

CONGRATULATING CAITLIN
LANTERMAN AND MADISON COL-
LINS

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans watching these proceedings right now are watching them on C-SPAN.

C-SPAN is a public service funded by the cable industry which receives no taxpayer dollars. Every year C-SPAN holds a documentary contest for middle and high school students called StudentCam. This year students addressed the theme: What does it mean to be an American?

Today I am proud to announce that some of my young constituents, Caitlin Lanterman and Madison Collins from Mountain View High School, were chosen as winners. The winning videos can be viewed at studentcam.org.

On behalf of the people of Idaho, congratulations on winning this prize out of nearly 3,000 entries.

EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me first, before we begin, given the tragedy that, once again, has visited our country over the weekend, pause and acknowledge—with Rabbi Lazowski from Connecticut in Washington, D.C., this evening and his son, Alan Lazowski, joining him at a Holocaust museum dedication, and after listening to the eloquence of SCOTT PETERS and our own JOHN LEWIS—how indeed saddened we are by these events.

As Mr. LEWIS said, we remain focused on ending and focusing on hoping and praying that these horrific events will stop, but I assure you they will not stop without action on behalf of the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are honored to rise this evening and discuss Social Security 2100. We are honored to be joined by the deputy chair of the committee, BILL PASCRELL from Paterson, New Jersey. We want to make sure that citizens all across this country understand the number of hearings that are going on in districts all across the country and here in the Nation's Capitol, because it is long overdue that we address the issue of not just protecting Social Security, but enhancing it.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the last time that the United States Congress significantly addressed the issue of Social Security was in 1983. Tip O'Neill was then Speaker of the House, and Ronald Reagan was President. It does demonstrate that Democrats and Republicans can work together in the best in-

terests of the country, and there is no bill currently before the body that does that in a better way than Social Security 2100.

I say that because it is the only bill that has an actuarial report that verifies that it does everything that it says it will do: keep Social Security solvent, sustainably solvent beyond the 75-year requirement by law. But also, not just make it sustainably solvent, but enhance the program so that people all across this country can benefit from the Nation's leading insurance program.

Now, the point we always try to make and get across is something that is intuitively obvious to American citizens, but not often explained graphically, and that is this: that Social Security is not an entitlement. Mr. Speaker, you hear people speak of Social Security and say: we need entitlement reform.

Certainly, you are entitled to Social Security because you paid for it. This is what every American citizen understands from the first time they get a paycheck and they look at its stub, and it says: FICA. FICA stands for Federal Insurance Contribution.

Whose contribution?

Yours.

American citizens throughout their work life contribute into the program. They do so knowing that since 1940 they have been able to get a check in return for either their retirement or because of a disability or spousal or dependent coverage. That is why it is the most effective and unique governmental program paid for by American citizens through their FICA premiums that are taken from their paycheck weekly, biweekly, or monthly.

But what every American knows is that this is the insurance you have paid for, not an entitlement program that the government somehow just grants you.

So we come to Congress in this session, as we have in the past, proposing a bill, but one that we have already had four public hearings on. In those hearings, we have discussed why, in fact, it is necessary for us not to just protect and preserve Social Security, make sure that it is sustainably solvent for 75 years, but, in fact, enhance it, starting with the fact that the last time we strengthened the program was in 1983.

So to say that we are overdue is an understatement. We are overdue at a time when baby boomers are retiring at a record rate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security. That, in and of itself, should require an actuarial adjustment, one that should have been indexed into the law in 1983 but was not.

So now it is incumbent upon the Congress. Citizens can't do this on their own. They make their premium payments every week, biweekly, or monthly, but it is up to Congress to make sure the program is actuarially sound.

So we proposed a bill that is not only actuarially sound beyond 75 years, but also one that is enhanced to make up for the lack of indexing and make sure that people now in their retirement can have a rational increase in their Social Security.

Nobody is getting wealthy on Social Security. Nobody is hoarding their Social Security money. They spend it weekly, biweekly, and monthly in their respective communities. It is an economic boost to every community and essential for the survival of many of our citizens.

We have opted to make sure that we enhance Social Security in the following four ways: number one, there is a modest, 2 percent across-the-board increase for everyone who is receiving Social Security and who will receive Social Security in the future.

