

year. For Christie and for the 30.3 million Americans who live with diabetes, we must pass H.R. 3 and lower drug costs now.

ADDRESSING PFAS CONTAMINATION AND ITS DEVASTATING EFFECTS

(Mr. DELGADO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, in September, I was named to the National Defense Authorization Act conference committee, which is tasked with reconciling differences between the House and Senate-passed defense authorization bills.

In this role, I believe I would have the chance to advocate for provisions for PFAS contamination and its devastating effects, which include thyroid disease, autoimmune disorders, and cancer. The contaminant has wreaked havoc in my district, from Hoosick Falls to Petersburg.

Unfortunately, leaders in both parties ultimately opted to hijack negotiations at the eleventh hour behind closed doors and in a disturbingly undemocratic fashion. In the end, nearly every PFAS provision was stripped from the agreement.

While I am pleased that my bipartisan legislation requiring PFAS chemicals to be listed on the EPA's Toxic Release Inventory was ultimately included, I am, nonetheless, deeply frustrated by an incredibly flawed process completely void of transparency.

For this reason, I decided not to sign the final conference report. I expected more from this process, and I am quite certain the American people expect more from this body.

ENSURING MEDICATION IS ACCESSIBLE

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces an alarming crisis: The cost of prescription drugs continues to rise, placing a dangerous burden on American families, especially our older citizens. That is why, this week, the House is taking action to lower the cost of lifesaving medication individuals need to survive by passing H.R. 3, the Elijah Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

I am especially proud this landmark legislation will include a provision I authored with my colleagues, Congressman ROSE and Congressman VEASEY, to help reduce Medicare part D costs for low-income seniors.

H.R. 3 will finally allow Medicare to negotiate drug costs, and our provision will ensure the cost savings go right back to supporting Medicare recipients by expanding access to programs that lower out-of-pocket expenses for vulnerable adults and individuals with disabilities.

We must continue working to improve our healthcare system, and this marks an important step forward in ensuring medication is accessible and affordable for everyday Americans.

REMEMBERING CARLOS GREGORIO HERNANDEZ VASQUEZ

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, his name was Carlos Gregorio Hernandez Vasquez. He was 16. He was sick with the flu, so sick with the flu that he passed out. He was being detained by U.S. Border Patrol. He laid out on the floor of his cell for hours without a single person coming to help him. He spent hours, until he died, on the floor alone.

When CBP detained him, they were responsible for his well-being. We were responsible for his well-being, and we failed him.

Some say we must create a deterrent from children fleeing their home country. I ask, Mr. President, is this deterrent enough for you?

Our country was founded on the principle that human rights are universal rights. It is at the very core of our Constitution, our democracy, and it is why this democratic experiment endures. Without it, we are nothing.

12 DAYS OF SALT

(Ms. SHERRILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, on the fifth day of SALT, my constituents have said to me that the SALT cap has hit the values of their homes and forced them to even sometimes sell their property.

A constituent recently shared that, when he bought his home, his father-in-law patted him on the back and told him he had done a great job, but last year he had to sell that home where he had raised his three children because he could no longer afford it.

Not only did my constituent have to move, but he had to sell his home for less than it was worth. He drew a direct link to the 2017 tax bill's SALT deduction cap.

This constituent is not alone. A Moody's economist found that the SALT cap has taken a trillion-dollar hit to home values. And nowhere is that felt more than in my district.

Mr. Speaker, Essex County is the most impacted county in the entire country, with an average 11.3 percent drop in home values. But counties in Texas, New York, Illinois, and Connecticut all rank in the top 30.

Homeownership is the pillar of the American Dream. The Federal Government should not be putting up barriers to owning a home. We need to get rid of this SALT cap and stop punishing homeowners.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 729, TRIBAL COASTAL RESILIENCY ACT

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 748

Resolved, That any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 729) to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-40 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 748, providing for consideration of H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act, under a structured rule.

This rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order 29 amendments and provides en bloc authority.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act brings together ten meaningful and bipartisan bills that have comprehensive and necessary benefits for the American people, and I am proud to add my voice in support of this much needed legislation.

Increased climate instability is an undeniable reality. All around us, we see spikes in severe weather patterns, rising sea levels, and destroyed ecosystems.

As natural disasters increase in frequency and devastation, our communities pay the price through destroyed infrastructure, economic instability, and even loss of life.

Coastal communities in particular are experiencing intense climate impacts, including severe weather events, sea level rise, chronic flooding, coastal erosion, and changing oceanic conditions.

Coastal communities and economies need to adapt for climate change.

My own district knows all too well the devastation that flood waters can cause, as many of my neighbors are still rebuilding from the severe flooding that we experienced in 2017 and again just this past spring.

Within 100 miles of shoreline that fronts directly on Lake Ontario or nearby bays, rivers, and streams, my district is directly impacted by lake fluctuations, and we are experiencing unprecedented flood waters that erode beaches, devastate family homes, and cripple lakeside businesses.

As a Member of this Congress, I know I am not alone in worrying about whether my constituents are adequately prepared for the next natural disaster, which is not a matter of if, but when.

So many of us in this body, in fact most of us, have communities that are struggling to deal with climate impacts. Whether it is wildfires, flooding, hurricanes, droughts, red tide in our oceans, harmful blue-green algae in our lakes, the list seems to never end, but one thing is clear: the situation is not going to get better on its own. We need to act now.

H.R. 729 is an opportunity to help our constituents prepare and adapt to our climate crisis. This coastal resiliency legislative package not only tells the American people that we care about preserving coastal communities and natural habitat, but proves we are willing to take the necessary actions to protect coastal ecosystems and local economies.

The bill also sets in place mechanisms to improve ocean monitoring and research and provides necessary tools and resources for coastal communities to protect themselves from climate impacts.

It is critical that we support proactive initiatives to prepare for and respond to our climate crisis, and this legislation takes those necessary steps.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak in support of this significant piece of legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MORELLE for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this week, Democrats have scheduled a series of bills on the House floor in the name of combating climate change that are actually re-treads of the programs that are already authorized and actions that are already being taken by the Federal Government.

H.R. 729 is clear proof that the Democrats have no agency and have no priorities other than to impeach the President of the United States.

Most of the bills included in this package duplicate existing authority that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife already have. Most authorizations of appropriations in the bill package are, therefore, unnecessary and are higher than current levels being spent.

NOAA, the agency that would be responsible for carrying out most of this legislation, stated in testimony that it can do and is doing most all of these functions under current law.

This package also creates a precedent of having a city, Washington, D.C., and a non-coastal one at that, as participating in the Coastal Zone Management Act. There is a real threat that

this would give D.C. veto power over Federal actions affecting its coastal zone once it develops an approved coastal zone management program.

The loan guarantee program under the Working Waterfront program, section 104, is problematic, because the American taxpayer will be on the hook for any default.

The National Sea Grant program is popular amongst coastal members, but the bill makes mandatory a fellowship program that provides free graduate students to congressional offices at taxpayer expense.

Mr. Speaker, I have concerns about the bills included in this package. For example, this land package addresses changes to the Coastal Zone Management Act. The act signed by President Nixon into law in 1972 provides Federal funds to States to develop plans to preserve, protect, and develop the resources of our Nation's coastal zones.

This bill that we are debating today contains text from H.R. 2185, which would allow Washington, D.C., to receive Federal funding to develop and implement a coastal zone management plan of their own.

This is an odd way to appropriate Federal funds, as the District of Columbia does not have a coast. Rather, Washington, D.C., borders the Potomac River, which eventually feeds into the Chesapeake Bay, which merges into the Atlantic Ocean.

The inclusion of Washington, D.C., in the Coastal Zone Management Act would no doubt reduce the funding for existing participants. It also raises the question of whether States that contain rivers that lead into the ocean, such as Arkansas with the Mississippi River or my home State of Arizona with the Colorado River, should get Federal funding to create a coastal management plan.

This is a dangerous precedent to create and a poor use of precious resources.

This package also authorizes funds to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to perform tasks that they already do. For example, this package contains text from H.R. 2189, which would authorize NOAA to conduct the Digital Coast program. This program supplies coastal communities and researchers with up-to-date mapping information to address coastal issues, such as storm preparation, flood management, ecosystem restoration, and coastal development.

