

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act, also known as the EFFORT Act.

The opioid crisis has, tragically, destroyed the lives of many Hoosiers. According to the most recent available data from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, in 2017, drug overdose deaths in Indiana increased by 22½ percent from the previous year. Indiana's 2017 rate of overdose deaths at over 29 per 100,000 was significantly higher than the national average.

This epidemic does not discriminate, and we must use evidence-based policy to ensure the health and well-being of current and future generations. The National Science Foundation's research has increased what we know about addiction, and while this research is at the top of its class, gaps still remain in the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction.

□ 1445

That is why I joined my colleague, Congresswoman WEXTON, to introduce the EFFORT Act, directing the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the National Institutes of Health, to support merit-reviewed and competitively awarded research on the science of opioid addiction.

By expanding basic research, we can promote collaboration and further understand how to better treat the multiple aspects of the opioid addiction.

I hope we can see an end to this crisis soon, and I am proud that Congress is taking action to fight back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

The opioid epidemic is one of the deadliest public health emergencies of our time, and it affects not just those addicted to opioids, but everyone around them as well.

The numbers describing this epidemic are truly staggering. According to the CDC, between 1999 and 2017, almost 400,000 Americans died from an opioid-related overdose. These statistics have worsened over time, with the CDC reporting that the number of Americans who died as the result of an opioid-involved overdose in 2017 was six times higher than the number who died in 1999.

My home State of Michigan has been hard-hit by this epidemic. Between 2016 and 2017, drug overdose deaths in Michigan increased by almost 14 percent, but it was not the only State suffering in this way.

In the same timeframe, 23 States, including Michigan, had a significant in-

crease in the rate of deaths from a drug overdose.

It is long past time that we invest in significant resources in combating the opioid epidemic.

As chairwoman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Research and Technology, I have seen firsthand the excellent work done by the National Science Foundation. Their previous work on addiction and opioids have resulted in critical insights into not only the psychological process of addiction, but the social impacts of addiction as well.

Despite the progress made by the National Science Foundation, there is no doubt that further work is essential to combat the opioid epidemic.

H.R. 3153 will take advantage of the NSF's strength in basic research across many disciplines, from neuroscience to social science, in collaboration with the expertise of the National Institutes of Health in public health.

The research authorized in this bill will allow us to develop a more focused and effective policy to address the opioid epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, both of whom I have the privilege of working with on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for their excellent leadership on this bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in passing it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume. I have no additional speakers.

I rise again in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

Opioid addiction knows no economic or political boundaries. It affects all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD for their bipartisan leadership on this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speeches. I would like to close at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank all of the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle and wish to recommend that we pass the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3153.

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.

COMBATING SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCIENCE ACT OF 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 36) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 36

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Research grants.
- Sec. 5. Data collection.
- Sec. 6. Responsible conduct guide.
- Sec. 7. Interagency working group.
- Sec. 8. National academies assessment.
- Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the report issued by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”—

(A) sexual harassment is pervasive in institutions of higher education;

(B) the most common type of sexual harassment is gender harassment, which includes verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about members of one gender;

(C) 58 percent of individuals in the academic workplace experience sexual harassment, the second highest rate when compared to the military, the private sector, and Federal, State, and local government;

(D) women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience sexual harassment and to feel unsafe at work than White women, White men, or men who are members of such groups;

(E) the training for each individual who has a doctor of philosophy in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields is estimated to cost approximately \$500,000; and

(F) attrition of an individual so trained results in a loss of talent and money.

(2) Sexual harassment undermines career advancement for women.

(3) According to a 2017 University of Illinois study, among astronomers and planetary scientists, 18 percent of women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups and 12 percent of White women skipped professional events because they did not feel safe attending.

(4) Many women report leaving employment at institutions of higher education due to sexual harassment.

(5) Research shows the majority of individuals do not formally report experiences of sexual harassment due to a justified fear of retaliation or other negative professional or personal consequences.

(6) Reporting procedures with respect to such harassment are inconsistent among Federal science agencies and have varying degrees of accessibility.

(7) There is not adequate communication among Federal science agencies and between such agencies and grantees regarding reports of sexual harassment, which has resulted in harassers receiving Federal funding after moving to a different institution.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACADEMIES.—The term “Academies” means the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(3) FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY.—The term “Federal science agency” means any Federal agency with an annual extramural research expenditure of over \$100,000,000.

(4) FINDING OR DETERMINATION.—The term “finding or determination” means the final disposition of a matter involving a violation of organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court of law.

(5) GENDER HARASSMENT.—The term “gender harassment” means verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey hostility, objectification, exclusion, or second-class status about one’s gender, gender identity, gender presentation, sexual orientation, or pregnancy status.

(6) GRANTEE.—The term “grantee” means the legal entity to which a grant is awarded and that is accountable to the Federal Government for the use of the funds provided.

(7) GRANT PERSONNEL.—The term “grant personnel” means principal investigators, co-principal investigators, postdoctoral researchers and other employees supported by a grant award, cooperative agreement, or contract under Federal law.

(8) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(9) SEXUAL HARASSMENT.—The term “sexual harassment” means conduct that encompasses—

(A) unwelcome sexual advances;

(B) unwanted physical contact that is sexual in nature, including assault;

(C) unwanted sexual attention, including sexual comments and propositions for sexual activity;

(D) conditioning professional or educational benefits on sexual activity; and

(E) retaliation for rejecting unwanted sexual attention.

(10) STEM.—The term “STEM” means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science.

SEC. 4. RESEARCH GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a program to award grants, on a competitive basis, to institutions of higher education or non-profit organizations (or consortia of such institutions or organizations)—

(1) to expand research efforts to better understand the factors contributing to, and consequences of, sexual harassment and gender harassment affecting individuals in the STEM workforce, including students and trainees; and

(2) to examine interventions to reduce the incidence and negative consequences of such harassment.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities funded by a grant under this section may include—

(1) research on the sexual harassment and gender harassment experiences of individuals in underrepresented or vulnerable groups, including racial and ethnic minority groups, disabled individuals, foreign nationals, sexual- and gender-minority individuals, and others;

(2) development and assessment of policies, procedures, trainings, and interventions, with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment, conflict management, and ways to foster respectful and inclusive climates;

(3) research on approaches for remediating the negative impacts and outcomes of such harassment on individuals experiencing such harassment;

(4) support for institutions of higher education to develop, adapt, and assess the impact

of innovative, evidence-based strategies, policies, and approaches to policy implementation to prevent and address sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(5) research on alternatives to the hierarchical and dependent relationships, including but not limited to the mentor-mentee relationship, in academia that have been shown to create higher levels of risk for sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(6) establishing a center for the ongoing compilation, management, and analysis of campus climate survey data.

SEC. 5. DATA COLLECTION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall convene a working group composed of representatives of Federal statistical agencies—

(1) to develop questions on sexual harassment and gender harassment in STEM departments to gather national data on the prevalence, nature, and implications of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education; and

(2) to include such questions as appropriate, with sufficient protections of the privacy of respondents, in relevant surveys conducted by the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics and other relevant entities.

SEC. 6. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT GUIDE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to update the report entitled “On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research” issued by the Academies. The report, as so updated, shall include—

(1) updated professional standards of conduct in research;

(2) standards of treatment individuals can expect to receive under such updated standards of conduct;

(3) evidence-based practices for fostering a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(4) methods, including bystander intervention, for identifying and addressing incidents of sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(5) professional standards for mentorship and teaching with an emphasis on preventing sexual harassment and gender harassment.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In updating the report under subsection (a), the Academies shall take into account recommendations made in the report issued by the Academies in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine” and other relevant studies and evidence.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the contract under subsection (a), the Academies, as part of such agreement, shall submit to the Director and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the report referred to in such subsection, as updated pursuant to such subsection.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, acting through the National Science and Technology Council, shall establish an interagency working group for the purpose of coordinating Federal science agency efforts to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment involving grant personnel. The working group shall be chaired by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (or the Director’s designee) and shall include a representative from each Federal science agency with annual extramural research expenditures totaling over \$1,000,000,000, a representative from the Department of Education, and a representative from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF WORKING GROUP.—The interagency working group established

under subsection (a) shall coordinate Federal science agency efforts to implement the policy guidelines developed under subsection (c)(2).

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF OSTP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an inventory of policies, procedures, and resources dedicated to preventing and responding to reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at Federal agencies that provide legal definitions to which institutions of higher education must comply; and

(2) not later than 6 months after the date on which the inventory is submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) in consultation with outside stakeholders and Federal science agencies, develop a uniform set of policy guidelines for Federal science agencies; and

(B) submit a report to the committees referred to in paragraph (1) containing such guidelines;

(3) encourage and monitor efforts of Federal science agencies to develop or maintain and implement policies based on the guidelines developed under paragraph (2), including the extent to which Federal science agency policies depart from the uniform policy guidelines;

(4) not later than 1 year after the date on which the inventory under paragraph (1) is submitted, and every 5 years thereafter, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall report to Congress on the implementation by Federal science agencies of the policy guidelines developed under paragraph (2); and

(5) update such policy guidelines as needed.

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall include guidelines that require—

(1) grantees to submit to the Federal science agency or agencies from which the grantees receive funding reports relating to—

(A) administrative action, related to an allegation against grant personnel of any sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, that affects the ability of grant personnel or their trainees to carry out the activities of the grant; and

(B) findings or determinations against grant personnel of sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, including any findings or determinations related to reports submitted under subparagraph (A) and any disciplinary action that was taken;

(2) the sharing, updating, and archiving of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment from grantees submitted under paragraph (1)(B) with relevant Federal science agencies on a quarterly basis; and

(3) to the extent practicable, ensure consistency among Federal agencies with regards to the policies and procedures for receiving reports submitted pursuant to paragraph (1), which may include the designation of a single agency to field reports so submitted.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall consider guidelines that require or incentivize—

(1) grantees to periodically assess their organizational climate, which may include the use of climate surveys, focus groups, or exit interviews;

(2) grantees to publish on a publicly available internet website the results of assessments conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), disaggregated by gender and, if possible, race, ethnicity, disability status, and sexual orientation;

(3) grantees to make public on an annual basis the number of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at each such institution;

(4) grantees to regularly assess and improve policies, procedures, and interventions to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(5) each grantee to demonstrate in its proposal for a grant award, cooperative agreement, or contract that a code of conduct is in place for maintaining a healthy and welcoming workplace for grant personnel and their trainees;

(6) the diffusion of the hierarchical and dependent relationships between grant personnel and their trainees;

(7) each grantee and Federal science agency to have in place mechanisms for the re-integration of individuals who have experienced sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(8) grantees to work to create a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment.

(f) FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION.—Each Federal science agency shall—

(1) develop or maintain and implement policies with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment that are consistent with policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2) and that protect the privacy of all parties involved in any report and investigation of sexual harassment and gender harassment, except to the extent necessary to carry out an investigation; and

(2) broadly disseminate such policies to current and potential recipients of research grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts awarded by such agency.

(g) FERPA.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall ensure that such guidelines and requirements are consistent with the requirements of section 44 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly referred to as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”).

(h) SUNSET.—The interagency working group established under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. NATIONAL ACADEMIES ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to undertake a study of the influence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education on the career advancement of individuals in the STEM workforce. The study shall assess—

(1) the state of research on sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;

(2) whether research demonstrates a change in the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;

(3) the progress made with respect to implementing recommendations promulgated in the Academies consensus study report entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”; and

(4) where to focus future efforts with respect to decreasing sexual harassment and gender harassment in such institutions.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director to carry out this Act, \$17,500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to re-

vise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 36, the bill that is now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Ranking Member Mr. LUCAS, for joining me in introducing this bill and for his commitment to expanding access to STEM studies and careers.

This bill is a product of more than a year of activity by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. We heard from many experts about the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM, what factors have enabled it, the impact it has on the lives and careers of so many talented young scientists and engineers, and the loss to our Nation when they leave research altogether.

We also learned of some best practices for universities, scientific societies, and Federal agencies to begin to bring transparency and accountability to this challenge.

Federal science agencies have an important role to play, because they have the responsibility to ensure that all federally-funded researchers, including students, are able to carry out their research in safe environments at all times.

However, agencies need universities to be partners in that area and effort, and that partnership starts with universities reporting to their funders when a student or researcher is brave enough to come forward with an allegation of sexual harassment.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the National Science Foundation for its bold leadership in implementing a reporting policy, and NIH and NASA for their own more recent efforts. Unfortunately, other agencies have been slow to respond.

H.R. 36 directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to issue uniform guidance to all Federal science agencies to implement reporting requirements for all grantees.

We worked closely with the university community to define the circumstances that should trigger a report. Not everybody was happy with the result, but it was a good compromise, and protects the most vulnerable.

Also, it is important to note that this bill does not interfere with due process. It simply requires transparency while protecting privacy.

H.R. 36 also supports research to inform updated policies in the future, it seeks to incentivize culture change at universities, and it makes clear that sexual harassment should now be considered as important as research mis-

conduct, as recommended by the National Academies.

While sexual harassment in science is not a problem that can be solved with legislation alone, H.R. 36 helps ensure that the Federal agencies are doing their part. No researcher should be forced to choose between her passion for science and her right to feel safe.

This legislation has broad support and has been endorsed by 28 scientific and scholarly organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, the Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019. I am proud to say that this bill is a foundation of more than a year of investigation, analysis, and recommendations to the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Curbing sexual misconduct in science is a priority that Chairwoman JOHNSON and I share.

Engaging more women in STEM studies and careers is essential to American competitiveness. Women make up half the workforce, but account for less than 25 percent of America’s STEM workforce.

Unfortunately, too many women have been driven out of STEM careers due to a culture of harassment and abuse.

H.R. 36 takes the first steps to address this problem. The bill directs the NSF to expand research efforts to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce.

Additionally, it directs the NSF to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment.

The bill also supports the adoption of uniform guidance across the Federal science agencies to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment involving grant personnel.

There is an established legal process in place within higher education and in the workplace for handling claims of sexual harassment. I cannot stress this enough: This bill does not alter that process.

What this bill does is to create a uniform policy for universities and research institutions to report to Federal science agencies when administrative action is taken that impacts the ability of a researcher to carry out a grant.

Pervasive sexual harassment in the scientific community discourages women from critical work in good-paying jobs and hurts American competitiveness.

It is unacceptable for taxpayer dollars to fund researchers who are guilty of harassing students or colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the stakeholders, especially the university community, for working with the committee staff to improve this legislation. I believe the revised bill strikes

the right balance of protecting due process and privacy, while making sure that Federal science agencies can act if a Federal research grant or the personnel supported by that grant is impacted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way to move this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R. 36 takes the first steps towards addressing the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM fields, which is driving women out of STEM careers and damaging U.S. competitiveness.

This legislation sends a strong message to the scientific community that misconduct will not be tolerated, and it sends a message to women who are in STEM studies and careers that we support them.

I look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and stakeholders to advance this legislation and make sure it is meeting the intended goals.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill. I thank members of the full committee for their work on this bill, I recommend passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 36, 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.

VERA C. RUBIN OBSERVATORY DESIGNATION ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3196) to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope”, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3196

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 “Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Dr. Vera Rubin was born July 23, 1928, to Philip and Rose Applebaum Cooper.

(2) Dr. Rubin pursued her graduate studies at Cornell University and Georgetown University, earning her Ph.D. in Physics in 1954.

(3) Dr. Rubin’s Ph.D. thesis on galaxy motions provided supporting evidence that galaxies are not uniformly distributed, but exist in clusters.

(4) Dr. Rubin continued to study the motions of galaxies, first as research associate and assistant professor at Georgetown University, and then as a member of the staff at the Carnegie Institution of Washington Department of Terrestrial Magnetism.

(5) Dr. Rubin faced barriers throughout her career because of her gender.

(6) For instance, one of the world’s leading astronomy facilities at the time, the Palomar Observatory, did not permit women. Dr. Rubin persisted and was finally allowed to observe at Palomar in 1965, the first woman officially allowed to do so.

(7) In 1970, Dr. Rubin published measurements of the Andromeda galaxy showing stars and gas orbiting the galaxy’s center too fast to be explained by the amount of mass associated with the light output of the stars.

(8) In the years that followed, Dr. Rubin and her collaborators used their observations, in conjunction with the work by earlier astronomers on the rotation of stars in spiral galaxies, to provide some of the best evidence for the existence of dark matter.

(9) This work contributed to a major shift in the conventional view of the universe, from one dominated by ordinary matter such as what produces the light of stars, to one dominated by dark matter.

(10) Dr. Rubin was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1981, the second woman astronomer to be so honored.

(11) Dr. Rubin was awarded the President’s National Medal of Science in 1993 “for her pioneering research programs in observational cosmology which demonstrated that much of the matter in the universe is dark, and for significant contributions to the realization that the universe is more complex and more mysterious than had been imagined”.

(12) Dr. Rubin was an outspoken advocate for the equal treatment and representation of women in science, and she served as a mentor, supporter, and role model to many women astronomers throughout her life.

(13) The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, will honor the legacy of Dr. Rubin and her colleagues to probe the nature of dark matter by mapping and cataloging billions of galaxies through space and time.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope shall be known and designated as the “Vera C. Rubin Observatory”.

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility described in section 3 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Vera C. Rubin Observatory”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3196, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3196, which, after today’s consideration, will be known as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act.

I thank Representative GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for joining me in introducing this bill.

Dr. Vera Rubin was a trailblazing astronomer, who dedicated her life to advancing our understanding of the cosmos. She was also a tireless advocate for women in science, and she was well known for her mentorship of aspiring women astronomers. Today would have been Dr. Rubin’s 91st birthday, but, sadly, she passed away on Christmas Day in 2016.

During the 1970s, Dr. Rubin published the best set of measurements of the galaxy rotation to date. Her data revealed something surprising. The stars orbiting in the outer regions of the galaxies were moving much faster than expected. Dark matter, first proposed decades prior, was the only way to explain the observed motion.

Dr. Rubin’s work helped to convince the broader astronomy community of the existence of dark matter and revolutionized the way we understand the universe. Instead of being dominated by light-emitting matter, Dr. Rubin’s work revealed that most of the universe is made up of a mysterious and invisible substance called dark matter.

The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, or LSST, is an 8.4-meter telescope currently under construction in Chile. Funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, LSST will conduct an unprecedented survey of the night sky. The data collected by this telescope will enable scientists to build on Dr. Rubin’s pioneering work and probe the nature of dark matter.

Dr. Rubin’s exemplary science and her sterling character will drive scientific discovery and inspire girls and women in STEM for decades to come. While Dr. Rubin has already claimed a well-deserved place in history, H.R. 3196 will further elevate her story by designating one of the world’s pre-eminent research facilities as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3196, the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act. This bill honors the contributions of the late Dr. Vera Rubin, an astronomer who made groundbreaking discoveries in the field of dark matter and contributed to the realization that the universe is more complex and more mysterious than was ever even imagined.