Number two, we make sure that the new level of Social Security payments is now changed so that as long as you have paid in your quarters, you have put in your time, and paid your Social Security benefits, the new floor for Social Security will be 125 percent of what the Federal Government determines the poverty rate is at that time, therefore lifting so many people, especially women, and more directly especially women of color, in this country who have been the caregivers of our children and family members whether through birth or through sickness, and therefore have not been in the workforce as long as their male counterparts. We also know that while they were in the workforce, they were making 70 cents for every dollar their male counterpart was. So to raise people out of poverty so they can make their payments to maintain a lifestyle or quality of life that is just above the poverty level is the right thing to do.

The third thing we do is something that the AARP has long advocated, and that is to make sure that we have a COLA that actually reflects the cost that people incur when they are in retirement.

What are those costs?

Those costs happen to be utility bills—heating and cooling your home—the doctor visits, the prescription drugs, the nutrition, and the physical therapy. Those are the essential—along with food—elements that you need to exist. It ought to be factored into how COLAs are given. Currently a COLA is just given based on the consumer price index and an average which incorporates a multitude of expenses, and, frankly, oftentimes, as every senior in America will attest, they have gone without COLA payments at a time when the disparity of wealth is getting greater in this country of ours. So a COLA payment makes sense and is geared towards your actual expenses, something that we call CPI-E, E standing for the elderly and the expenses that they incur.

□ 1945

Lastly, we also do a fourth thing. We provide a tax break to seniors.

Again, in 1983, they determined that if you were single and making more than \$24,000 a year, your Social Security was taxed; if you were a married couple and making more than \$32,000 a year, your Social Security was taxed.

Today, that has certainly not kept pace and is way out of line with what should happen. So in our bill, Social Security 2100, we move that to \$50,000 per individual and \$100,000 per couple. 12.5 million Americans will get a tax cut immediately, something that I know they will be able to use.

Why do people remain working when they are retired? Number one, because many of them have to. Number two, because many of them find it more purposeful in their lives to stay gainfully employed and involved and committed in their communities, and they do.

This, again, is another reasonable measure: an increase across the board of 2 percent, make sure that 125 percent of poverty is the new floor for Social Security, have a COLA that is based on actual expenses, and provide a tax break for those who are currently working or will continue to work after retirement age.

We already have growth in the age group. Just this past year, 66 has now become the age at which you can become eligible for Social Security. You can get it if you are at 62, if you can make that case, but you will receive far less money.

The beauty of Social Security is that it also has built-in incentives for people, depending on their circumstances. If they can wait longer, there is more money that they will receive.

An example: If a person who opted to take money at 62 waited until they were age 70, they could almost double what they would receive, in terms of a Social Security payment for their retirement.

That is the kind of incentive that we should have for people, knowing that, if they can, through education, understand what this would be. They should contact the Social Security office and make sure that they find out what their payments are and what is in their best interests.

Everybody's case, as we know, is not the same. It is different depending upon your health and lifestyle circumstances; what you had for a job and the kind of job and its impact on you physically, mentally, and emotionally; and where you are, at whatever state in time, so that you need this.

That is what we are also pleased about, that we are presenting an opportunity for people to get Social Security in a manner in which it will be enhanced in these four ways and that it is sustainably solvent.

How do we get there to do this, especially without burdening any future generation? We do it the same way that Franklin Delano Roosevelt thought it should be done, and Dwight David Eisenhower when he expanded the program thought it should be done, and Lyndon Baines Johnson when he

expanded the program, and lastly, when Ronald Reagan agreed to improve and expand the program.

We do it by way of introducing legislation and then by doing the time-honored thing of increasing the contribution. This is an insurance payment—an insurance payment. Americans, in poll after poll after poll, are saying: My God, we are willing to pay more so that we can reap the benefit. Why doesn't Congress make it actuarially sound so that we are able to do this?

By increasing the payment by 1.2 percent but then phasing that in over 25 years, we are able to come up with an incremental adjustment that takes the place of what should have happened in 1983, which would have been the gradual indexing in payment of the program.

This way, we make the program actuarially sound. We make sure that it is sustainably solvent and that people can have the benefits that they need.

How do we know this? How does any senior? How can anyone rely on it? They can because we have the corresponding actuarial report that goes through every line of the bill and certifies how it is paid for and that it is sustainably solvent beyond 75 years.

We also scrap the cap on people making over \$400,000. Usually, when I am at a senior hall, I will ask somebody to raise their hand if they are making over \$400,000. It might surprise some of our viewers that not many hands go up in the room. So far, I have yet to see a hand go up in any senior center that I have been in.