It should be noted that NOAA has already been conducting this program under the line item of Ocean and Coastal Management and Services since 2007. In other words, this bill would require Federal agencies to carry out duties that they have already been doing.

Like I said earlier, this is really not a great use of the public's time on the House floor.

Another example of this package directing Federal agencies to perform tasks that they have already been doing can be seen in the text that is

drawn from H.R. 3541. This legislation would establish a coastal climate change adaption preparedness and response program to assist States in developing plans to minimize negative consequences of climate change and implementation of those plans. NOAA, through the Coastal Zone Management Act, already funds State programs relating to climate change and has already been providing assistance to States that H.R. 3541 wants the agency to do.

H.R. 2189 and H.R. 3541 are just two of many examples in this bill that duplicate existing authority that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration already has under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Further, the cost of this land package to the American taxpayer is immense. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the cumulative cost of this package would cost as much as \$1.4 billion more than what is already being spent over the authorized periods.

Even worse, these bills have the potential for an additional cost of \$292 million outside of the bill's authorized windows if certain conditions are met.

With over \$22 trillion in debt, we should not be moving bills that are duplicative, repetitive, and unnecessarily expensive.

□ 1230

We need to be responsible with the hardworking taxpayers' money.

Why can't we discuss land packages that have more bipartisan support and do not cost a fortune to the taxpayer?

Back in February 2019, we all voted on S. 47, the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act. The bill received overwhelming support from Republicans and Democrats in both Chambers and was signed into law by President Trump. This bipartisan legislation permanently reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund and protected hunting and fishing rights while also reforming various aspects of the Federal lands governance system.

The CBO estimated that S. 47 would decrease direct Federal spending by \$9 million over a 10-year period. I believe that effectively balancing conservation practices, resource development, and recreation, along with saving taxpayer dollars, is very important.

This land package that we are currently debating today does not even come close to the success that this House had experienced with S. 47.

Ultimately, this package highlights the real opportunity cost of impeachment. The Democrats have rallied and promised real, sweeping policies to address what they call the climate crisis. However, they have been so consumed with attacking our President and with impeachment that they have nothing to show for it.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt by the majority to portray themselves as doing something, any-

thing, for the American people, when, in fact, this bill underscores the truth: They have and are doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend. We serve on the Rules Committee together, and I always appreciate hearing her thoughts. But I do want to make a couple of points that I think bear being said.

This is not a duplicative effort, and the need does exist. For instance, while NOAA may have the flexibility to create a program like the working waterfronts program, they are not currently supporting working waterfronts in the way that the bill envisions and continue to propose the elimination of coastal zone management grants.

The amount of need for coastal zone management grants far exceeds the amount made available for grants each year, so this bill would direct NOAA to create a grant program and a loan program to support working waterfront activities and would also authorize extra funding to make that happen.

Also, I wanted to make a point as it relates to the District of Columbia, which sits at the confluence of the Potomac and the Anacostia Rivers and lies mostly in the coastal plain. It is also bordered by the coastal States of Virginia and Maryland, whose adjoining waterways are included in their States' coastal zones. The shorelines of Arlington and Alexandria, Virginia, and Prince George's County, Maryland, are included in their States' coastal zones programs.

To clarify, the Virginia side of the Potomac is eligible, while the District of Columbia side is not. Inclusion of the District of Columbia would simply connect this gap and subject it to submission and approval of the coastal zone management plan. Coastal floods do not recognize State borders, and the District of Columbia is at risk of continued and increasing flooding.

Since 1950, NOAA reports a 343 percent increase in nuisance flooding in the District of Columbia, and a single 100-year flood event could cost over \$1.2 billion in damages, including damages to Federal property.

I also want to note that in addition to consolidating 10 bipartisan bills, the legislation also includes a range of bipartisan amendments. I am proud that my own amendment will be included. It ensures 5 percent of funds for the working waterfronts grant program will be used for technical assistance, and this will help States and local governments with early-stage resources, planning assistance, and additional expertise.

