

why do we fixate on industrial production? What are the two factors that allow a business concern to pay their workers more? Well, it is traditionally inflation, which doesn't mean a bigger paycheck buys you anything more. It is productivity.

When productivity goes up, people get paid more. And the purchasing power is more. Industrial production is linked to productivity. It means this is part of the reason our brothers and sisters out there, who are out there working their hearts out, are getting paid more, and their purchasing power is better.

I know this is geeky. I know I come behind this microphone and sometimes sound like an accountant on steroids, but these things are important because it is real. It is not some emotional blaring of, you know, we hate this person, we like this person.

We made the math work. And we are seeing the results of good things for hardworking Americans. Growth is moral.

And where I want to take that is my experience in Phoenix of visiting the homeless campus, and St. Joseph the Worker there having jobs because we are so desperate for workers in our market that employers are trying to recruit workers from the homeless campus.

□ 1930

And we actually brought someone last year to testify in front of the Ways and Means Committee. We are so desperate for carpenters and plumbers and electricians, they brought a young man to come testify in front of the Ways and Means Committee who wasn't like our typical witness. He wasn't wearing a suit. He had a number of facial tattoos. As a matter of fact, he had a number of facial piercings.

He opened up his testimony to the Ways and Means Committee saying: I am a three-time convicted felon. I am an addict.

But because of a private group that was so desperate for workers, they took a chance. They were doing training—in his case, electrical training—in the prison before he got probation, and they guaranteed him a job when he got out. It didn't mean they were going to keep him.

He had Republicans and Democrats and everyone in the room, as well as the staff, crying because he told the story: I am a three-time convicted felon.

He was an addict, and he was saying he had not touched drugs or alcohol for a year. He gets to see his family again. He gets to see his child again. And he is now up to \$22 an hour, and he is so busy working that he hasn't had the chance to relapse.

It is stories like that that need to be part of our lexicon. It is part of the joy that economic growth is moral because it helps and solves so many problems, and particularly in our earlier slides where I had this absolute fixation on

retirement security and our discussion of growing the economy and labor force participation and technology and incentives, bringing that package all together so we keep our promises around Social Security and Medicare.

But we have the first pillar that we are living in right now, and that is a proof that policy—policy—can work, whether it be the tax policy we did a couple of years ago or whether it be some of the regulatory changes we have embraced.

Madam Speaker, could you imagine if we could actually get that extra half a point of GDP growth by finishing the NAFTA replacement, the USMCA?

How many of our brothers and sisters in this place will drop their politics or their terror of giving this White House a victory and actually do what is good for the workers in this country—actually, the workers for all of North America, because, as supply chains are moving away from China, wouldn't we like to have them here in our hemisphere? Or do politics blind people to the point that basic economics in math and opportunity don't count?

So, back to one of the other things, and I put up this slide. Partially, it is one of my Democrat friends here who brought this to my attention, because we have been working on this concept that there is a disruptive revolution coming in healthcare.

We have done the presentations here on the floor many times of the thing you can blow into and it instantly tells you you have the flu, and the algorithm, if we could just legalize it, could actually order your antivirals, except for the fact that that technology is illegal under current law.

But, also, the concept of, in just a few months, there is going to be a drug that cures hemophilia. It is going to be really expensive, but, for our brothers and sisters who have one of the most expensive diseases in our society, they are cured.

So what would happen to those numbers I was showing you on Medicare if I came to you and said: Hey, there is one disease group that is 30 percent of Medicare spending in the model for the next three decades? It turns out it is diabetes.

It is one of the reasons this body has been investing in things like the Cures Act and other miracles that are now happening in what we call synthetic biology, in the new types of biological drugs—you have all seen the stories, and it is still a bit of optimism—that we may be able to start growing pancreatic cells again.

Could you imagine if we cured just diabetes? It is not only the noble thing of curing a disease that is part of our chronic population; we often don't think about what is the economic cascade that it has to, actually, retirement security.

It turns out, if 30 percent of Medicare future costs are just somehow related to first-degree or second-degree or third-degree effects of diabetes, it is

part of the reason so many of us in this body have worked so hard to say: Put the money in. Let's invest in the disruptions.

Because I do believe, if we could buy a calculator for our Members here and help them understand the technology disruptions that are going to make the environment and healthcare and so many other things just amazing—and, then, if we could legalize many of the technologies that, oddly enough, are illegal under our reimbursements and under our rules today, there are some really amazing things.

These next few decades could be just amazing, particularly for my little 4-year-old girl. But these amazing things don't happen when everything is political and everything is weaponized and, if it is not a melodrama, we don't do it.

So we typically start with this, but I am going to close with it this time.

We have been trying to help our brothers and sisters in here understand, the old discussions of, well, we can do this little bit of entitlement reform or raise taxes over here or do this and that fixes the fragility that is the future of, particularly, Medicare, but those days are over. We lost that mathematical opportunity a decade and a half ago.

But there is a way to survive the debt bomb that is coming at us if we do the things that are necessary for economic expansion, do the things that are necessary to encourage our brothers and sisters to be in the labor force, actually embrace the disruptive technologies instead of being fearful of them and being fearful of sort of telling many of our incumbent business models that they are going to have to adopt.

And we are going to have to tell the truth that, within the benefits, we need incentives for you to think about, if you are healthy and can do it, staying in the labor force.

And the other thing is we are going to have to actually talk about, just as Mr. YOHO before me, things we do in immigration and population stability, of an immigration system that maximizes economic vitality, sort of the talent-based system the President talks about.

But, even in a country where our birthrates have collapsed, how we encourage family formation, if you mix all these things together and with a couple good lucks, like with the technology we are talking about that cures diabetes, we can make the math work that the \$103 trillion of debt that we expect over the next 30 years, substantially because of our demographics, does not have to destroy this country, because we can cut that in half. If we do that, we have some amazing decades ahead of us.

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

CURRENT STATE OF IMMIGRATION LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, prior to discussing the current state of immigration law, I would like to yield some time to my good friend and colleague, Congressman DUFFY, who I think is going to address some important issues of Congress tonight.

I hope everybody pays attention because I think, other than perhaps lecturing us on logging and fishing and hunting, this will be his last official speech as a Congressman for a few years.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), my colleague.

FINAL ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Wisconsin for yielding tonight.

Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you, it is a pretty unique and cool feeling to stand in this well and hold onto this podium for the last time. What an honor it is to serve in this House and stand in this Chamber.

I want to take a moment, as I give my last address to the House, to thank my constituents who have put so much faith in me that they would give me the opportunity—a guy from small town Wisconsin, from Hayward, Wisconsin, who had a big family and grew up doing lumberjack sports—to come here and represent them. And they have done that five times, five times over.

I would just note that they have been so kind to me, whether they agreed with me or not. Whether I was at a townhall or a Lincoln Day dinner or a dairy breakfast or a parade or affair, the kindness that has come from my constituents as I have done my best to serve their interests could not fill my heart with greater pride and joy to represent the good people of Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District, which is the central, northern, and western part of our great State.

But, as many of us will tell you, I don't think our Founders ever envisioned that to come to this Chamber should be a lifetime sentence. We are supposed to come, be citizen legislators, serve our time, and then step aside and let someone else step forward and do the good work.

And, in news reports, as I have announced that I was going to step aside, people will say, "SEAN DUFFY's seat." Well, I think we should correct that. It is not my seat. It was not my predecessor's seat. It is the people's seat, and they get to choose every 2 years—well, now, this is going to be 8 months in—a new Congressman to represent them. It is the people's seat. It is not mine. It is theirs. So, I thank the Seventh District.

I want to say thanks to my fellow colleagues and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. We get a bad rap in this Chamber where people will tell us: You guys are so dysfunctional. You guys can't get along. You guys can't get anything done.

There is some truth to that. There is a lot of bickering; there is a lot of fighting; and, yes, sometimes we don't get a lot done. But I will just tell you this, that people get along a lot better across the aisle than might meet the eye on some of the major news networks.

Though it might not be on tax reform or immigration reform, there is a lot of legislation that we work on together, on which we try to find bipartisan compromise that can not just pass our committees, but can pass the House and can get our dysfunctional friends in the Senate to actually pick up and pass so we can get it to the President's desk. It happens a lot.

The Chamber, I think, though it is going through some difficult times, we are actually working, and I am proud of that.

I am proud to serve with my ranking member, PATRICK MCHENRY, who has been so kind and generous to me. I have actually enjoyed serving with MAXINE WATERS.

Some of the subcommittee chairs and ranking members like AL GREEN and LACY CLAY and EMANUEL CLEAVER have become good friends of mine, and I honor their friendship and am grateful for it. But sometimes, oftentimes, we work better than we are given credit for.

I want to take a second, because I think this is such an important part of the debate that we are having today, and talk about American capitalism. I mean, American capitalism is the American model. It has been our American way that has brought us more opportunity, more prosperity, more upward mobility, more innovation, more creativity, more generosity than any other country that has existed on the face of the Earth.

Part of that American capitalist system is an idea not that we have no government, but that we have limited government, and not that we have no taxes, but we have limited taxes. What you saw over 2 years of a Republican-led majority in the House and the Senate with a Republican President is we did those things. And the net end result was what we thought it would be: We put people back to work.

When I ran the first time 9 years ago, we had people who couldn't find jobs, families who were suffering. I heard, all the time, families say: I wish we had a better economy, because I want my kids to be able to stay in our hometown and get a job in our hometown and raise their family in our hometown so we can have an extended family, but they have to leave. They have to go to Milwaukee or Minneapolis or Chicago or Wausau or somewhere else to get a job, but they can't stay here.

□ 1945

But today, after we have implemented these reforms, it is profound what is happening. People are going back to work. In Wisconsin, our wages are up, and unemployment is down. We

have more jobs in Wisconsin than we have people to fill those jobs. That is a success story of American capitalism. I am proud of that.

Though everybody may not agree that it has been those policies that have created it—some of those are on the left—when they dig deep in their heart, they can't deny that what we have done has made their lives better.

And so often we have, in my district, it has been the forgotten men and women, men and women who feel like people come to this Chamber, to this town, and they engage in debates that are irrelevant; debates that don't make their lives better; debates that don't improve their economy. Maybe it is a debate that might improve the coasts or global corporations, but it is a debate that doesn't help their rural, small-town community.

They have seen, over the last few years, that their voices have been heard; their pain has been heard, and it has been addressed. And for that, they are incredibly grateful.

When you shop at Walmart and you have a hard time figuring out where you are going to get the dollars to pay your mortgage, or how you are going to send your kids to school, and if you lose your job, then it all collapses; and in today's market, they look and go, This is really great. This has improved so much. We couldn't be more grateful for the economy and the system that has offered this prosperity that we now feel.

I am troubled that, even though we have had the success of a free enterprise system, an American capitalist system, we now have a debate in this Chamber where people want to go a different model, right?

We have a debate saying we want to go to socialism. Socialism should be the model of America's future; and that the promise of socialism, where we can all be equal, and we can all get free stuff, if we can just tax the rich a little bit more and give a little bit more to you, it is going to be a beautiful economy.

Those promises have been made throughout human history, and those promises always fail. Whether you want to go to the old Soviet Union, whether you want to go to Venezuela, or Cuba, it never works.

This country actually fought socialism in Europe. We fought socialism in our universities. Now we are fighting socialism in the halls of Congress?

We can't lose this fight, because if we lose this fight, we lose our future. And if you lose the future, you don't leave enough to your kids.

So I hope that this Chamber will recalibrate and think through what the best economic model is to continue with that prosperity, continue with that opportunity for our kids and for our next generation.

But as we talk about maybe equality and opportunity, I do think there is a really important point: As the socialist talks about the equality of the outcome, I think our model has been the equality of opportunity.

When I look at communities in America, and communities in Wisconsin, and you can look at a zip code of that community, and you will be able to recognize the opportunity and the poverty of the kids that are being raised in those communities, by their zip code, because of the school system they have in place in those communities in those zip codes.

That is a travesty. That is not equal opportunity. That has given a group of kids the short end of the stick.

So, as I have been in this Chamber, I have fought for school choice. Because if you are a parent and you have a child and you have a failing school, you should have the opportunity to get out of your failing school and go to a school that is going to give you the skill sets and the tools to take advantage of the American economy. You should have that right. You should have that option. And that is school choice.

I would love it if we could make the schools better in these communities, and we should fight to do that. But these kids can't wait. So I hope the fight for school choice continues.

I have fought in this Chamber for free trade, but I have also fought with our President for fair trade. And when we have people who take advantage of this economy, of my constituents, and say it is free trade, well, free trade isn't free trade if it is not fair trade. And I couldn't support the President more in his fight against China to make sure that we have a fair system with their growing economy. And it is not easy.

I look in this Chamber. Oftentimes there is not a lot of political courage, but you have a President who, one of the greatest things he has going for him is the great economy; and he is willing to jeopardize this great economy, to risk the great economy and engage in a trade conflict with China, not to help him in the next election, but to help American kids in the next 10, 15, 20 years.

That is what real leaders do. That is what courage is in a leader, and that is what our President has done on this trade fight; risking the economy for the kids and our future, to make sure we are still the number one economy and the number one military.

One of the great issues I am proud to have fought on is the issue of life. I don't think that there is anyone who is more vulnerable, more voiceless than the unborn; and to have been in this Chamber, and to have been able to lend my voice to those who don't have one has been an amazing honor.

I think that this will be a scourge at this time period in American history, and we have had these time periods in our past, that we haven't stood up and fought what science tells us, as you look at a 4D ultrasound, what that baby is in the womb.

I am on the right side of history to have fought for the millions of little babies who have lost their lives over

the course of the last 40-plus years. And I hope this Chamber one day can see that life does begin at conception; that we shouldn't be having a debate about late-term, partial-birth abortion. We shouldn't be having a debate about how we allowed children to die more comfortably after they are born; that that is outrageous. It is, frankly disgusting. We should get that right.

As I close my final remarks from this well, I want to thank my team.

Any Member of Congress, anyone who serves in this institution can't do it without great people with them, great people surrounding them, fighting—not with them personally, but fighting on the issues with them. It doesn't work without them.

Over the course of the last 8½ years, I have had the most remarkable team to serve with me and work with me. And though they have worked for me, they are some of my best friends who have stood with me, and I couldn't be more grateful that they have come into my life and come into my district and our community; and not just fought so hard with me, but fought so hard for the people that I represent to make sure their issues are covered, to make sure that their voices were heard.

They helped me amplify my constituents' voices, and I want to thank Pete and the D.C. team, specifically, and Jesse and the district team for their endless efforts. My constituents were well served by them, so thank you.

Finally, I want to thank my family. When I started, I didn't have as many kids. Actually, I had Patrick and Margarita and Mari V and Paloma, who didn't know their father at any point other than as a Congressman. But some of my older kids were well aware of what we did before.

My oldest daughter, Evita, we did our first parade together, and I was terrified. I was terrified to do a parade, and this little 9-year old girl came out with me with the most courage.

All of them have stood with me and worked with me and campaigned with me. It has been a family endeavor.

Anyone who runs, they know the sacrifice that their families go through. My family has been great, going to parades, and going—in Wisconsin we do dairy breakfasts—going to dairy breakfasts. And they have been there supporting me and working with me, and I couldn't be more grateful for them.

As their dad comes out to Congress 4 days a week, I am not there as much, and they have supported me through this whole effort, this whole adventure. A dad can't do that unless he has kids who support him. So, to all of them, from Lucia, to Evita, to Patrick, and John Paul, and Margarita, and Mari V, and Paloma, and Jack, I want to thank you all for the support you have given me.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, I would not be here without her. When I ran, everyone said I could never make it to this Chamber. I could never win. And she was the one who said, No, I

think you can. I think you can represent these people, your people well. And we did it together.

When I am here, as every spouse who has someone who comes here, she was the one who held up our house. She was a single mom, and we have 8 kids. She was a single mom with 8 kids. And you have to be incredibly dedicated and devoted and passionate about what we do in this Chamber if you are going to be a single mom with 8 kids and let your husband go off and fight the great fight of the day.

So I want to tell her how much I love her and how grateful I am that she has supported my dream to come here and fight the good fight.

When I won on my first night, on election night, I said that the battle for America's future is a fight against socialism. It is a battle to return our Nation to the principles that made America different, that made America better, that made America great. I think that couldn't be more true today.

And with me and Rachel, and my team, and my kids, I couldn't be more grateful that they have stood with me to help engage in that fight.

So for the final time, as I step out of this well with a grateful, and it might not be obvious, but a happy heart, I want to thank my colleagues for their friendship.

I want to thank the great State of Wisconsin for their trust.

I want to thank my whole family for their support. I want to thank God for his blessings, and for this opportunity and for the wisdom to know when my time is up.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, Congress, last week, got back from their time in district in August, and quite a bit happened on the immigration front since then; some good news, some bad news, but it is important to address what Congress has yet to do.

I do want to point out the good news. So far this year, we have built or rehabbed 66 miles of the wall on the southern border, and we are on track to do another 390 miles by the end of 2020. When that is done, we will have built 700 miles along the 2,000-mile border. Some more will probably have to be done at that time, but we are, at last, doing this.

The other good news is that it is a tremendous wall. That wall is going to be 30 feet high and 6 feet under the ground. I have been down there looking at parts of that wall. There are things that we have done on top of the wall that will make it still more difficult to get over.

I am told that, so far, four people have tried to get across the wall and all have failed.

For those people who thought a wall does not work, I suggest that they look at that wall that is currently being built.

I will point out; the USA will not be the first country to have success with a wall. Israel along the Egyptian border

has a wall. India along the Bangladesh border has a wall; a wall, quite frankly, a lot—a border a lot longer than the America/Mexican border; and Hungary has a considerable border wall with Serbia.

□ 2000

All those other walls are effective. I am glad the United States is finally getting going on the wall.

The next thing I will count as good news on the immigration front is that I was able to attend a ceremony in which legal immigrants were being sworn in, in Milwaukee. Every month in a city as small as Milwaukee, about 400 new citizens are being sworn in. Neither Donald Trump nor virtually any Republican who I am aware of wants to stop those 400 new citizens coming here each month.

It is very exhilarating to talk to them. So many of them have already founded their own businesses. Obviously, the rest already have jobs and have spent a considerable amount of time working in this country and are very proud to renounce the citizenship of their native land and become American citizens.

Overall, we swear in 700,000 new citizens a year and have 4 million people on work visas. But there is other news that probably can be considered not quite as good. We had 64,000 people cross the border in August. That is down from 144,000 in May, but it is still 20,000 more than it was last year.

When we talk about 64,000 people being processed into this country or processed at the border, we don't include other people who haven't even been caught, and those are the most dangerous people of all.

Many of the people being processed on the border feel that they will be able to come to this country through an asylum process legally. When people are not checking themselves in at the border, it means they feel they have to sneak through the border and probably have something to hide.

While the Border Patrol doesn't know exactly how many people they are not processing, they are guessing it is over 10,000 people a month. That is certainly something that has to be addressed.

The next thing to talk about, as far as people coming across the border, is why it is higher than it was a year ago, and why is that still higher than it was 20 or 30 years ago?

Some people think the reason so many people try to come across our border is that things are worse in other countries. That is not so. There were times in the relatively recent past in which we had outright civil wars in Central America. People did not come to the United States even though there were civil wars in their home country because they felt they couldn't. They felt the United States would enforce its current immigration laws.

The reason we had so many more people try to get in here in the past

year is because the word was out in other countries. The word was out among the cartels that escort so many people to this country that the United States was not enforcing its immigration laws.

I was at the border again at the end of July, and it was interesting to hear from the Border Patrol that at the time Donald Trump was first elected, they were almost bored at the border. There was nobody trying to come in here. Why was that? Because Donald Trump ran on immigration reform and immigration stability, and they felt they wouldn't have a chance to come to the United States.

The reason we had 64,000 people checked in at the border, plus who knows how many sneaking across, in August is the word is still out in other countries that the United States is not enforcing its laws.

The question is, what can we do to stop the floodgates of 60,000 people still coming here?

First of all, we need more personnel. As we have had a flood of more people coming on the border, the Border Patrol has to spend their time on paperwork, and the Border Patrol has to spend its time babysitting children, not guarding the border. These new employees are less costly than the Border Patrol.