Nonetheless, it represents about six-tenths of the American people. We lift the cap on it, and all that means is that they will pay what a guy making \$50,000 a year is paying.

When we first introduced this bill on Social Security, the cap on Social Security was \$112,000. It is now \$132,900. It will grow every year. But we lift the cap on people over \$400,000 because baby boomers will peak around 2022. This helps us ease them into that process actuarially.

We have two things that are going on that help us both enhance the program and make sure that it is sustainably solvent.

Another way to explain this—and I often do this by holding up a very popular brand of coffee and saying to seniors: How much does this Starbucks cost? Typically, they will know the answer immediately. They will ask if it is a latte. I will say, yes, it is. They will say \$4.50.

That is right. Or, if you are making \$50,000 a year, that is 9 weeks of Social Security payments. Or, if you were those fortunate people at \$400,000 a year, it would still cost you more weekly to buy this latte than it will to fix Social Security.

Can we do this, America? You bet we can, in the same traditional, time-honored way that we have done it in the past.

This is not an entitlement. This is insurance that needs to be paid for. You

have contributed to it all your life. For a small enhancement, for a small contribution—if you are making \$25,000 a year, it costs you 25 cents; if you are making \$100,000 a year, it costs you a buck a week to make sure that Social Security is there for all American citizens.

Let me say this, too, because I know our viewers know, and especially the man from Paterson knows this, that it is not just a retirement plan, though we focus on this. It is also spousal and dependent coverage, disability coverage. In fact, one in five recipients of Social Security is not in retirement currently.

That is why we have the support of so many organizations, from Social Security Works to the National Committee to Preserve Social Security, the AFL-CIO, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, who have been before the committee to testify.

If you heard them speak, there is not an American anywhere in this country who wouldn't stand up and salute and say: This is what we need to do. This is what we must do for all our citizens but especially those who have gone above and beyond in terms of the sacrifice that they have provided for this country.

We are proud of all the sponsors that this has attracted, but it doesn't happen without the day-to-day work, without the testimony, without the hearings. There is nobody who has worked harder at this than the Congressman from Paterson, New Jersey; the deputy chair of the Subcommittee on Social Security; the former mayor of Paterson; a voice for America; my dear friend and colleague, BILL PASCRELL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, if nominated, I will not run.

This is an interesting subject, not only for the elderly like myself, but for young people who need to know about Social Security.

Many times, younger folks, like myself when I was younger, I didn't talk about Social Security too much. I didn't concern myself with what was going to happen when I was 65 years of age—or now 66, as the chairman pointed out.

But this is going to happen. I hate to tell you: You are going to get older. Mr. Speaker, you are going to get older. You are going to be 66, and then you are going to be 67, et cetera. Then you are going to have to address whether or not there is enough money in this insurance plan for you.

The chairman needs all the credit in the world because we are living in a time when people do not want to address the problems that every American is going to face. It doesn't matter whether you are this party or that party. You are going to be affected by it.

Many people treat Social Security like they treat their health: I am not sick. I am 25 years of age. I am

healthy. Why in God's name do I need to be covered by insurance?

Does that sound familiar? We have a big debate going on as to whether we should mandate the Affordable Care Act. All boats have to rise, or they will all fall.

Secondly, let's put this into a timeframe, as Chairman LARSON alluded to. Let's put it in a timeframe.

I compare it to, if I may, an analogy of apples and oranges. Allow me that, please. Give me license to do that.

I compare this to climate change. We started to talk about climate change on this floor—I wasn't here—25 years ago. We have been talking each issue to death, like we do a lot of problems, and we don't do anything.

Two new books just came out in the last week about climate change, more scientific evidence to prove, to support the idea that we are running out of time.

Our shorelines are moving. They are moving inland, not moving out, and this can lead to tremendous devastation.

We know many of these things happen in nature. I have heard that before. But many things are pushed by human behavior, and matters become worse.

□ 2000

And the same thing with Social Security. Presidents in the past, regardless of which party they belonged to, were always willing to make adjustments so that people had those benefits in this insurance program—not an entitlement, not an entitlement—so that there was always adjustments to take care of things.

We have approached that time. We are into that time, and we have got about 12 to 14 years to make up our mind what direction we are going to go in. And I suggest that this piece of legislation, which Mr. LARSON has sponsored and I am proudly part of it, this legislation is actuarially acceptable. We know what is going to happen 30 years, 40 years from now.

