering community and building resiliency through every day acts of kindness can do wonders. Kindness can change a family, a neighborhood, a school, a city, a nation, and ultimately, our world. We must recognize the long history of Americans demonstrating kindness daily in their homes, schools, places of faith, businesses, community organizations, and throughout their neighborhoods. The resolution also recognizes that kindness and compassion can heal the country from within and promote a healthier society.

Creating a culture of kindness can foster strong bonds that will bring individuals together despite their differences in order to tackle the challenges that face us. We must ensure that we remain a nation who acts with kindness towards one another.

CALLING ON GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON AND ARMED GROUPS TO RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL CAMEROONIAN CITIZENS

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, over the past two years, tensions have escalated in the North-west and Southwest regions in Cameroon between the minority Anglophone population and the Francophone faction that control the government. The conflict has killed hundreds of Cameroonians, has displaced nearly half of a million people, and human rights violations have been alleged against both security forces loyal to the Francophone-led Cameroon government and militant Anglophone separatist groups. This conflict has severely impacted the town of Kumto in Cameroon, which is the sister city of La Crosse, Wisconsin.

As sister cities, Kumbo and La Crosse have exchanged many official delegation visits, and a local nonprofit called the La Crosse Friends of Cameroon has been dedicated to deepening the ties between the two cities and raising awareness about the conflict. Their passion and dedication to finding a sustainable and inclusive peace in Cameroon was clear as I spoke before them at an event in La Crosse. Following that event, I traveled to Cameroon as part of a congressional delegation, and I was grateful to the local leaders from Kumbo who traveled to meet with us to share their powerful stories about how the conflict has affected their home.

The ongoing devastation that our Cameroon friends are experiencing as a result of this crisis is unconscionable, which is why I helped introduce a resolution calling for the respect of human rights of all Cameroon citizens, an immediate end to the violence, and for the creation of a broad-based dialogue to seek nonviolent solutions to the conflict. I am proud to see the House of Representatives take up this resolution to show that Congress supports a path to a sustainable, inclusive peace in Cameroon.

HONORING MS. JUDY SCHNEIDER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Judy Schneider of the Congressional Research Service for her service to the United States Congress and the
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 549, “The Venezuela TPS Act of 2019.”

The bill would designate Venezuela for temporary protected status (TPS), allowing certain Venezuelan nationals to stay in the U.S., regardless of their current immigration status. The Secretary of Homeland Security grants TPS to certain individuals who cannot safely return to their home countries due to ongoing armed conflict, environmental disasters, or other extraordinary circumstances.

While the total number of individuals, who would be eligible for TPS under this bill, is unclear, about 72,000 Venezuelans have come to the U.S. since 2014. The Venezuela TPS Act of 2019 would designate Venezuela for TPS, allowing its nationals to remain in the U.S. for 18 months, regardless of their immigration status if they: Have been continuously physically present in the United States since the date of the enactment of the bill; and Meet all other requirements for TPS. Provide Venezuelan nationals who meet the above requirements with: Employment authorization; and Authorization to travel outside the U.S. for emergencies and extenuating circumstances.

Direct the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security to work with international partners to increase capacity of countries surrounding Venezuela to provide migration services and asylum, specifically to establish and expand in-country reception centers and shelters and improve migration and asylum registration systems.

Congress should designate Venezuela for TPS because: The country has been facing unprecedented economic, humanitarian, security, and refugee crisis, consisting of extreme food and medicine shortages, severe infant and child malnutrition, rampant crime, and government-sponsored repression.

Venezuela ranks as the most dangerous country in the world. In 2017, the country’s homicide rate stood at 89 per 100,000 people which compares to 5.3 per 100,000 people in the United States. TPS holders contribute to the U.S. economy.

For example, TPS holders from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti contribute $4.5 billion in income to the gross domestic product annually and $6.9 billion to Social Security and Medicare over a decade.
2018, in my hometown of Springfield, MA, and over the past year has done a remarkable job of piloting the association. He has proven himself to be a strong and thoughtful leader for independent insurance agents across the country.

Joe graduated from Western New England College and is currently the President of Leahy & Brown Insurance & Realty, Inc., which he founded with his wife Frances in 1989. Joe has a fine record of public service as he previously served as Chief of Staff to Massachusetts State Senator Martin T. Reilly (D—Springfield).

At the state association level, Leahy was elected to the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Association of Insurance Agents (MAIA) in 2001, served as chairman in 2005, and was Massachusetts director on the Big “I” national board from 2008 to 2013. In 2013, Leahy received the MAIA Henry F. Barry, Jr. Memorial Pacesetter Award, which is awarded to an agent who has contributed his or her talent, time and energy for the betterment of the agency system and is the highest honor that the MAIA bestows.

On the national association level, Joe has served on numerous Big “I” committees and task forces including the Big “I” Executive Committee, Government Affairs Committee, Tax Task Force, and the InsurPac Board of Trustees.

I would also like to recognize the aforementioned Frances Leahy, Joe’s esteemed wife. Joe has been married to Frances for more than 30 years. Together they reside in Northampton, Massachusetts and have six children and eight grandchildren.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I am proud of Joe Leahy and all he has accomplished for Massachusetts and beyond. I wish him and Frances well in all their future endeavors, following his successful year as Chairman of the Big “I.”

HONORING GARY GALLO

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Gary Gallo on the occasion of his retirement from the Garden City, Michigan Fire Department.

Gary Gallo has displayed true leadership, rising through the ranks of the Garden City Fire Department, before finally retiring as captain. After obtaining certification, Captain Gallo took on the role of Team Leader to the Western Wayne County Hazardous Incident Response Team in addition to his responsibilities. He has been a dependable and active member of the Fire Department. Captain Gallo’s devotion is evident in his service to the community. Beyond his duties as a firefighter, he has served as a board member to of Garden City United Needy Family Fund as well as Union President and Treasurer of International Association of Fire Fighters Local 1911.

Please join me in saluting Captain Gary Gallo for his twenty-five years of bravery and service to the public as we wish him well on his retirement.

HON. GRACE MENG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a call to action regarding the right to clean drinking water. Every person has a right to drink water without fear of being poisoned. That is why, today, I am introducing the Safe Drinking Water in Playgrounds and Parks Act. This bill would ensure states, municipalities, and schools have the financial resources to replace drinking water fountains. While we can test water fountains for lead poisoning, some municipalities and schools lack the resources to replace their water fountains; this is simply wrong. My bill will ensure such entities have the necessary financial resources.

Children who play at playgrounds may be exposed to lead if they drink from the water fountain. This is deeply worrisome and no parent should have to worry that their child may be exposed to this deadly contaminant.

Exposure to lead—even low levels—can have serious health and development consequences for infants, children under six, and pregnant women. For those exposed to this dangerous element, signs of poisoning may include cognitive impairment, behavioral problems, and other health related problems. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, “there is no safe amount of lead exposure in children . . . .” which is why it is critical that we advance efforts that prevents lead poisoning.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Safe Drinking Water in Playgrounds and Parks Act. It is undeniable that the fate of our children and future generations rests on the decisions we make today about fighting lead water pipes.

HONORING LISETTE MORTON
AND HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JERROLD NADLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Lisette Morton, my long time Legislative Assistant, has been a vital member of my team. Lisette began her career on Capitol Hill in 1996 as my Legislative Correspondent. In 2000, Lisette became my Legislative Director and worked to establish herself as the Director of Member Services and worked to make sure Members and Members are kept informed of Judiciary Committee business. In 2011, she became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Lisette worked tirelessly to pass the Music Modernization Act out of the Judiciary Committee and ultimately out of the House by a remarkable vote of 415–0. Passage of this bill was a major legislative achievement that took years to complete and would not have happened without her hard work and dedication to the effort.

Lisette played a critical role in helping to elect me to the position of Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee in 2017. She quickly established herself as the Director of Member Services and worked to make sure Members concerns are heard and that committee staff and Members are kept informed of Judiciary Committee business.

This year, when I became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Lisette took on the new role of Director of Policy, Planning, and Member Services. She worked with our entire Judiciary team to create a bold legislative agenda, to ensure hearings were held on critical issues facing the country, and to pass meaningful legislation out of Committee and onto the floor of the House. With her help, the Judiciary Committee passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act; H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act; H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act; H.R. 5, the American Dream and Promise Act; H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization; H.R. 5, the Equality Act; and H.R. 1327, the Permanent Reauthorization of the September-
11th Victim Compensation Fund Act. Our Committee would not be as active or successful without her incredible work.

None of these accomplishments happen by chance. They are the result of hard work and years of building relationships on the Hill, in the administration, and in New York. She understands how this institution works—and how it should work—and she knows how to do the necessary work to turn a simple bill into an organizing tool for a movement. She has a unique ability to build relationships and work with others to get a job done. That is what makes her so effective in creating lasting change.

And I am not the only one to hold that view. Judiciary Committee Ranking Member Doug Collins has said, Lisette “has given a great deal of service to this House and to me and to my staff personally. She will be missed, on both sides of this aisle, because she understands completely what this House should be about and that is actually service and actually getting legislation done.”

But Lisette is more than just a staffer to me. To me, she is like family. She has given our office more than her hard work, she has given us her great sense of humor and ready laugh, her kind support, and her willingness to share her life with us. She tells stories with great passion about her beloved Nationals and Caps, her trips to Spring Training or to the Minnesota State Fair, her love of all things Star Wars, Star Trek, and Disney, and her love of Bravo TV and good books. She has brought all that joy and life with her to work each day in addition to being an incredibly hard working, capable, and brilliant staffer.

I know I will miss Lisette greatly, but I am happy she has found a new position working on issues she is passionate about. And I am pleased she will continue to pursue those passions both in and out of the office every day. I wish her luck and joy in all her future endeavors.

And so, it is only fitting to say as a final farewell, “Lisette, may the Force be with you.”

**TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES**

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Wednesday, July 24, 2019**

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as Members of Congress we know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men and women who will go on to become leaders in our local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, law, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Madam Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Kennedy who said, “Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country,” and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said: Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as volunteers in my offices. They may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated. That is why today I rise to pay tribute to 17 extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are: Hadeel Abdallah, University of Oxford; Lakeshia Barnes, Indiana University; Mia Arrington, Villanova University; Dalia Batuuka, Pennsylvania State University; Julia Chun, Clark University; Katherine Holder, Texas Tech University; Lillian Keller, Swarthmore College; Elizabeth Leé, Howard University; Keva Luke, Georgetown University; Michael Pender, United States Naval Academy; Nia Prince, Rice University; Hargun Sodhi, University of Houston; Rafael Martinez, Texas Tech University; Lily Rathbun, The Madeira School; Keenan Parker, The Madeira School; Jacky Lee, The Madeira School; and Kayla Rothstein, The Madeira School.

Madam Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright, and its best days lie ahead. I wish them well.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

**SUPPORTING H.R. 736**

**HON. HARLEY ROUDA OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Wednesday, July 24, 2019**

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I include in the record the following letters from Chairman Cummings and Chairperson Lofgren in support of H.R. 736.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM, WASHINGTON, DC, July 17, 2019.**

Hon. Zoe Lofgren, Chairperson, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

**DEAR MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 736, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act. As you know, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on House Administration. I thank you for allowing the Committee on the House Administration to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to expedite floor consideration. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on House Administration represented on the conference committee. I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding. Sincerely,**

**Eliah E. Cummings,**

**Chairman.**
Florida Inventors Hall of Fame 2019 Inductees

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS of Florida
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the eight inventors who have been recognized as the 2019 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame. To be named as an Inductee, these inventors were nominated by their peers nationwide and have undergone the scrutiny of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame Selection Committee. As a result, their innovations have been identified as significantly impacting the quality of life, economic development, and welfare of their communities, the residents of Florida, and the United States.

The Florida Inventors Hall of Fame was founded in 2013 by Paul R. Sanberg, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Knowledge Enterprise, and Judy Genshaft, President, at the University of South Florida. It was recognized by the Florida Senate with Senate Resolution 1756, adopted on April 30, 2014. Its mission is to encourage individuals of all backgrounds to strive toward the betterment of Florida and society through continuous, groundbreaking innovation by celebrating the incredible scientific work that has been or is being accomplished in Florida and by its citizens.

Nomination to the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame is open to all Florida inventors (living or dead) who are or have been residents of Florida. The inventors must be named inventors on a patented issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The impact of the inventor and his or her invention should be significant to society, and the invention should have been commercialized, utilized, or led to important innovations.

The 2019 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are:

Michael Bass: Professor Emeritus at the University of Central Florida selected for his significant inventions in optics and spectroscopy that have optimized the use of lasers and optical systems, aiding in the treatment of major diseases and improving the design of the world’s fiber optic communication system. Joanna S. Fowler: Native Floridian, University of South Florida alumni, and 2008 National Medal of Science recipient selected for her transformative research that enabled the use of molecular imaging to more accurately identify and treat illnesses ranging from drug addiction to cancer.

Hedy Lamarr (1914–2000): Former Florida resident for nearly two decades, Oscar-nominated actress, and 2014 National Inventors Hall of Fame inductee selected for her groundbreaking invention of the Secret Communication System, which led to the creation of various technologies used today to support Wi-Fi, GPS, and Bluetooth.

Thomas A. Lipo: Research Professor at the Florida State University Center for Advanced Power Systems selected for his pioneering innovations in the field of electrical machinery and power electronics that improved the technology that runs subway cars as well as paved the way for hybrid and electric vehicles.

Alan F. List: CEO and president of Moffitt Cancer Center selected for his dedication to understanding cancer biology and developing novel therapies for treating hematologic malignancies such as myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) and acute myelocytic leukemia (AML).

Chris A. Malachowsky: University of Florida alum selected for inventing the Graphics Processing Unit (GPU) that transformed the visual computing industry, revolutionized high performance computing, and opened the door to modern artificial intelligence.

Luther George Simjian (1905–1997): Prolific inventor and founder of Tampa based Reflectone, Inc, who developed the Optical Range Estimation Trainer used during WWII, which became the standard for simulation defense training, and for his many other inventions including his ATM concept that revolutionized the banking system.

Richard A. Yost: University of Florida professor of chemistry selected for his invention of the triple quadrupole mass spectrometer, a ground breaking analytical instrument that is used daily in drug development, disease testing, food safety, and environmental studies.

Innovation and inventions are the building blocks of our nation. I applaud these highly accomplished individuals and the organizations that support them in their quest to change the world in ways that truly benefit humanity. It is because of the perseverance of these inventors that future generations are encouraged to reach beyond their limits and push the boundaries of innovation.

Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 736, the “Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act.” This measure, introduced on January 23, 2019, was referred to your committee as well as the Committee on House Administration. The Committee on House Administration recognizes the importance of H.R. 736 and the need to move this bill expeditiously. Therefore, while we have valid jurisdictional claims to this bill, the Committee on House Administration will waive further consideration of H.R. 736. The Committee does so with the understanding that by waiving further consideration of this bill it does not waive any future jurisdictional claims over similar measures.

I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter and a copy of your response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 736 on the House floor. Sincerely,

ZOR LOFGREN, Chairperson.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2019.

H.R. 736 on the House floor.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the eight inventors who have been recognized as the 2019 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame. To be named as an Inductee, these inventors were nominated by their peers nationwide and have undergone the scrutiny of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame Selection Committee. As a result, their innovations have been identified as significantly impacting the quality of life, economic development, and welfare of their communities, the residents of Florida, and the United States.

The Florida Inventors Hall of Fame was founded in 2013 by Paul R. Sanberg, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Knowledge Enterprise, and Judy Genshaft, President, at the University of South Florida. It was recognized by the Florida Senate with Senate Resolution 1756, adopted on April 30, 2014. Its mission is to encourage individuals of all backgrounds to strive toward the betterment of Florida and society through continuous, groundbreaking innovation by celebrating the incredible scientific work that has been or is being accomplished in Florida and by its citizens.

Nomination to the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame is open to all Florida inventors (living or dead) who have been recognized as the 2019 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame. To be named as an Inductee, these inventors were nominated by their peers nationwide and have undergone the scrutiny of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame Selection Committee. As a result, their innovations have been identified as significantly impacting the quality of life, economic development, and welfare of their communities, the residents of Florida, and the United States.

The Florida Inventors Hall of Fame was founded in 2013 by Paul R. Sanberg, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Knowledge Enterprise, and Judy Genshaft, President, at the University of South Florida. It was recognized by the Florida Senate with Senate Resolution 1756, adopted on April 30, 2014. Its mission is to encourage individuals of all backgrounds to strive toward the betterment of Florida and society through continuous, groundbreaking innovation by celebrating the incredible scientific work that has been or is being accomplished in Florida and by its citizens.

Nomination to the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame is open to all Florida inventors (living or dead) who are or have been residents of Florida. The inventors must be named inventors on a patented issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The impact of the inventor and his or her invention should be significant to society, and the invention should have been commercialized, utilized, or led to important innovations.

The 2019 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are:

Michael Bass: Professor Emeritus at the University of Central Florida selected for his significant inventions in optics and spectroscopy that have optimized the use of lasers and optical systems, aiding in the treatment of major diseases and improving the design of the world’s fiber optic communication system. Joanna S. Fowler: Native Floridian, University of South Florida alumni, and 2008 National Medal of Science recipient selected for her transformative research that enabled the use of molecular imaging to more accurately identify and treat illnesses ranging from drug addiction to cancer.

Hedy Lamarr (1914–2000): Former Florida resident for nearly two decades, Oscar-nominated actress, and 2014 National Inventors Hall of Fame inductee selected for her groundbreaking invention of the Secret Communication System, which led to the creation of various technologies used today to support Wi-Fi, GPS, and Bluetooth.

Thomas A. Lipo: Research Professor at the Florida State University Center for Advanced Power Systems selected for his pioneering innovations in the field of electrical machinery and power electronics that improved the technology that runs subway cars as well as paved the way for hybrid and electric vehicles.

Alan F. List: CEO and president of Moffitt Cancer Center selected for his dedication to understanding cancer biology and developing novel therapies for treating hematologic malignancies such as myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) and acute myelocytic leukemia (AML).

Chris A. Malachowsky: University of Florida alum selected for inventing the Graphics Processing Unit (GPU) that transformed the visual computing industry, revolutionized high performance computing, and opened the door to modern artificial intelligence.

Luther George Simjian (1905–1997): Prolific inventor and founder of Tampa based Reflectone, Inc, who developed the Optical Range Estimation Trainer used during WWII, which became the standard for simulation defense training, and for his many other inventions including his ATM concept that revolutionized the banking system.

Richard A. Yost: University of Florida professor of chemistry selected for his invention of the triple quadrupole mass spectrometer, a groundbreaking analytical instrument that is used daily in drug development, disease testing, food safety, and environmental studies.

Innovation and invention are the building blocks of our nation. I applaud these highly accomplished individuals and the organizations that support them in their quest to change the world in ways that truly benefit humanity. It is because of the perseverance of these inventors that future generations are encouraged to reach beyond their limits and push the boundaries of innovation.

Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36 to research and better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in science.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36 to research and better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in science.

HONORING HARRY BEAL,
AMERICA’S FIRST NAVY SEAL

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Greenville Township, Somerset County, Pennsylvania, native Harry Beal, who was the first U.S. Navy SEAL.

Mr. Beal enlisted in the Navy in 1948 when he was just 17 years old. The Korean War began shortly after Beal joined the Navy, however, he never saw Korea. In the early 1960s, Beal was assigned to Naval Air Station Key West but was discharged for medical reasons. He then trained at the Naval Special Warfare Group at Fort Story in Virginia and graduated in 1962.
President John F. Kennedy was looking for a group of men that could go anywhere in the world at a moment’s notice. Beal was a member of SEAL Team Two, which was based out of Little Creek. His service was exemplary.

Harry Beal served in the Navy for 20 years. His service took him to South America, Southeast Asia, Europe, and the Caribbean Sea. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Harry Beal for his lifetime of service to our nation.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL

SPEECH OF
HON. LOIS FRANKEL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 246, a bipartisan resolution that opposes the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement aimed against Israel, strongly supports a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and affirms the Constitutional right of American citizens to free speech.

Let’s be clear about what BDS is and is not—BDS is not a social justice movement. It ignores Palestinian terrorist attacks targeting Israeli civilians, including more than 18,000 rockets and 105 suicide bombings, as well as human rights abuses perpetrated by Palestinian leaders against their own people.

BDS is an international effort to economically, politically and culturally isolate our close ally Israel. It undermines prospects for a two-state solution by punishing Israel with economic harm in order to force concessions by Israel alone and encouraging the Palestinians to reject negotiations in favor of international pressure.

BDS does not recognize the right of the Jewish people to national self-determination, a right proclaimed by the United Nations. Some of its supporters even advocate for Israel’s complete destruction. Omar Barghouti, a co-founder of the movement, has said, “Most definitely, we oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine.”

I am pleased that members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, understand that a secure Israel is important for our country as well as our allies. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this resolution which puts Congress on the record opposing the discriminatory BDS campaign against Israel and supporting a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states.

CONGRATULATING THE TUMON BAY YOUTH ORCHESTRA

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS
OF GUAM
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tumon Bay Youth Orchestra for taking home a Gold Award in the 2019 Australian International Music Festival held in Sydney, Australia. The Tumon Bay Youth Orchestra was organized in September 2018, launching Guam’s newest community youth orchestra. The Orchestra seeks to provide a platform for youth musicians from various schools to build camaraderie through music. The repertoire for the ensemble includes the grand masterworks of centuries past to the latest movie or video game soundtracks, to the delight of audiences of all ages. The Orchestra is led by Artistic Director Maximo Ronquillo, Jr.

The Tumon Bay Youth Orchestra received a Gold Award for its debut performance for the 2019 Australian International Music Festival at the Sydney Opera House. The Australian International Music Festival is among the largest music festivals in the southern hemisphere, receiving participation from 62 ensembles and over 1,300 participants in 2019. On behalf of the people of Guam, I want to congratulate the Tumon Bay Youth Orchestra for their success in the 2019 Australian International Music Festival.

IN RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL SELF-CARE DAY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, July 24th is recognized as “International Self-Care Day” to bring attention to the importance of advancing public health through effective and safe self-care. Over-the-counter (OTC) products from cold medicines to cures for headaches, play a key role in consumer self-care which is evident by widespread use in nearly every household across the country. We must do all we can to support self-care and to advance lower-cost, safe and effective options for American consumers.

When health care innovation is blocked by government regulations, it’s patients who lose. Our current process for approving over-the-counter products is unnecessarily inefficient, leading to higher prices and fewer choices for consumers. A problem like this rightfully deserves bipartisan solutions, and that’s what we have in the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act. I thank my friend from Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE for working with me for several years on H.R. 3443 to reform a broken system and bring new cost-effective OTC products to market faster. It’s time for the over-the-counter approval process to be as modern as the innovations being presented to the FDA.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the value and importance of OTC medicines to promote and achieve self-care for families across our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, extenuating circumstances regrettably prevented me from voting YEA on H. Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, of which I am a co-sponsor. I strongly support this resolution and our ally, the Jewish, democratic state of Israel. I am a proponent of a negotiated “two-state solution” for the Israelis and the Palestinians and will continue to condemn efforts that stand in the way of the path to peace.

SMALL BUSINESS REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2019

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3311, “The Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019.”

H.R. 3311, the “Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019,” would streamline the bankruptcy process by which small business debtors reorganize and rehabilitate their financial affairs.

I support this legislation because it addresses the special problems presented by small business cases by instituting a variety of time frames and enforcement mechanisms designed to weed out small business debtors who are not likely to reorganize.

It also requires these cases to be more actively monitored by United States trustees and the bankruptcy courts.

According to the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy, approximately 20 percent of small businesses survive the first year, but by the five-year mark only 50 percent are still in business and by the ten-year mark only one-third survive.

Under the protection of chapter 11, a debtor is given a “financial breathing spell” from most creditor collection efforts.

This protection allows the chapter 11 debtor to continue its business operations while formulating a plan of reorganization to repay its creditors.

Not surprisingly, while most chapter 11 business cases are filed by small business debtors, they are often “the least likely to reorganize successfully.”

I know first hand that Hurricane Harvey hurt many small businesses and though we worked to help them recover, bankruptcy was the only option for some of them.

While the Bankruptcy Code envisions that creditors will play a major role in monitoring these cases, this often does not occur, chiefly because creditors in these smaller cases do not have claims large enough to warrant the time and money to participate actively in these cases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3311 to help our small businesses have a chance at success during difficult times.
TRIBUTE TO JUDY SCHNEIDER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my deep gratitude and appreciation to someone who has played an indispensable role in Congress for more than four decades—my guide and my great friend, Judy Schneider. After a legendary career as a Specialist on Congress at the Congressional Research Service—really the specialist on Congress—Judy is retiring. Judy will be missed.

Judy Schneider is a recognized institution on Capitol Hill—not just because of her unparalleled knowledge of procedure, but because of her belief in how those of us fortunate enough to work here can use those procedures to move effective policy solutions. She has never failed to recognize the enormous possibilities we have been given to represent our constituents and our nation, and she has never failed to help anyone—on either side of the aisle—who sought her guidance.

Like many of my colleagues and their staffs, I have relied on Judy to help me navigate Congress—not just how the House and Senate and our committees work according to precedent, but how these bodies actually work in today’s world. Along with her colleague Michael Koempel, she literally wrote the book—The Congressional Deskbook: The Practical and Comprehensive Guide to Congress—to help explain the rules within which we operate.

Judy and I have been colleagues for many years. I was fortunate to meet Judy at the new member retreat during my first weeks in Congress, and immediately I knew Judy was not just a resource to be able to talk with Members of Congress, their staffs and other institutions such as the leadership and the caucus. Judy has been generous in sharing her vast expertise. I was fortunate to include in the Record comments about the situation in Iran that I believe are relevant and should be widely shared. The comments, from former New York City Mayor and attorney to the United Nations Rudy Giuliani, address the peaceful regime change in Iran and the work of the Iranian Resistance. Giuliani delivered this speech at the International Gathering at Ashraf-3, Tirana, Albania, which is home to members of the Iranian opposition, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (PMOI/MEK). More than 350 bipartisan dignitaries and parliamentarians from 47 countries attended the conference. I offer these comments for thoughtful discussion as follows:

Giuliani: “Thanks to you and particularly to the people who live here in Ashraf 3. You’ll be the ones who lead your people to freedom and you’ll be honored forever in Iranian history and in the history of those who love and are willing to die for freedom. God bless you.

This organization has grown and grown and grown and I feel in this room today a kind of optimism that I don’t remember feeling before when we were in Paris. I feel an optimism maybe because you’ve done a miracle here in Ashraf. If we were to build this in New York City, it would take 15 years and 14 corruption investigations. I was here a year and a half ago, this was just being cleaned up.

And of course, all of this is possible because of the leadership of Madame Maryam Rajavi, a truly exceptional leader. Just like her husband Massoud Rajavi, who began this movement in one very brave act. He refused to swear allegiance to the Supreme Leader, Khomeini to his face. He said, “No, I will not swear allegiance to you. I will not deliver my nation to a tyrant.”

I’m here to say three things. First, I accuse the Ayatollah and Rouhani and all of their sycophants and followers of mass murder, human rights abuses. We should be embarrassed for our countries if they haven’t stood up against this. There’s no middle ground here. These people have killed at least 120,000 members and associates of this great organization. You see the book. You go through the sad, tragic, but heroic exhibit they have of the martyrs to freedom. Look at the photograph of the people in the infirmary being treated for illness, slaughtered just a few years ago. Killed 52 of over 100 people who stayed at Ashraf, they tried to wipe them all out. In 1988, in two months they slaughtered 30,000 people. These are not numbers, these are human lives.

There are three things that we have to do. Number one, we have to get the governments of Europe to stand up to wake up, to reclaim their dignity and their honor. These are the countries that gave us democracy. Greece, Rome, Italy, France, United Kingdom. Everywhere, all places in which freedom was born, democracy was born. Democracy emerged. Democracy for our nation came out of Europe and the experience of Europe. So how can the leaders of those countries turn their back on mass murder? How can they do it? And what will the consequences be? It’s time to end that shameful disregard.

There’s no statute of limitations on murder. I prosecuted two Nazis 40 years after their horrible deeds. One killed 20,000 people, the other killed 12,000 people and we found them and put them to justice. The people who slaughtered 30,000 people in 1988 should be identified, they should be prosecuted, and they should either be imprisoned for life or executed. They’re criminals. They’re murderers. They’re not leaders of countries. They are the true murderers in the street except they’re worse because they’re mass murderers.

I am so proud of my government because we have stood up. We looked at that agreement that would make Iran a nuclear power and we said tear it up. We’re not going to put nuclear weapons in the hands of a maniac. Well, I say to the leaders of Europe, you can be liberators too. You can go down in history as fighters for freedom.

Was it not better than just running a government and making money and giving blood money to Iran? How can you do commerce with them? We all know they’re the largest sponsor of terrorism in the world. What does that mean? That means they fund and they sponsor mass murderers not only in their own country, but all over the world. And when you give them money, when you relieve them of a debt, which my government did in the prior administration, and put over a billion dollars back in their hands, you are supporting murder. What do they use it for? Their people know, their people know that when they get money, when a French company or a German company does business with them, that money, that profit is going to be used to kill people in Syria or to kill people somewhere else or to send weapons to a person to go kill someone else. People know there is complicity. What do you do? Do you like it? These are the people who stay at Ashraf, they tried to wipe them all out. Number two, let’s make it clear, there is an alternative to this horrible regime of terror. This isn’t one of those situations in which we have the choice of deposing a horrible dictator and we don’t know if a more horrible one will come along. Right? And when we saw that happen, we saw it happen in Egypt, in some ways we saw it happen in Libya.

But here we don’t have that problem. We’ve got the worst regime in the world by far, the
biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world. And then we have the National Council, the NCRI, led by the president-elect, Madame Rajavi. Coalition of resistance organizations respected throughout the world. There are representatives of most of the major countries in the world here. They've got to know her. They've gotten to know her. In my country, she's thoroughly respected.

We know there's a group of people who have been fighting for freedom all their lives, who have lost the closest people to them in the fight for freedom, who are dedicated to that. People here at Ashraf, let's make it clear. I spent a lot of time with them. These are people who are dedicated to freedom. And if you think that's a cult, then there's something wrong with you. There's something missing in your soul.

But we know that there is a government in exile, it negotiates with the whole world, and it's written down plain as can be what it stands for. And it looks just like our Bill of Rights, just like the universal declarations of freedom and democracy. They enshrine the basic rights enshrined in the great documents of the world. Free elections within six months is the promise, and I believe it will be fulfilled. They're for gender equality. They're for human rights. They're for a system of law. They're for we don't imprison someone unless they have a fair trial. And because of their history, they oppose capital punishment, because there's been too much of it. And it isn't just capital punishment, it's murder in their country. This is a good organization. And it's an organization that is ready, willing and able not to take over Iran but to guide Iran to elections as quickly as possible and hopefully they will be part of the coalition governing Iran like they're part of the coalition that is trying to guide Iran to freedom. This is a group that we can support. It's a group that we should stop maligning and it's a group that should make us comfortable having regime change in the worst regime in the world.

Here's what you can do. You can be a witness like in the Biblical sense of a witness. You know something that a lot of people don't know. You know really how bad it is in Iran. And you have to speak out about it. And you can know about Madame Rajavi. And you know the truth, not the lies, "the cult, they don't have support in Iran." Why has the Ayatollah been murdering them for 40 years if they don't have support in Iran? The Ayatollah, Rouhani, have said that this organization is the only one that's really a danger to them.

You now have a responsibility because of your knowledge. Don't be euphemistic about it. Don't hide your eyes. You've got to get to the leaders of your country to stand up so you can all be part of the community and work towards protecting people.

I get attacked and my colleagues who will be here in a moment get attacked all the time in America. Why we're doing this? We're doing it really very simply because we love freedom and we can't turn our back on people who are being treated this way and we can't turn our back on a situation that could be catastrophic for them and catastrophic for the world. You know what I say to them? Keep doing it. Keep doing it. I wear it as a badge of honor. I support freedom, you support opposition. I support democracy, you support a dictatorship. We've got to know the people, to share the values of decent governments, and you support mass murderers. Now who's right and who's wrong?

But I know and I feel as I've told you, and I know why there's an optimism in this room. Because we're going to be in Tehran much sooner than all those cynics believe. You know why? [Because we are Hazer, Hazer, Hazer. (We're ready).]

CELEBRATION OF THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF HIGGINSVILLE

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER
M MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the sesquicentennial of Higginsville, Missouri. For the past 150 years, Higginsville has served as the hub of Lafayette County and the home of a tight-knit, caring community. May it stand for another 150 years as a glittering example to other towns around the country.

In 1869, the town was incorporated on land purchased by its namesake, Harvey Higgins. A post office was soon established, and the growth of the town took off from there. The first school was built in 1886 and enrolled 572 students by 1888. Powered by coal mines, Higginsville thrived in agriculture, and the population exploded until it had over 2,500 people living there in 1910. To point the way to a bustling town, the yellow “Welcome to Higginsville” finger signs were installed on Highway 13 and US Highway 40 (now I–70) in 1924. These four corner signs stand today as a sunny tribute to the hospitality of Higginsville’s people.

The 20th century and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal programs brought development and investment, including Fairground park, a swimming pool, and a new post office with a mural done by a student of the great regionalist painter Thomas Hart Benton. After World War II, further investment brought a golf course, additions to the park, a new city hall, new school buildings, and a municipal airport.

In 1967, the Higginsville and Corder School districts were consolidated forming the Lafayette County C–1 school district. The school has grown to serve almost a thousand students and stands as a center of academic excellence. It was Accredited with Distinction in Performance by the State of Missouri for the 2009–2010 school year. The district’s competent instructors, small class sizes, and abundant resources makes it one of the best schools in the county.

Situated less than fifty miles outside of Kansas City and near I–70, Higginsville residents have access to both city and country living. Jobs in Kansas City are easily accessible, and there are also good jobs in Higginsville. Lafayette County’s top employer is the Higginsville Habilitation Center and Northwest Community Services. Higginsville signs stand today as a sunny tribute to the hospitality of Higginsville’s people.

Situated less than fifty miles outside of Kansas City and near I–70, Higginsville residents have access to both city and country living. Jobs in Kansas City are easily accessible, and there are also good jobs in Higginsville. Lafayette County’s top employer is the Higginsville Habilitation Center and Northwest Community Services. Higginsville signs stand today as a sunny tribute to the hospitality of Higginsville’s people.

Although Social Security benefits are not treated as income for purposes of the Bankruptcy Code's means test, veterans receive certain Social Security payments. Veterans’ disability benefits, do constitute income under this test.

Many veterans become ineligible for the VA benefits because they do not meet the eligibility requirements set forth by the VA. This requirement applies even with respect to servicemembers who have returned to the United States from active service and thus no longer receive combat pay.

Under the means test, such servicemember would have to calculate his or her income based on the average monthly income that he or she received during the six-month period preceding the filing date of the bankruptcy case, rather than the debtor’s actual income, which may be much less because of the debtor’s non-combat status.

Many veterans become ineligible for the immediate discharge available under Chapter 7 and, instead, they are steered into Chapter 13, which requires a debtor to make payments to creditors pursuant to a 3 or 5 year plan before he or she can receive a discharge.
“will remedy an imbalance in the Bankruptcy Code that disproportionately steers veterans receiving such benefits into Chapter 13 cases because they often fail the Chapter 7 means test.”

This bill is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Affairs, the American Legion, and the Disabled American Veterans, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, and the American College of Bankruptcy among others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2938 to allow our veterans to have a chance to provide for their families and to live a peaceful lifestyle.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for the following votes on Tuesday, July 23. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 497; YEA on Roll Call No. 498; and YEA on Roll Call No. 499.

CONGRATULATING TIMOTHY WEAVERLING

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 2019 Citizen of the Year, Timothy Weaverling, Mr. Weaverling of Bedford Borough, Bedford County, Pennsylvania, will receive this honor on August 19th from the Rotary Clubs of Bedford and the Bedford Elks Lodge.

Mr. Weaverling has served on the Bedford County Chamber Foundation Board of Trustees, the Chamber Board of Directors and Executive Committee. He is currently serving in the second year of his term as Chair of the Chamber Board. In addition to the Chamber, Mr. Weaverling serves on the Bedford Borough Council as well as leadership of the Bedford Sunrise Rotary.

Mr. Weaverling is a community leader that exemplifies Bedford in commitment, growth, and development. Mr. Weaverling is a role model of citizenship and pride that allows others to engage and empower. I take great pleasure in congratulating Timothy Weaverling for this outstanding accomplishment.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL

SPEECH OF
HON. GWEN MOORE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the right to participate in boycotts, whether we agree with them or not, is protected by our constitution, including political expression aimed at Israeli policy. Americans have long used such tactics to influence and pressure our government and other governments. The only difference here is we appear to be striving to cut out and treat differently, even silence, those who disagree with the policies undertaken by our ally Israel.

How can we go under the Constitution to political speech including boycotts and then bring this resolution to the floor?

Let me be clear, I oppose anyone (Palestinian, Israeli, American, etc.) who are taking actions aimed to promote peace. And after nearly three decades, it is fair to say all sides, including the U.S., have done so in some shape or form.

Any effort that has at its heart delegitimizing the State of Israel is doomed to fail. And the BDS movement, just like unilateral actions undertaken by either side, is not going to bring two states living in peace side by side. It was born out of frustration, that we all share, with a moribund peace process that harms both Israelis and Palestinians.

At this time when Congress can be doing so much more to help advance the peace process or even to just revive it, why is the only action we are taking is to bring to the floor a nonbinding resolution that doesn’t address where most of the blame for the failures lay: the continuing intransigence and refusal by Israeli and Palestinian political leaders to make the tough decisions and compromises that need to be made for peace.

That refusal continues to feed the status quo. But rather than call out those responsible, including several actions taken by this Administration, for setting back the cause of peace, we have decided that this moment is ripe solely to attack the First Amendment rights of Americans?

Again, rather than press the parties to make the tough decision and concessions that will be necessary for peace, Congress has decided that the top focus at the moment is the voluntary decisions by some Americans to exercise political expression? The First Amendment does not threaten Israel’s right to exist. Nor does any American exercising that right.

I agree with the editorial by the New York Times which warned that attempting to “silence one side of the debate” is not “in the interests of Israel, the United States, or their shared democratic values.”

Rather than attacking the First Amendment right of Americans to criticize the policies of our own government or our allies, how about pushing our own administration to actually say the words “two-state solution” which it refuses to do or to actually act as if its interested in pushing that longstanding goal that this Congress and past administrations has reaffirmed is the best option for peace between the Israelis and Palestinians.

I am concerned that resolutions such as this one serves no real purpose, certainly not to those of us interested in working as honest brokers to bring this decades long history of simmering tensions, outright war, and hostility to an end, permanently.

I fear that this resolution is just another in a long line of nonbinding resolutions considered by this House that fails to actually advance the prospects for peace in this conflict the worse in a generation including actions by this administration that have been roundly rejected by many.

Again, in looking at this resolution, I understand that it is easier to blame a host of outside actors, including those who we disagree with, for the current damaging status quo. The reality however remains that it is the consistent and repeated failure of political leaders in Ramallah, Jerusalem, and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to make the tough decisions and concessions that peace requires and which has left us in this damaging status quo.

The rally of the current administration was incited by the Trump administration’s recent Bahrain conference which neither the Palestinians or Israelis attended.

Finally, I am concerned that this resolution is a slippery slope to actually taking up binding legislation affecting cherished First Amendment rights such as the bill that passed the Senate earlier this year which was derided in media reports as a “political stunt.” Israel’s and Palestinians alike have had enough of political stunts.

Opportunities for progress and for peace are growing fewer and farther apart as the damaging status quo and divides only harden, waiting for the next explosion of violence. And are we surprised that without prospects for peace, extremists seem to be gaining ground?

I would be far more realistic if this Congress would focus on finding viable solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict rather than promoting legislation that raises free speech concerns. For example, H.Res. 326 which was marked up in committee at the same time as this resolution but is curiously absent from this week’s calendar.

I firmly believe it is our responsibility as a Congress to keep working towards peace despite pessimism and pessimists.

Clearly right now, what the Middle East needs is more solutions, not more meaningless resolutions. I said this a few years ago and I will repeat it again now: both peoples would gladly trade empty resolutions from the U.S. Congress for real progress on the ground and a sincere path forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KELLY ARMSTRONG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I got delayed travelling back to D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 497.

HONORING NATHANIEL “NAT” WASHINGTON, SR. AND HIS SON NAT JR.

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Nathaniel “Nat” Washington, Sr. and his son, Nat Jr. Their public service transformed the Columbia Basin, Washington state, and the entire Pacific Northwest by securing hydropower as the foundation of the region’s power system.
The Grand Coulee Dam is the largest power station in the nation. With a 6,809-megawatt generating capacity, the Dam supplies an average of 21 billion kilowatt hours of clean, affordable, and reliable electricity to 11 States and Canada each year. Reservoirs from the Dam are the backbone of the Columbia Basin Project, which provides irrigation to 10,000 farms on 671,000 acres of farmland in the Columbia Basin.

While residents throughout the Pacific Northwest reap these benefits, many are unaware of how the Dam came to be or how the work of a father and son changed Central Washington, our state, and the region forever.

In 1908, Nat Washington, Sr., a decedent of President George Washington’s family, left his home in Virginia and established a homestead along the Columbia River, not far from where the Grand Coulee Dam sits today. Shortly after arriving in Washington, Nat Sr. was elected as Grant County Prosecutor and later in the Washington State Legislature for 30 years. During this time, Nat Jr. was instrumental in the development of several hydropower projects across the region, including the Columbia Basin Project, which is the largest water reclamation project in the United States, providing nearly $2 billion in economic benefits to the region each year.

With these immeasurable contributions to Central Washington in mind, I rise to introduce legislation to rename the Third Power Plant at the Grand Coulee Dam as the Nathaniel “Nat” Washington” Power Plant in honor of Nat Jr. and Sr. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of these pioneers of Northwest hydropower.

RAISE THE WAGE ACT

SPREECH OF
HON. ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

Oxfam, July 16, 2019.

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Ms. EUNICE IKEN,
Labor Policy Advisor at House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

DEAR Ms. IKEN AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

On behalf of Oxfam America, I urge you to vote for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) and vote against any amendments that would weaken the bill.

Oxfam America is an international development and relief agency committed to working for lasting solutions to poverty, hunger and social injustice in over 90 countries, including the United States. Oxfam has carried out development and humanitarian programs throughout the globe.

Within the United States, we have focused our efforts to elevating the rights and life opportunities for historically disadvantaged workers in low-wage sectors. With a federal minimum wage of $7.25 an hour, a full-time worker may only make $15,080 a year, a salaried worker is almost $8,000 below the poverty line for a family of three.

The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would benefit over a quarter of the workforce; nearly 71 million workers in 34 million families. The Act would raise the federal minimum wage to $8.55 this year and increase it over the next five years until it reaches $15 in 2024, then adjust it each year to keep pace with the typical worker’s wages.

Here are six reasons why raising the wage makes sense.

1. It is long overdue.

In the decade since it was last raised, the minimum wage has failed to keep up with inflation, falling far behind average wages, and—most dramatically—failed to keep up with incomes of the top 1 percent and CEOs, contributing to America’s growing inequality.

Low-wage workers are not benefiting from economic growth and productivity. If the minimum wage had kept pace with productivity increases since 1968, it would be $20.20.

Just 30 years ago, the average pay gap between CEOs and workers was 59 to 1; last year, it soared to 1,149. The average CEO makes $13,940,000, while a minimum wage worker makes $15,080; a gap of 292 to 1.

2. It would address longstanding racial and gender inequity.

Historically marginalized people do more than their fair share of low-wage work, and would stand to benefit disproportionately from the bump.

While 27 percent of the total workforce would benefit from the raise:

- 39 percent of Black and Latina women would benefit (vs. 18 percent of white men).
- 38 percent of African American workers would benefit.
- 35 percent of Latino workers would benefit.
- 32 percent of women workers would benefit (vs 22 percent of men).

3. It would reduce poverty.

The bump from $290 a week to $600 a week would lift millions of family out of poverty.

Two-thirds of all working people in poverty (67.3 percent) would see a raise in wages.

4. It would fuel economic growth.

The roughly $290 billion extra paid to workers would be pumped back into the economy for necessities such as rent, food, clothes.

Economists have long recognized that boosting purchasing power by putting money in people’s pockets for consumer spending has positive ripple effects on the entire economy.

In one recent poll, 67 percent of small business owners support the minimum wage increase to $15 an hour. They say it would spark consumer demand, which would enable them to retain or hire new employees.

And raising the wage doesn’t seem to compel employers to cut jobs. As states and cities across the country have raised wages, research has found that statistically significant effect on employment.

5. It would save taxpayers money and reduce use of government programs.

When employers don’t pay people enough to survive, those workers are compelled to seek government assistance, meaning taxpayers are essentially subsidizing the corporations.

In 2016, EPJ found that, among recipients of public assistance, most work or have a family member who works; and that are concentrated at the bottom of the pay scale.

Raising wages for low-wage workers would “unambiguously reduce net spending on public assistance programs and is likely to be affected by a federal minimum-wage increase.”

6. It’s what the vast majority of Americans want.

Vast majorities (up to three quarters, including a majority across party lines) support raising the wage. Even in a poll sponsored by the National Restaurant Association (which has worked to block state minimum wage increases and preempt local sick days) 71 percent ofrowning indicated support for raising the wage, “even if it also increases the cost of food and service to customers.”

In fact, over the half the states have raised their minimum wages to restore basic fairness to the workforce.

CONCLUSION

Raising the minimum wage offers benefits to workers, children, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole. It increases buying power and reduces the daily struggle for people to pay their basic expenses. It enables people to save for and invest in their future. It contributes toward building a workforce that is healthier, more stable, better educated, and more productive.

Raising the minimum wage will require members of Congress of both parties to be willing to overcome the divide; to be open to compromise; to recognize the thousands of hard-working constituents and taxpayers, to consider the wide range of benefits—and ultimately, to give a raise to the people who need it the most.

We strongly urge every member of Congress to vote for the Raise the Wage Act and enact this important piece of legislation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

MINOR SINCLAIR,
Director, US Domestic Program,
Oxfam America.

RETIEMENT OF MR. MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of myself and the members of the House Committee on Armed Services, to congratulate and celebrate Mr. Michael J. Sullivan, the Director of Defense Weapon System Acquisitions for the Government Accountability Office (GAO), on the occasion of his retirement after 34 years of distinguished federal service.

Mr. Sullivan’s dedication to his profession, his selfless public service, and his role helping GAO meet its mission have exceeded everyone’s expectations. During his time at GAO, Mr. Sullivan has been an effective thought leader, most notably in GAO’s work to identify and apply best acquisition practices for product development, production, testing, and fielding, for many of DOD’s most complex, expensive, and critical weapon system acquisitions. Over the years, Mr. Sullivan’s efforts resulted in numerous modifications and alterations to DOD’s acquisition polices, processes and implementation. Mr. Sullivan significantly contributed to the development and enactment of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–23), which lead to improved acquisition outcomes and effective returns on investment of billions of dollars on behalf of the Congress and the American taxpayer.

Mr. Sullivan testified numerous times before the House Armed Services Committee,
expertly representing GAO’s work on high profile, complex, and sensitive DOD acquisition programs including the F-22 Raptor, the F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter, among other high-profile programs such as the B-2 Spirit, the KC–46A tanker, the B–21 Raider, the Next Generation Air Dominance concept, and numerous unmanned aircraft programs such as the MQ–1, MQ–9, RQ–4, UCASS, UCLASS, and MQ–25. He consistently delivered insightful, independent, and fact-based analyses that informed the decision-making of the Armed Services Committee, and regarding many of DOD’s largest and most complex acquisition programs during many cycles of the Committee during formulation of annual National Defense Authorization Acts. He has been a constant voice for good government and a force for positive change. In addition to his program oversight noted above, Mr. Sullivan has also been greatly involved in reviewing issues related to science and technology portfolio management, technology maturation and requirements development efforts, and Department of Defense tactical aircraft force structure planning and execution.

We all are eternally grateful for Mr. Sullivan’s contributions to oversight of national security issues and fiscal resources of the most importance to Congress and the American taxpayer. Mr. Sullivan’s exceptional work and many accomplishments over more than three decades are deeply valued by me, the committee, and the Congress. We sincerely thank Mr. Sullivan and wish him the best success in all of his future endeavors after retirement.

HONORING THE EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF JUDY SCHNEIDER ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. JOYCE BEATTY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Judy Schneider on the occasion of her retirement. Throughout her time on the Hill, Judy served as an unparalleled testament to bipartisanship, hard work, and public service. There is no one more deserving of being recognized for a lifetime of exemplary public service.

Cherished mentor to a lucky few and friend to countless Members of this body, Senators, and Hill staff, including my Chief of Staff, Judy embraced each day of her four decades of service as an opportunity to improve the processes of Congress.

Her expertise knew no bounds. She has authored countless reports and mentored thousands. Judy was a tremendous help in the successful orchestration of the 2014 Women’s Fly-In.

Committing forty years to Congress takes resilience and a passion for public service. But to embrace those years with her unwavering belief that Congress can always do better is her shining legacy.

Many of you know that I am a fierce advocate for the 3 P’s of public service: Policy, Process, and Politics. Fewer know that it was Judy who took the time to teach me the three P’s, and emphasize that they are the key to fostering bipartisanship, even in the most contentious of times.

Her touchstone is immeasurable, her service is deeply appreciated, and her retirement is well-deserved.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SUSAN “LEANNE” POWELL

HON. RICHARD HUDSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Susan “Leanne” Powell, a dear friend of more than 15 years. Leanne was a passionate and fierce leader whose light reached across North Carolina’s Eighth Congressional District and enlightened our great nation. Leanne departed this life on July 20, 2019 at Carolinas Medical Center in Charlotte. Exemplary of her devotion to others, Leanne requested her organs be donated to her community and now three North Carolinians will benefit from her continued generosity.

Leanne led a life of distinction and at age 12 started a career in politics that would span more than three decades. As a young woman she served as a campaign volunteer for the late Congressman Bill Hefner and later joined his office staff. This experience foreshadowed the extraordinary woman she was to become. Leanne went on to serve the White House Women’s Office under President Bill Clinton and Department of Agriculture Undersecretary Jill Long Thompson. Following this time in our nation’s capital, she returned to North Carolina and founded a successful campaign consulting firm before managing the campaign of Congressman Larry Kissell. Leanne helped elect this history teacher-turned-candidate to Congress in 2008 and served two terms as Congressman Kissell’s Chief of Staff, a tenure defined by ideological purity and constituent service.

After deciding to leave politics in 2013, Leanne would tell colleagues she wanted to “make an honest living making whiskey.” Today, Southern Grace Distilleries stands as one of North Carolina’s premier distilleries and a testament of Leanne’s hard work and dedication. Reflective of Leanne’s innumerable accomplishments and devotion to public service, North Carolina Governor Roy Cooper inducted Leanne into the Order of the Long Leaf Pine on July 17, 2019, the highest civilian honor the governor can bestow. Throughout Leanne’s life she made service to others a priority.

My thoughts and prayers are with Leanne’s husband, Drew Arrowood; her mother, Judy Jr.; and all who loved her, including her beloved canine companion, Bleu. Renee and I join our entire community as we grieve together during this difficult time.

Today, the people of Venezuela face economic, political and humanitarian crises. The economy has shrunk by nearly 30 percent over the past four years, declines often seen only in wartime. Their currency erodes daily and is experiencing the highest inflation rates in the world. Poverty rates have skyrocketed with over three out of every four Venezuelans living in dire straits. Venezuelans can no longer meet the recommended 2,000 calories a day. 75 percent of the population reported significant weight loss in the last year alone. Hospitals are without basic medicines and equipment to treat the sick.

Venezuela used to be South America’s richest nation, now the majority of Venezuelans live in unsustainable conditions.

This crisis is also affecting regional stability. Brazil and Colombia are dealing with escalating migrant and refugee flows, as millions of Venezuelans cross into their borders. Colombia has taken in almost 1.5 million Venezuelan refugees, straining their countries resources. The U.N. called the exodus from Venezuela the “largest in recent history of Latin America and the Caribbean.”

It is time for the United States to step up. President Trump has been tough on Venezuela’s dictator, Maduro, but has shown no mercy to the thousands of Venezuelans that have applied for protection in the United States. The conditions in Venezuela are exactly what TPS was designed to address. It prevents foreign nationals from being deported back to countries facing similar conditions.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this critical bill tonight.

This is how we help Venezuelans in the short term.

REMEMBERING STEFANO GIUSEPPE RIBOLI

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember a great Angeleno, Stefano Giuseppe Riboli, who passed away on July 3, 2019, at the age of 97. He was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, and lived a joyous life filled with the love of family and friends. To the people of Los Angeles, he was also cherished as the patriarch of San Antonio Winery, who led the family winery for many years before passing. Today, Southern Grace Distilleries stands as one of North Carolina’s premier distilleries and a testament of Leanne’s hard work and dedication. Reflective of Leanne’s innumerable accomplishments and devotion to public service, North Carolina Governor Roy Cooper inducted Leanne into the Order of the Long Leaf Pine on July 17, 2019, the highest civilian honor the governor can bestow. Throughout Leanne’s life she made service to others a priority.

My thoughts and prayers are with Leanne’s husband, Drew Arrowood; her mother, Judy Jr.; and all who loved her, including her beloved canine companion, Bleu. Renee and I join our entire community as we grieve together during this difficult time.

I know I speak for the entire community when I say Leanne lives on in the hearts and minds of all who felt her kindness and generosity and I will do everything in my power to honor her extraordinary life.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in honoring the life and legacy of Susan “Leanne” Powell.
Italian immigrant parents. However, when he was three, his family moved back to Italy, and Stefano grew up there in the small mountain village of Berzo San Fermo. In the springs and summers, he shepherded cows in the local Alpine mountain pastures, and those experiences helped give him his lifelong fondness for nature and animals.

When Stefano was 16, he returned to Los Angeles to work at San Antonio Winery, which his uncle, Santo Cambianica, had founded in 1917 in the Italian-American neighborhood of Lincoln Heights. Santo mentored Stefano, and his friendly and helpful attitude to people of all backgrounds set an example that Stefano carried forward throughout his life.

Thanks in large part to Stefano’s hard work, his kind and cheerful manner, and the love and support of his family, San Antonio Winery rose from its humble beginnings to become Los Angeles’s largest and longest-producing winery, recently honored as 2018’s American Winery of the Year by Wine Enthusiast Magazine. And just as in its early days, the winery is a family enterprise, with all of Stefano’s children and many of his grandchildren working there.

San Antonio Winery is much more than just a winery to the Los Angeles community. It is a place where people of all backgrounds can meet and enjoy each other’s company. All are welcome, from families to business leaders to tourists. And Stefano’s charm and his remarkable memory were essential to the winery’s convivial spirit. He was known as “Papa Steve,” and would regale visitors with stories of the winery’s history and his days growing up in Italy—always with a smile on his face and a glass of wine at the ready. His outgoing disposition was infectious, and encouraged visitors to come back again and again.

For 73 years, Stefano was blessed by the strong and loving union he shared with his wife, Maddalena. Their support and devotion to each other nurtured their children and grandchildren, their winery, and their entire community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in sending our deepest condolences to the family of Stefano Giuseppe Riboli, including Maddalena, their children Santo (Joan), Cathy (Nino), and Steve (Sindee), their grandchildren Anthony, Steve, Lisa, Michael, Jennifer, David, Dante, Blake, Christopher, and Alex, and their seven great-grandchildren. Stefano will be greatly missed by Angelenos of all ages and walks of life, but we know that his gracious and gentle spirit will always live on in the family he loved and the business he led.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 25, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 30

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Vice Admiral Michael M. Gilday, USN, to be Admiral and Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense.

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine regulatory frameworks for digital currencies and blockchain.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Sharon Fast Gustafson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, and Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member, both of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine unprecedented migration at the United States southern border, focusing on what is required to improve conditions.

10:15 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Leslie Carwile, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, and Erin Elizabeth McKee, of California, to be Ambassador to the Independent State of Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, both of the Department of State.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management
To hold hearings to examine solutions to improve Federal hiring.

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Intellectual Property
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the United States Copyright Office.

JULY 31

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine perspectives on reauthorization of the U.S. Grain Standards Act.

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, “Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

2 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine next steps for positive train control implementation.

SEPTEMBER 17

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights
To hold an oversight hearing to examine enforcement of the antitrust laws.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5027–S5072

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2243–2260, and S. Res. 283.

Measures Reported:

S. 542, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions. (S. Rept. No. 116–65)

H.R. 3305, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”.

Measures Passed:

Federal Aviation Administration: Senate passed S. 2249, 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.

International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements: Senate agreed to S. Res. 283, expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements”.

Veto Messages:

Resolutions of Disapproval of Proposed Transfers of Certain Defense Articles and Services—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the veto messages with respect to S.J. Res. 36, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services, be considered as having been read, en bloc, that they be printed in the Record and spread in full upon the Journal, en bloc.

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the veto messages with respect to S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 37, and S.J. Res. 38, be considered at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, prior to August 2, 2019; that they be debated concurrently for up to two hours, with 15 minutes reserved for the Chairman and Ranking Member respectively; and that Senate vote on passage of the joint resolutions, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, in the order listed; and that the unanimous-consent agreement of Wednesday, June 19, 2019, for the remaining joint resolutions of disapproval of arms sales remain in effect.

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to the Constitution, the report of the veto of S.J. Res. 36, a Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services; ordered to be printed in the Record, spread in full upon the Journal, and held at the desk. (PM–23)

Transmitting, pursuant to the Constitution, the report of the veto of S.J. Res. 37, a Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services; ordered to be printed in the Record, spread in full upon the Journal, and held at the desk. (PM–24)

Transmitting, pursuant to the Constitution, the report of the veto of S.J. Res. 38, a Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services; or—
ordered to be printed in the Record, spread in full
upon the Journal, and held at the desk. (PM–25)

Pages S5059–60

Miley Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-
consent agreement was reached providing that at
1:45 p.m., on Thursday, July 25, 2019, Senate begin
consideration of the nomination of General Mark A.
Milley, to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;
and that Senate vote on confirmation of the nomina-
tion, with no intervening action or debate, and that
no further motions be in order. Page S5071

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the fol-
lowing nominations:

By 52 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. EX. 225), Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

By 54 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. EX. 228), Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. EX. 226), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

By 51 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. EX. 229), Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 227), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Pages S5031–32

Messages from the House:

Pages S5060–61

Measures Referred:

Page S5061

Measures Read the First Time:

Pages S5061, S5071

Enrolled Bills Presented:

Page S5061

Executive Communications:

Pages S5061–62

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S5062

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S5063–64

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S5064–70

Additional Statements:

Pages S5056–58

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S5071

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S5071

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—229)

Pages S5031, S5032, S5043

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and
adjourned at 6:33 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday,
July 25, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the re-
marks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's
Record on page S5072.)

Committee Meetings

(Committes not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a
hearing to examine the nomination of David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of De-
fense, after the nominee testified and answered ques-
tions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 496, to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training
and assisting the next generation of commercial fish-
ermen;

S. 893, to require the President to develop a strat-
egy to ensure the security of next generation mobile
telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic part-
ners in maximizing the security of next generation
mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure,
and software, with an amendment in the nature of a
substitute;

S. 1148, to amend title 49, United States Code,
to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation
Administration to give preferential consideration to
individuals who have successfully completed air traf-
cic controller training and veterans when hiring air
traffic control specialists, with amendments;

S. 1341, to adopt a certain California flammability
standard as a Federal flammability standard to protect
against the risk of upholstered furniture flammability,
with amendments;

S. 1349, to expand enrollment in TSA PreCheck
to expedite commercial travel screening and improve
airport security;

S. 1625, to promote the deployment of commer-
cial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing
of information with communications providers in the
United States regarding security risks to the net-
works of those providers, with an amendment in the
nature of a substitute;

S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications
Commission to issue rules relating to the collection
of data with respect to the availability of broadband
services, with an amendment in the nature of sub-
stitute;
S. 1858, to ensure the Chief Information Office of the Consumer Product Safety Commission has a significant role in decisions related to information technology, proposed legislation entitled, “Regional Ocean Partnership Act”, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2055, to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements;

S. 2203, to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, with amendments;

S. 2166, to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

A promotion list in the Coast Guard.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Theodore Rokita, of Indiana, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Jennifer L. Homendy, of Virginia, who was introduced by Senator Blumenthal, and Michael Graham, of Kansas, who was introduced by Senator Moran, both to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, Carl Whitney Bentzel, of Maryland, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner, Michael J.K. Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and Ian Paul Steff, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, who was introduced by Senator Young, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

REDUCING HUMAN-PREDATOR CONFLICT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize, focusing on innovative solutions to reduce human-predator conflict, including S. 2194, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize for reducing human-predator conflict, after receiving testimony from Brad S. Hovinga, Wyoming Game and Fish Department Jackson Regional Wildlife Supervisor, Jackson Hole; Forrest Galante, Animal Planet, New York, New York; and Nick Whitney, New England Aquarium Anderson Cabot Center for Ocean Life, Boston, Massachusetts.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Under Secretary, Brian Callanan, of New Jersey, to be General Counsel, and Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, who was introduced by Senator McConnell, all of the Department of the Treasury, and Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, who was introduced by Senator Blackburn, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine authorities for the use of military force, after receiving testimony from David Hale, Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and Marik String, Acting Legal Adviser, Office of Legal Adviser, both of the Department of State.

CONFRONTING EBOLA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy concluded a hearing to examine confronting Ebola, focusing on addressing a 21st century global health crisis, after receiving testimony from Tibor Nagy, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, and Marcia S. Bernicat, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, both of the Department of State; Rear Admiral Tim Ziemer, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development; and Mitch Wolfe, Chief Medical Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1976, to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2065, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish an annual report on the use of deepfake technology, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2183, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives, with amendments;
S. 2177, to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory;

S. 2169, to amend section 3116 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of the appointment limitations for students appointed under the expedited hiring authority for post-secondary students, with an amendment;

S. 2107, to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

S. 2193, to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, with an amendment;

S. 764, to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 439, to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan;

S. 2119, to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees;

H.R. 2590, to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 3305, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”; and

The nominations of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland Security, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, and Ashley Jay Elizabeth Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 2159, to repeal the Act entitled “An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation”.

NOMINATION
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of E. Sequoyah Simermeyer, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

GPO OVERSIGHT

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 29 public bills, H.R. 3927–3930, 3932–3956; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 54–55; and H. Res. 515–518, 520–521 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
H.R. 2385, 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 (H. Rept. 116–179);

H.R. 3931, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–180);

H.R. 3352, to provide for certain authorities of the Department of State, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–181);

H.R. 2336, to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to the definition of “family farmer” (H. Rept. 116–182); and
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 (H. Rept. 116–183).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 11:13 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Mark Getman, Temple Emanu-El of Canarsie, Brooklyn, New York.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2019: H.R. 3409, amended, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard;

Disclosing Aid Spent to Ensure Relief Act: 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;

Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act: 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;

Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act: H.R. 1307, to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance;

Stopping Bad Robocalls Act: H.R. 3375, amended, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 429 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 502;


Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “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”;

Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019: H.R. 2035, amended, to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care;

Promoting Respect for Individuals’ Dignity and Equality Act of 2019: H.R. 3299, amended, 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;

Making technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act: H.R. 1365, amended, to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act;

Emancipation National Historic Trail Study Act: H.R. 434, amended, to designate the Emancipation National Historic Trail;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes”;

Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas Equal and Fair Opportunity Settlement Act: H.R. 759, amended, to restore an opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair;

Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2019: H.R. 776, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program; and

Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2019: H.R. 2507, amended, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases.

Moment of Silence: The House observed 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.
Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 516, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. Page H7313

Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 264 ayes to 169 noes, Roll No. 505. Pages H7318–35, H7345–48

Rejected: The Mast motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 504. Pages H7346–47

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–24 shall be considered as adopted, 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. Pages H7318–23

Rejected: Roe amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–178) that sought to set the loan interest rates at 5% per annum for the first 5 years and 9% per annum thereafter (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 503). Pages H7334–35, H7345

H. Res. 509, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 397) and (H.R. 3239) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 501, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 500. Pages H7342–45

Consensus Calendar: The Chair announced the Speaker’s designation, pursuant to clause 7(a)(1) of rule 15, of 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, as the measure on the Consensus Calendar to be considered this week. Page H7368

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

U.S. Senator Joseph D. Tydings Memorial Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2019: H.R. 693, amended, 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. Pages H7368–74

Senate Referral: S. 2249 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H7292.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7310–11, H7311–12, H7312, H7345, H7347, H7347–48, H7349–50, and H7350. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:49 p.m.
Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT OF THE UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN PROGRAM: ENSURING THE SAFETY OF CHILDREN IN HHS CARE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Unaccompanied Children Program: Ensuring the Safety of Children in HHS Care”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Shalala, Wasserman Schultz, Higgins of Louisiana, and Burgess; Jonathan Hayes, Director, Office of Refugee Resettlement, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; Lynn Johnson, Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget and oversight hearing on the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Testimony was heard from Kelvin Droegemeier, Director, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President.

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION—BORDER PATROL


BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION, EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Bureau of Indian Education, Education Construction”. Testimony was heard from Jason Freihage, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

THE COSTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE: FROM COASTS TO HEARTLAND, HEALTH TO SECURITY

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Costs of Climate Change: From Coasts to Heartland, Health to Security”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Lower Half Ann C. Phillips, Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection, Office of the Governor, Virginia; and public witnesses.

BUILDING AMERICA’S CLEAN FUTURE: PATHWAYS TO DECARBONIZE THE ECONOMY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Building America’s Clean Future: Pathways to Decarbonize the Economy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATION TO MAKE CARS IN AMERICA SAFER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a hearing entitled “Legislation to Make Cars in America Safer”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE NEXT MEGABANK? EXAMINING THE PROPOSED MERGER OF SUNTRUST AND BB&T

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Next Megabank? Examining the Proposed Merger of SunTrust and BB&T”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FY20 BUDGET: STATE DEPARTMENT COUNTERTERRORISM AND COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM BUREAU

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The FY20 Budget: State Department Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism Bureau”. Testimony was heard from Nathan Sales, Acting Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Ambassador-at-Large, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, Department of State.

OVERSIGHT OF THE REPORT ON THE INVESTIGATION INTO RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: FORMER SPECIAL COUNSEL ROBERT S. MUELLER, III


LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 934, the “Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2019”;
and H.R. 935, the “Miners Pension Protection Act”. Testimony was heard from Representative McKinley and public witnesses.

THE STATUS OF THE RECLAMATION FUND AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION’S FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING NEEDS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “The Status of the Reclamation Fund and the Bureau of Reclamation’s Future Infrastructure Funding Needs”. Testimony was heard from Grayford Payne, Deputy Commissioner, Policy, Administration and Budget, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Tony Willardson, Executive Director, Western States Water Council, Murray, Utah; Federico Barajas, Executive Director, San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority, Los Baños, California; and a public witness.

EXAMINING JUUL’S ROLE IN THE YOUTH NICOTINE EPIDEMIC: PART I

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy held a hearing entitled “Examining JUUL’s Role in the Youth Nicotine Epidemic: Part I”. Testimony was heard from Senator Durbin; and public witnesses.

BEYOND THE CITIZENSHIP QUESTION: REPAIRING THE DAMAGE AND PREPARING TO COUNT ‘WE THE PEOPLE’

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Beyond the Citizenship Question: Repairing the Damage and Preparing to Count ‘We the People’”. Testimony was heard from Steven Dillingham, Director, U.S. Census Bureau; Robert Goldenkoff, Director of Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Nicholas Marinos, Director of Information Technology and Cybersecurity, Government Accountability Office.

THE DEVIL THEY KNEW—PFAS CONTAMINATION AND THE NEED FOR CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “The Devil They Knew—PFAS Contamination and the Need for Corporate Accountability”. Testimony was heard from Catherine R. McCabe, Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection; Robert R. Scott, Commissioner, New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services; Steve Sliver, Executive Director, Michigan PFAS Action Response Team, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy; and public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT; BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019; VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2203, the “Homeland Security Improvement Act”; H.R. 3877, the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”; and H.R. 549, the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3877, the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”, and H.R. 549, the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3877, the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, provides that the bill shall be considered as read, and waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 549, the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”, under a closed rule. The rule provides thirty minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–28 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule waives clause 6(a) of Rule XIII, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee against any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 26, 2019. Testimony was heard from Chairman Thompson of Mississippi and Representative Rogers of Alabama.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3357, the “Solar Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3607, the “Fossil Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3609, the “Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 335, the “South Florida Clean Coastal Waters Act of 2019”. H.R. 3597, H.R. 3607, H.R. 3609, and H.R. 335 were ordered reported, as amended.

IS THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT A HELP OR HINDRANCE TO MAIN STREET?

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act a
Help or Hindrance to Main Street?”. Testimony was heard from Jane Gravelle, Senior Specialist in Economic Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

**TRUE TRANSPARENCY? ASSESSING WAIT TIMES FIVE YEARS AFTER PHOENIX**

**Committee on Veterans’ Affairs**: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “True Transparency? Assessing Wait Times Five Years after Phoenix”. Testimony was heard from Debra A. Draper, Director, Health Care Team, Government Accountability Office; Teresa S. Boyd, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

**FORMER SPECIAL COUNSEL ROBERT S. MUELLER, III ON THE INVESTIGATION INTO RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION**

**Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence**: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Former Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**MODERNIZING LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES: LESSONS FROM THE STATES**

**Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress**: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Modernizing Legislative Information Technologies: Lessons from the States”. Testimony was heard from Diane Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel, California; Nelson P. Moe, Chief Information Officer, Virginia; Mike Rohrbach, Chief Information Officer and Director of Information Technology, State Legislature, Washington.

**Joint Meetings**

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2019**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

**Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry**: to hold hearings to examine hemp production and the 2018 farm bill, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

**Committee on Armed Services**: business meeting to consider pending military nominations, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

**Committee on Energy and Natural Resources**: to hold hearings to examine the importance of energy innovation to economic growth and competitiveness, 10 a.m., SD–366.

**Committee on Finance**: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, “The Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2019”, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

**Committee on Foreign Relations**: business meeting to consider S. 398, to support the peaceful resolution of the civil war in Yemen, to address the resulting humanitarian crisis, and to hold the perpetrators responsible for murdering a Saudi dissident, S. 2066, to review United States Saudi Arabia Policy, S. 1441, to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia (Treaty Doc. 116–01), and the nominations of Pamela Bates, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Jonathan R. Cohen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Christopher Landau, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the United Mexican States, Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Libya, John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, Jennifer D. Nordquist, of Virginia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years, and other pending nominations, 10:30 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

**Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs**: to hold hearings to examine state and Federal recommendations for enhancing school safety against targeted violence, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

**Committee on the Judiciary**: business meeting to consider S. 1494, to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to protect alien minors and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end abuse of the asylum system and establish refugee application and processing centers outside the United States, 10 a.m., SD–226.

**Select Committee on Intelligence**: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

**House**

**Committee on Appropriations**: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, oversight hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 1 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.


**Committee on Energy and Commerce**: Full Committee, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.
Committee on Financial Services, Task Force on Financial Technology, hearing entitled “Examining the Use of Alternative Data in Underwriting and Credit Scoring to Expand Access to Credit”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation, hearing entitled “Human Rights in Southeast Asia: A Regional Outlook”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment, hearing entitled “Russia and Arms Control: Extending New START or Starting Over?”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of Family Separation and U.S. Customs and Border Protection Short-Term Custody under the Trump Administration”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


Full Committee, hearing entitled “When Science Gets Trumped: Scientific Integrity at the Department of the Interior”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, markup on S. 406, the “Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act of 2019”; H.R. 887, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the “Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building”; H.R. 1252, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6531 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the “Marilyn Monroe Post Office”; H.R. 1253, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13507 Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima, California, as the “Ritchie Valens Post Office Building”; H.R. 1972, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the “Jeanette Rankin Post Office Building”; H.R. 2151, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7722 South Main Street in Pine Plains, New York, as the “Senior Chief Petty Officer Shannon M. Kent Post Office”; H.R. 3207, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Mill Street in Hookstown, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Dylan Elchin Post Office Building”; H.R. 3314, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 McCulloch Boulevard North in Lake Havasu City, Arizona, as the “Lake Havasu City Combat Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 3329, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5186 Benito Street in Montclair, California, as the “Paul Eaton Post Office Building”; a Resolution offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoena Related to Non-Official Electronic Messaging Accounts; H.R. 3889, the “ONDCP Technical Corrections Act”; and a Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Kellyanne Conway, Senior Counselor to the President, in Contempt of Congress for her Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled “Examining JUUL’s Role in the Youth Nicotine Epidemic: Part II”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “Benign by Design: Innovations in Sustainable Chemistry”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.


Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture, Trade, and Entrepreneurship, hearing entitled “Supporting the Next Generation of Agricultural Businesses”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing entitled “Examining the Federal Role in Improving School Bus Safety”, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.


Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Social Security 2100 Act”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Full Committee, business meeting on historical documents protected under Internal Revenue Code section 6103, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting on Consideration of the Access Request from Rep. Elissa Slotkin and Rep. Mike Thompson; and Consideration of the Access Request from Rep. Stephanie Murphy, 9 a.m., HVC–304.

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Creating a Climate Resilient America: Business Views on the Costs of the Climate Crisis”, 2 p.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine the state of media freedom in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe region, 3 p.m., HVC–210.
Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, July 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1:45 p.m.), Senate begin consideration of the nomination of General Mark A. Milley, to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and vote on confirmation thereon.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, July 25

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 3877—Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 549—Venezuela TPS Act of 2019 (Subject to a Rule).
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