I respect the Border Patrol so much after being down there three times. Can you imagine, in the middle of the night, maybe finding 50 people and having to, in essence, arrest them yourself and escort them back to the border?

We could use some personnel to do—I don't know what I can refer to it as—the babysitting part of the job, the paperwork part of the job, to free up the Border Patrol so they can enforce the border.

Secondly, this Congress that is so quick to spend money on anything can give us more technology at the points of entry, and I would also add more dogs at the point of entry, which do such a great job of identifying people trying to sneak across.

Another thing that Congress should do is get rid of birthright citizenship. When I was at the El Paso sector and saw people waiting to come in, it was obvious there were a disproportionate number of pregnant women coming into this country, which is what we have heard. People 6, 7 months pregnant, whether they fly in from Asia or cross the southern border, they come here because the United States is one of only two of the, I believe, the 40th wealthiest countries in the world to have birthright citizenship.

Donald Trump had promised to get rid of that when he first ran for election, and I hope that is something he follows up on.

Another problem we have is that, right now, families are still allowed in the United States under the Flores settlement after they are here for maybe 20 days. If they were here for 60 days, they wouldn't be able to sneak in this

country and disappear into kind of the ether, but they would be able to stay here until they have their court hearing. It is so important for this Congress to pass a law saying that you can keep these families at the border or not let them in the United States for at least 60 days pending their court hearing.

While I talk about families at the border, I want to make some other observations that the Border Patrol gave me. First of all, it frustrates them that people coming here get such better healthcare than people who are already here in America. The vast majority of us have some sort of large deductible. They have copays. People coming from other countries when they come to the border are given whatever they want for anything wrong. I can understand that we don't want anything bad to happen to people, but it is an inducement for more people to sneak in here as long as we give away free medical care.

The next thing that we need is the ability to return children to their parents. Under current law, we can return unaccompanied children to their parents in Canada and Mexico. We cannot do that to Central American countries. The Central American countries are frustrated that we are taking their youth and bringing them to the United States.

These bills are available to be brought to the floor. It is time that Congress act and say we are not going to tear apart families. If we catch a 15-year-old coming into this country from Honduras, we should be able to return them to their parents in Honduras. We shouldn't, as under current law, be required to keep them in this country. It is kind of the ugly America at its worst that we tear apart families and take young children who have fled their parents.

The next thing that we have to do is we have to raise the standard of credible fear. We cannot continue to have people come into this country sometimes without the strongest evidence that they are genuinely in fear of what is going on in their country, particularly because, right now, immigration attorneys assist people in allowing them to come into our country.

We need more money for ICE to remove illegal immigrants, particularly illegal immigrants who are criminals. Donald Trump must be allowed to continue on his plan of not letting people in this country if they are probably going to wind up on public assistance or welfare. That would be a disaster for their country.

If we do these things, I think we can finally secure our border.

Again, Donald Trump has done a lot on his own. He has reassigned money that was originally going to the Department of Defense. He has tried to change the way we deal with asylum. Congress has to step up with President Trump and do something: hire more personnel at the border; get more technology at the border; get rid of the

birthright citizenship; change the law so we can keep people at the border for 60 days; return children, particularly unaccompanied children, to their parents when they try to sneak in here; change the standard of credible fear. Then we will go the rest of the way toward having a good immigration system.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 18, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1200. To increase, effective as of December 1, 2019, the rates of compensation for veterans with serviceconnected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity

compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 20, 2019, at 9 a.m.

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. 550, the Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1396, the Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal 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. 1830, the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1830

Table with columns for fiscal years 2019-2029 and 2019-2024/2019-2029. Row: NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT. Row: Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact. Values: 0, 0, -5, -2, 0, 7, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.

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. 2290, the Shutdown Guidance for Financial Institutions Act, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 2290

Table with columns for fiscal years 2019-2029 and 2019-2024/2019-2029. Row: NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT. Row: Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact. Values: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1.

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. 3589, the Greg LeMond Congressional Gold Medal Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3619, the Appraisal Reform Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on the deficit, 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. 3625, the PCAOB Whistleblower Protection Act of 2019, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3625

Table with columns for fiscal years 2019-2029 and 2019-2024/2019-2029. Row: NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT. Row: Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact. Values: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2, 3.