If we do this legislation, we reduce the anxiety that is involved. And even though you are younger, Social Security affects you because you are paying into it. You don't even know sometimes that you are paying into it, but you are paying into it. You are paying into a social insurance program.

So what is going to happen if we do not address environmental issues is we will be choked to death, literally. That is not hyperbole; that is science. Sorry about that.

We will cut off food supplies. Some areas of the world are already being affected by that. And again, we will move our shorelines.

So, seniors, we need to educate younger people. They need to understand that Social Security takes care of the disabled for young and old. Younger Americans should be concerned and involved with this shrinking reserve in our insurance plan which we have paid into.

So, for too long, I think, in my estimation, the Congress has been silent in the face of this crisis. We are paralyzed on many of the issues. We don't want to act to make things better. We would rather they get worse, and maybe the heavens will open and they won't get worse anymore. I wouldn't count on that. Today we stand up to say the time for action is now. Seniors, families, future generations depend on it.

I talk with people in my district, the Ninth District of New Jersey, every day, even when I am down here, families that are dependent upon their Social Security check as their only means of income, and we are thinking in our heads that maybe we should cut benefits in order to make it better? That will make it worse. That will make it worse. Serious stuff.

So many people depend on Social Security. Think about it. You are 25 years old. Are you thinking about what is going to happen to you when you are 67 years of age and you are living—because you haven't saved enough, or you couldn't save enough, because most people don't have too much to spend day in, day out. We have seen those numbers over the past 3 months. Are you thinking about what is going to happen to you if you have to live on a Social Security check for which the benefits have been cut?

And we raised the age of being eligible for Social Security so we could fit and stretch the reserve a little longer. Raising the age is not solving the problem of when someone is eligible. People retire earlier in this day and age.

We must have courage to act in the face of challenges. Social Security is this insurance program which we want to protect and expand and help senior citizens and younger people and the disabled.

Those who pay into that reserve deserve to know they will be taken care of in their older years, that hard work, paying your dues still means something in the United States of America. Congress must take up this Social Security 2100 Act; they must take that up right now, without delay.

I think, in the Social Security Subcommittee, there are folks on the other side of the aisle who want to see a positive change, but they must have the courage to cross the line and make a decision.

The commitment that I made when I first ran for office in 1996, my first commitment when I ran against an incumbent in my district was this: Social Security will be one of my first priorities, my top three priorities in Congress, that I will try everything in my power to bolster Social Security, and I will never support diminishing the benefits of the insurance policy that I pay into and you pay into and everyone pays into. I think that that is critical.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman. I think that his courage in speaking out—and I am not blowing smoke. I mean this. The courage to speak out on these issues is going to

have long-standing effects down the line, because when you are 25, you are not thinking about this. Let's be honest. I didn't. If you talked to me about Social Security when I was 25, I would have rather watched paint dry on a wall. How stupid that was.

You are going to get older, God willing, and you want something back from what you paid into. I mean, is that radical? I don't think that is a radical idea.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's resolve in this matter—because the chairman has gone all over the country to talk about this legislation. He is serious about it. This is not a photo op. This is not a speech. This is something that needs to be digested, and then you act upon it.

You ask your Congressman: "What are you doing about Social Security?" Call him up and ask him: "What are you doing about Social Security?"

Oh, the Congressman may answer: "Well, you are not one of those who is going to lose sight of the fact that these are all things that are going to get solved sooner or later."

"Yeah, but isn't the time shrinking?"

"Yes, the time is shrinking, but I am learning more about it."

"What are you doing?"

Silence is golden. Silence makes no mistakes.

We need to do something about this now, Mr. Speaker. I commit to the gentleman: You can count on me. This is a sound program.

And, by the way, the COLA doesn't include some of the expenses that seniors go through, which makes it incredible.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his continued leadership.

I want to underscore a couple of things that he said, and especially reaching out to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It is not often that I think you see us come to the floor and talk about following President Trump, but I believe they should follow their President in this instance, because he had both the audacity and the temerity to argue in front of 16 other Republicans when he was campaigning for President and they attempted to corner him and commit that Social Security was an entitlement. He said, no, it is an earned benefit; it needs to be protected. To his credit, he had written before about it in a book as well, and so he is on the record.

