

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

I want to thank the distinguished and always eloquent gentleman from Georgia for his comments on a number of interesting things. One is the question of bipartisanship and us working together, and I think the gentleman correctly invites us to study the record of legislative success and achievements in our body.

It is true that the best legislation, like the Voting Rights Act, for example, is legislation that came through a bipartisan process where we had both parties working together.

All of our great Presidents have been people who themselves were involved in partisan politics, and often in a bare-knuckled way, but also, once they were in office, called the country to try to speak across party lines.

Jefferson said, "We are all republicans. We are all federalists" in his inaugural address in 1800.

And Lincoln, of course, said: We are friends; we must not be enemies. We must be friends, and we must not be enemies.

And President Obama said: We are not the red States of America; we are not the blue States of America. We are the United States of America.

And so we have to try to aspire to that even though we work in a party system. And the reason we have a party system is because we are not a one-party dictatorship.

One way to get rid of partisanship is you get rid of political parties and you have a one-party state. But we don't believe in that. We have got political freedom in America.

But, at the same time, once we get in, the same way that we render constituent service to all of our constituents without regard to whether they are Democrats or Republicans or Independents, we should try to render legislative service to the whole country at the same time.

Let me just make one other point to my friend about the Seat of Government Clause.

Now, as the gentleman knows, the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia represents 700,000 people who have no voting representation in Congress, and the basis for that, what I think is a historical accident, has been the existence of the District Clause that Congress exercises exclusive legislation over the land that is ceded to Congress for the purposes of a seat of government.

Well, I suppose to the extent that there is an attempt to justify us being the only country on Earth where the people of the Capital City are not represented, it has to do with the fact that this is where the Federal Government is located.

Now, the District of Columbia is involved in a statehood struggle, which I support. Like every other American, they want to be part of a State. But as long as they are in the so-called seat of government, it seems to me that the

gentlewoman makes a good point, which is that truly Federal functions should not be stripped away from Washington, D.C., and relocated around the country.

Now, most Federal employees don't live in the National Capital area; 80 to 85 percent of them live across America at Army bases or post offices, Departments of Justice around the country. They work in all of those Federal functions around the country.

But there are certain things that do belong here. The Federal departments clearly belong within the seat of government, and I think that the gentlewoman was just identifying that there has been an effort to strip away essential Federal functions and to relocate them to other parts of the country, leaving her constituents with the worst of both worlds, which is no representation the way that our constituents are represented, but, at the same time, a gradual stripping away of the Federal offices and departments.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker and I will yield him the balance of my time, so when he yields back, I will close.

I appreciate that now that the airplane has circled enough and we have run out of enough fuel, we are now on to the next topic, and I appreciate the gentleman discussing that.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation that I am going to discuss now.

I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1663. Put simply, this bill helps to support those Federal attorneys who prosecute major drug traffickers, white-collar criminals, and others who commit Federal crimes and those Federal judges who preside over cases heard in their courtrooms.

In a few short months, the Federal Bar Association will celebrate the centennial anniversary of its founding. It was founded with a mission to promote and support legal research and education, to advance the science of jurisprudence, to facilitate the administration of justice, and to foster improvements in the practice of Federal law.

Back in 1954, Congress chartered the Federal Bar Association, but in the decades since receiving its charter, it has neither been updated nor amended.

As a former educator and attorney and current senior member of the Judiciary Committee myself, I recognize, as many of my colleagues do, the important work that the Federal Bar Association does to bring civics education to classrooms in my State of Ohio and throughout the country.

Without legislation like this, H.R. 1663, it would take, literally, an act of Congress to allow the Federal Bar Association to make simple changes to its bylaws.

More specifically, this legislation gives the association the ability to choose the location of its principal office, restricts its officers from engaging in political activity, and makes other technical changes to conform to commonly used language used by other congressionally chartered groups.

This legislation being considered today serves to provide the Federal Bar Association with the ability to continue its important work and scholarship in communities throughout the country.

Finally, I want to again thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for his support of H.R. 1663, and I want to thank both Chairman NADLER and Ranking Member COLLINS for bringing it to the floor today for consideration. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CHABOT for his excellent work on this legislation, and I want to thank Mr. COLLINS for his thoughtful intervention.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was advanced to allow the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association the flexibility it needs to successfully manage its own affairs, as Mr. CHABOT pointed out. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1663.

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.

REAUTHORIZING SECURITY FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES ACT OF 2019

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4258) to authorize the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to protect the Justices, employees, and official guests of the Supreme Court outside of the Supreme Court grounds, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4258

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 "Reauthorizing Security for Supreme Court Justices Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION AUTHORITY OF MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT AND SUPREME COURT POLICE.

Section 6121 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "any State" and inserting "any location"; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “violation of federal or state law” and inserting “violation of Federal or State law”; and

(ii) by striking “regulation under federal or state law” and inserting “regulation under Federal or State law”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking “ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS” and all that follows through “Duties under” and inserting “AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY FIREARMS—Duties under”; and

(C) by striking “any State” and inserting “any location”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to thank Chairman NADLER and Ranking Member COLLINS for moving H.R. 4258, the Reauthorizing Security for Supreme Court Justices Act of 2019, through the Judiciary Committee in a swift manner.

I would also like to thank my friend and fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman STEUBE, for joining me in introducing this important piece of legislation.

The Supreme Court Police currently has permanent authority to protect Justices on Supreme Court grounds; however, its authority to protect them outside of the Supreme Court grounds is temporary and has been reauthorized in a bipartisan manner since 1928. H.R. 4258 is a bipartisan bill that will permanently reauthorize the ability to protect the Justices outside of the Supreme Court grounds.

With the increase of potential threats against the Justices of the Supreme Court in recent years and the current authorization set to expire on December 29 of this year, this bill is needed to remove the threat of disruptions and security gaps caused by the temporary authority.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4258. I hope the Senate acts swiftly and considers this bill. It is critically important that we protect the Justices of the highest court in our land.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4258. The gentleman has spoken well of what it actually does and what it will not do. I support that.

I would like to congratulate Congressmen STANTON and STEUBE on their work on this legislation.

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 Arizona (Mr. STANTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4258.

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.

□ 1245

VETERAN ENTREPRENEURSHIP TRAINING ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3537) to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3537

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 “Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.

Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.—

“(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(A) a member of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves;

“(B) an individual who is participating in the Transition Assistance Program established under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code;

“(C) an individual who—

“(i) served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves; and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable; and

“(D) a spouse or dependent of an individual described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Beginning on the first October 1 after the enactment of this subsection and for the subsequent 4 fiscal years, the Administrator shall carry out a program to be known as the ‘Boots to Business Program’ to provide entrepreneurship training to covered individuals.

“(3) GOALS.—The goals of the Boots to Business Program are to—

“(A) provide assistance and in-depth training to covered individuals interested in business ownership; and

“(B) provide covered individuals with the tools, skills, and knowledge necessary to identify a business opportunity, draft a business plan, identify sources of capital, connect with local resources for small business concerns, and start up a small business concern.

“(4) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Boots to Business Program may include—

“(i) a presentation providing exposure to the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

“(ii) an online, self-study course focused on the basic skills of entrepreneurship, the language of business, and the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

“(iii) an in-person classroom instruction component providing an introduction to the foundations of self employment and ownership of a small business concern; and

“(iv) in-depth training delivered through online instruction, including an online course that leads to the creation of a business plan.

“(B) COLLABORATION.—The Administrator may—

“(i) collaborate with public and private entities to develop course curricula for the Boots to Business Program; and

“(ii) modify program components in coordination with entities participating in a Warriors in Transition program, as defined in section 738(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

“(C) USE OF RESOURCE PARTNERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

“(I) ensure that Veteran Business Outreach Centers regularly participate, on a nationwide basis, in the Boots to Business Program; and

“(II) to the maximum extent practicable, use a variety of other resource partners and entities in administering the Boots to Business Program.

“(ii) GRANT AUTHORITY.—In carrying out clause (i), the Administrator may make grants to Veteran Business Outreach Centers, other resource partners, or other entities to carry out components of the Boots to Business Program.

“(D) AVAILABILITY TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Administrator shall make available to the Secretary of Defense information regarding the Boots to Business Program, including all course materials and outreach materials related to the Boots to Business Program, for inclusion on the website of the Department of Defense relating to the Transition Assistance Program, in the Transition Assistance Program manual, and in other relevant materials available for distribution from the Secretary of Defense.

“(E) AVAILABILITY TO VETERANS AFFAIRS.—In consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Administrator shall make available for distribution and display at local facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs outreach materials regarding the Boots to Business Program which shall, at a minimum—

“(i) describe the Boots to Business Program and the services provided; and

“(ii) include eligibility requirements for participating in the Boots to Business Program.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and every year thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the Boots to Business Program, which may be included as part of another report submitted to such Committees by the Administrator, and which shall include—

“(A) information regarding grants awarded under paragraph (4)(C);

“(B) the total cost of the Boots to Business Program;