Additionally, I would like to highlight two other amendments led by my friend and colleague Representative JOHN KATKO, who represents Syracuse, New York, just to the east of my district. Both of those amendments I am pleased to cosponsor.

These amendments make meaningful improvements that will advance research on harmful algal bloom development and open opportunities to assess the impact of water level regulating practices on the Great Lakes.

These amendments further demonstrate the bipartisan work that went into this legislative package, and I thank my colleagues on the other side who contributed to this bill.

Policy is always better when we work together, and I look forward to ensuring our constituents get access to the key provisions included in this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my friend Mr. MORELLE, Washington, D.C., does not have a beach on the ocean. Virginia does.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to consider H. Res. 750, which expresses the sense of the House that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect and promote individual choice and health insurance for the American people and prevent any Medicare for All proposal that would outlaw private health insurance plans, such as employer-based coverage and Medicare Advantage plans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I hear from my constituents regularly—and I have a lot of senior citizens—that they are afraid of a Medicare for All approach.

They understand that a one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare system will not work. That is because whether it is called a single-payer system or a socialist system, Medicare for All constitutes a complete government takeover of healthcare in America.

Medicare for All will end, eliminate, private health insurance plans. It will eliminate the current Medicare. It will eliminate all Medicare Advantage plans like my mother is on, and replace it, instead, with a one-size-fits-all, government-controlled healthcare plan. Just like ObamaCare, even if you like your plan, you will not be able to keep it.

Passage of Medicare for All would push over 150 million Americans off their health insurance plans and into government health insurance plans.

Further, while no version of Medicare for All has yet received a budget score, Senator BERNIE SANDERS' version of Medicare for All did receive estimated scores from two outside groups.

In 2016, the Urban Institute calculated that Senator SANDERS' healthcare proposals would increase Federal funding by a whopping \$32.6

trillion over 10 years. Separately, in June 2018, the Mercatus Center estimated that Medicare for All would increase Federal spending by \$32 trillion over 10 years.

Our national debt is a national security crisis, and we must work together to combat it, not increase costs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 750 expresses the sense of Congress that individual choice in health insurance should be protected. Almost 160 million Americans under 65 years of age are enrolled in employer-sponsored health insurance, and another 14 million Americans under 65 have purchased their own private health insurance.

Additionally, an increasing number of Americans are taking advantage of the robust choices in Medicare Advantage plans. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the number of individuals with employer-sponsored insurance has increased by 3 million since President Trump took office, largely an effect of our great economy.

Right now, the Energy and Commerce Committee is holding a hearing on one-size-fits-all healthcare. Being discussed are nine bills that serve to lay the groundwork toward socialized medicine in the United States.

I fear that if House Democrats declare this their north star, as they did in the hearing today, it abandons the health insurance options that Americans have said are working for them.

Medicare for All would eliminate private insurance, eliminate employer-sponsored health insurance, eliminate Medicaid, and eliminate the Children's Health Insurance Program, upon which many Americans depend. I am concerned about the consequences for existing Medicare beneficiaries, as this policy would more rapidly deplete the Medicare trust fund, which is already slated to be insolvent in 2026.

The practical effect of that is no doctor, no hospital, could be reimbursed by Medicare under law once that trust fund is exhausted.

Our Nation's seniors depend on the existence of Medicare for their health needs in retirement. More than 70 percent of Americans are satisfied with their employer-sponsored health insurance. It provides robust protections for all individuals, and since 1996, it has provided protections for preexisting conditions.

This is why it is so important that we protect individuals' employer-sponsored insurance for the majority of Americans who would like to keep it. According to one study by America's health insurance plans, consumers prefer greater market competition rather than greater government involvement.

Medicare for All is a complete government takeover of the healthcare industry. This same study found that consumer satisfaction is driven by comprehensive coverage, affordability, and choice. A one-size-fits-all health

program results in no choice for Americans.

Consumers value discounts for good health, flexible spending accounts, and health savings account programs that would all but disappear in a Medicare for All world.

The New York Times reported rural hospitals are saying that they would virtually close overnight, while others have said they would try to offset the steep cuts by laying off hundreds of thousands of workers and abandoning lower paying services, such as services for mental health.

Other countries with socialized medicine have seen increased wait times. In Canada, the wait time for a specialist consultation is over 9 weeks. Americans deserve to have better access to healthcare than the long waiting lists and lower quality care found in other nations.

Single-payer healthcare would be another failed attempt at a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. Single-payer is not one size fits all. It is one size fits no one. It is critical that this Congress maintain access to healthcare choices and build upon what is working in our healthcare system.

I urge my fellow Members to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can support H. Res. 750.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and to move on to a vote on the rule.

Even if the previous question was defeated, the amendment would not be able to move as the gentlewoman suggests. The amendment is not germane to the bill on natural resources.

Obviously, this is an attempt to obscure what we are attempting to do, which is, we can either help coastal communities plan and prosper for a resilient future, or we can continue to delay and pay.

Forty-two percent of Americans live in coastal communities. Working waterfronts employ more than 2 million people. Great Lakes fisheries alone support more than 75,000 jobs, and healthy fish habitats support a recreational fishing industry that provides more than 800,000 jobs to American citizens.

Coastal communities around the country are experiencing intense climate impacts, including severe weather events, sea level rise, chronic flooding, coastal erosion, and changing ocean conditions.

Coastal communities and economies need to adapt for climate change, and H.R. 729 will help communities do just that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. However, I do want to say that I believe that the amendment, if the previous question is defeated, is germane because it applies to the rule and not to the bill itself.

In closing, I want to emphasize to my friends across the aisle that we should be bringing legislation to this floor that showcases how we can work together. However, this package ultimately highlights the real opportunity cost of impeachment.

The Democrats have rallied for months now and promised real, sweeping policies to address what they call the climate crisis. However, they have been so consumed with attacking our President and impeachment that they have nothing to show for it. In an attempt to satisfy their base that they are doing something about climate change, they are, instead, in this package, just repeating things already being done, but it is at a higher cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question and "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the next devastating flood or natural disaster is not if, but when, and we have a choice to make here today: We can either help our communities prepare and prosper for years to come or continue to drag our feet and face the dire consequences.

We owe it to ourselves, to our constituents, and to future generations to get this right, and I, personally, want to be on the right side of history when we look back on this climate crisis. The work we are doing here is not duplicative or onerous; it is smart, meaningful, and bipartisan, and I look forward to its passage.

I would like to thank all my colleagues for their support of H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

I especially would like to thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his leadership and the commitment of his committee on this effort.

I applaud and thank the sponsor, Mr. KILMER, for his leadership on this important legislation and Chairman MCGOVERN for his work to move this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 748

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 750) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that individual choice in health insurance should be protected. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 750.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORELLE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

TELEVISION VIEWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5035) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5035

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 "Television Viewer Protection Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking "December 31, 2019" and inserting "the expiration date, if any, described in section 119(h) of title 17, United States Code"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking "until January 1, 2020," each place it appears.

SEC. 3. SATISFACTION OF GOOD FAITH NEGOTIATION REQUIREMENT BY MULTICHANNEL VIDEO PROGRAMMING DISTRIBUTORS.

(a) SATISFACTION OF GOOD FAITH NEGOTIATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iv), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(vi) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Television Viewer Protection Act of 2019, specify that—

"(I) a multichannel video programming distributor may satisfy its obligation to negotiate in good faith under clause (iii) with respect to a negotiation for retransmission consent under

this section with a large station group by designating a qualified MVPD buying group to negotiate on its behalf, so long as the qualified MVPD buying group itself negotiates in good faith in accordance with such clause;

"(II) it is a violation of the obligation to negotiate in good faith under clause (iii) for the qualified MVPD buying group to disclose the prices, terms, or conditions of an ongoing negotiation or the final terms of a negotiation to a member of the qualified MVPD buying group that is not intending, or is unlikely, to enter into the final terms negotiated by the qualified MVPD buying group; and

"(III) a large station group has an obligation to negotiate in good faith under clause (ii) with respect to a negotiation for retransmission consent under this section with a qualified MVPD buying group."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 325(b)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) 'qualified MVPD buying group' means an entity that, with respect to a negotiation with a large station group for retransmission consent under this section—

"(i) negotiates on behalf of two or more multichannel video programming distributors—

"(I) none of which is a multichannel video programming distributor that serves more than 500,000 subscribers nationally; and

"(II) that do not collectively serve more than 25 percent of all households served by a multichannel video programming distributor in any single local market in which the applicable large station group operates; and

"(ii) negotiates agreements for such retransmission consent—

"(I) that contain standardized contract provisions, including billing structures and technical quality standards, for each multichannel video programming distributor on behalf of which the entity negotiates; and

"(II) under which the entity assumes liability to remit to the applicable large station group all fees received from the multichannel video programming distributors on behalf of which the entity negotiates;

"(D) 'large station group' means a group of television broadcast stations that—

"(i) are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted by the regulations of the Commission;

"(ii) generally negotiate agreements for retransmission consent under this section as a single entity; and

"(iii) include only television broadcast stations that have a national audience reach of more than 20 percent;

"(E) 'local market' has the meaning given such term in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code; and

"(F) 'multichannel video programming distributor' has the meaning given such term in section 602."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting "and" after "1992,"; and

(B) by striking "and the term 'local market' has the meaning given that term in section 122(j) of such title"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking "(as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code)" each place it appears.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section, and the regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission under such amendments, shall not take effect before January 1 of the calendar year after the calendar year in which this Act is enacted.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CHARGES FOR COVERED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part IV of title VI of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 551 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 642. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CHARGES FOR COVERED SERVICES.

"(a) CONSUMER RIGHTS IN SALES.—

"(1) RIGHT TO TRANSPARENCY.—Before entering into a contract with a consumer for the provision of a covered service, a provider of a covered service shall provide the consumer, by phone, in person, online, or by other reasonable means, the total monthly charge for the covered service, whether offered individually or as part of a bundled service, selected by the consumer (explicitly noting the amount of any applicable promotional discount reflected in such charge and when such discount will expire), including any related administrative fees, equipment fees, or other charges, a good faith estimate of any tax, fee, or charge imposed by the Federal Government or a State or local government (whether imposed on the provider or imposed on the consumer but collected by the provider), and a good faith estimate of any fee or charge that is used to recover any other assessment imposed on the provider by the Federal Government or a State or local government.

"(2) RIGHT TO FORMAL NOTICE.—A provider of a covered service that enters into a contract described in paragraph (1) shall, not later than 24 hours after entering into the contract, send the consumer, by email, online link, or other reasonably comparable means, a copy of the information described in such paragraph.

"(3) RIGHT TO CANCEL.—A provider of a covered service that enters into a contract described in paragraph (1) shall permit the consumer to cancel the contract, without paying early cancellation fees or other disconnection fees or penalties, during the 24-hour period beginning when the provider of the covered service sends the copy required by paragraph (2).

"(b) CONSUMER RIGHTS IN E-BILLING.—If a provider of a covered service provides a bill to a consumer in an electronic format, the provider shall include in the bill—

"(1) an itemized statement that breaks down the total amount charged for or relating to the provision of the covered service by the amount charged for the provision of the service itself and the amount of all related taxes, administrative fees, equipment fees, or other charges;

"(2) the termination date of the contract for the provision of the covered service entered into between the consumer and the provider; and

"(3) the termination date of any applicable promotional discount.

"(c) CONSUMER RIGHTS TO ACCURATE EQUIPMENT CHARGES.—A provider of a covered service or fixed broadband internet access service may not charge a consumer for—

"(1) using covered equipment provided by the consumer; or

"(2) renting, leasing, or otherwise providing to the consumer covered equipment if—

"(A) the provider has not provided the equipment to the consumer; or

"(B) the consumer has returned the equipment to the provider, except to the extent that the charge relates to the period beginning on the date when the provider provided the equipment to the consumer and ending on the date when the consumer returned the equipment to the provider.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term 'broadband internet access service' has the meaning given such term in section 8.1(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

"(2) COVERED EQUIPMENT.—The term 'covered equipment' means equipment (such as a router) employed on the premises of a person (other than a provider of a covered service or fixed broadband internet access service) to provide a