We will pass a bill in the House of Representatives, there is no question, with more than 206 original cosponsors on the bill, but what we need to happen here, I think, is for people to come together in a way that they did in 1983 and present the American people.

Now, some would say, well, geez, that is impossible to do. The House is Democratic, the President is Republican, and the Senate is Republican.

In 1983, the House was Democratic and Tip O'Neill was the Speaker; Ronald Reagan was the President; Howard

Baker was the Senate majority leader, a Republican.

So what happened then and what needs to happen now is for the American public to make sure that they are contacting their Representative, their Senator, the President and saying this can be done.

I am confident that NANCY PELOSI and Donald Trump could do what Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan did in 1983, except this time it would be enhanced and indexed and help so many people.

Here are the facts:

Almost 63 million people are receiving Social Security benefits, of which 55 percent are women and 45 percent are men;

For almost two-thirds of those beneficiaries, Social Security provides a majority of their income—a majority of their income for two-thirds of American people—and for almost one-third, it provides 90 percent or more of their income;

The average annual Social Security benefit for a woman is \$14,000—nobody is getting wealthy on these programs that they have paid for—compared with \$18,000 for men;

Without these very modest benefits, nearly half of women 65 years or older living without a spouse would live in poverty;

Nearly 20 percent of Hispanic women 65 years and older live under this current program in poverty, and without Social Security increases, this would rise to 50 percent for Hispanic women over 65 years old;

Today, nearly 18 percent of African Americans live in poverty on Social Security.

So the Nation's preeminent insurance program, as sound and as solid as it is and will be, the latest Social Security Trustees report says that in just 15 years, if we do nothing—which, shamelessly, has been the role that Congress has played, it has done nothing—if we do nothing, there will be a 21 percent across-the-board cut in order for people to continue to receive their checks.

We can do this, America. This is within our grasp. You have a President who is like-minded, a Speaker of the House who would be very enthusiastic about making sure that we are taking care of all Americans with this universal insurance plan that provides retirement funding, dependent and spousal coverage in time of death.

Three of the members on the Ways and Means Committee and two on the Subcommittee on Social Security were raised by a single parent, having lost a father prematurely.

It is incredible to me that we don't just come together and recognize, as a nation—noting that the President has recognized this; clearly, the Speaker has; and I am sure that even MITCH MCCONNELL would recognize this as well—that we need to come together.

What Americans dislike most about Congress is they don't see us solving problems. They see us straining on the fringes, both making our points but

not coming together to solve a problem that works to their benefit.

That is why we are elected: to govern and to govern on behalf of the people who sent us here. We think that this is a good step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for joining me here this evening. I hope that those who have heard us here this evening will call their elected Representative and their United States Senators to talk to them about coming together to solve the problem for Social Security and pass Social Security 2100.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1222, the Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

792. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — *Phytophthora ramorum*; Regulated Areas, Regulated Establishments, and Testing Protocols [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0101] (RIN: 0579-AE30) received April 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 Agriculture.

793. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Student Eligibility, Convicted Felons, Lottery and Gambling, and State Verification Provisions of the Agricultural Act of 2014 [FNS 2015-0038] (RIN: 0584-AE41) received April 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 Agriculture.

794. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a Summary Report of Antideficiency Act violation; Air Force Case Number 16-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

795. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Allotments for Child and Spousal Support [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0045] (RIN: 0790-AJ98) received April 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.

796. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting proposed legislation that would clarify that the Department of Energy has fulfilled the requirements of Sec. 631(b)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

797. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final authorization — Alabama: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2018-0529; FRL-9992-49-Region 4] received April 16, 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.

798. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Diammonium Phosphate Fertilizer Units [EPA-R07-OAR-2018-0837; FRL-9992-09-Region 7] received April 16, 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.

799. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Disapproval; Wisconsin; Redesignation Request for the Wisconsin Portion of the Chicago-Naperville, Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0496; FRL-9992-43-Region 5] received April 16, 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.

800. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA: Non-Interference Demonstration and Maintenance Plan Revision for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement in the Atlanta Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0617; FRL-9992-54-Region 4] received April 16, 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.

801. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final evaluation of applicant submittal — Safety Evaluation for Tennessee Valley Authority Topical Report "TVA Overall Basin Probable Maximum Precipitation and Local Intense Precipitation Analysis, Calculation CDQ0000002016000041" received April 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

802. A letter from the Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rural Call Completion [WC Docket No.: 13-39] received April 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

803. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties