more than 500 percent increase in the incarcerated population over the last 40 years.

Over 95 percent of people currently incarcerated will eventually be released back to their communities.

In fact, approximately 600,000 people are released from custody every year and at the end of 2016, an estimated 4.5 million adults were under community supervision, which includes probation or parole.

Reentry services are essential for this population, to ensure that these individuals transition smoothly out of jail and prison and to keep recidivism to a minimum.

The recidivism rates for individuals leaving prisons remain high, and a large number of those released from prison will ultimately find themselves back in the criminal legal system.

A 2018 study found that 83 percent of people released from prisons in 2005 were arrested at least once during the nine years following their release, and of those released from state prisons, 44 percent were arrested at least once in the year immediately following their release.

Lack of access to resources upon release leads to a cycle of rearrest and reincarceration that some scholars call the ''revolving door'' to prison.

This cycle of recidivism has tremendous financial consequences—the United States spends over $80 billion dollars a year on incarceration—not to mention the human toll it takes on families and communities.

The cycle of release, rearrest, and reincarceration, also costs state and local communities over $100 million in policing and judicial administration costs.

While some returning individuals have a release plan, many people are released from custody with only their personal property, little money, and no place to go.

The result of not having a reentry plan can be ruinous.

In the last decade, policymakers have begun to measure the effects of reentry on returning individuals, their families, and their communities.

Studies show that most people enter the prison system with low levels of education, limited work experience, substance abuse issues, and mental health infirmities, and that these same issues are still present when a person is released from prison.

Without appropriate reentry services to assist them, many returning citizens find themselves back in the criminal justice system.

H.R. 8161 provides grants to community-based organizations for the creation of one-stop reentry centers, which would combine the provision of various reentry services in one location, thus making it easier for returning citizens to access them.

The one-stop shop model that this legislation promotes would aim to provide complete reentry services to address the critical elements of the reentry process that promote long-term reentry success.

The one-stop centers would include support personnel, who themselves are formerly incarcerated individuals, to provide direct support for recently released individuals.

In addition, where reentry services may not logistically be able to be placed in a single geographic location, this legislation authorizes the Attorney General to fund States and local jurisdictions to establish 24/7 reentry service assistance hotlines that direct recently released individuals to appropriate reentry resources.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 8161, the ''One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2020.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8161, 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.

CRIMINAL ANTITRUST ANTI-RETALIATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2258) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2258

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 ''Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO ACPERA.

The Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–237; 15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended by inserting after section 215 the following:

''SEC. 216. ANTI-RETALIATION PROTECTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS.

''(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, AND AGENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No employer may discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against a covered individual in the terms and conditions of employment of the covered individual because of any lawful act done by the covered individual—

''(A) to provide or cause to be provided to the Federal Government or a person with supervisory authority over the covered individual (or such other person working for the employer who has the authority to investigate, discover, or terminate misconduct) information relating to—

''(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, the antitrust laws; or

''(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws; or

''(B) to cause to be filed, testify in, participate in, or otherwise assist a Federal Government investigation or a Federal Government proceeding filed or about to be filed (with any knowledge of the employer) relating to—

''(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, the antitrust laws; or

''(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws.

''(2) LIMITATION ON PROTECTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any covered individual if—

''(A) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws;

''(B) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of another criminal law in conjunction with a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws; or

''(C) the covered individual planned and initiated an obstruction or attempted obstruction of an investigation by the Department of Justice of a violation of the antitrust laws.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(A) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term 'antitrust laws' means section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 and 3).

''(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means an employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of an employer.

''(C) EMPLOYER.—The term 'employer' means a person, or any officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of such person.

''(D) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Federal Government' means—

''(i) a Federal regulatory or law enforcement agency; or

''(ii) any Member of Congress or committee of Congress.

''(E) PERSON.—The term 'person' has the same meaning as in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)).

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The term 'violation', with respect to the antitrust laws, shall not be construed to include a civil violation of any law that is not also a criminal violation.

''(b) ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual who alleges discharge or other discrimination by any employer in violation of subsection (a) may seek relief under subsection (c) by—

''(A) filing a complaint with the Secretary of Labor; or

''(B) if the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final decision within 180 days of the filing of the complaint and there is no showing that such delay is due to the bad faith of the claimant, bringing an action at law or equity for de novo review in the appropriate district court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

''(2) PROCEDURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed under the rules and procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notification made under section 42121(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made to any individual named in the complaint and to the employer.

''(C) BURDENS OF PROOF.—An action brought under paragraph (1)(B) shall be governed by the legal burdens of proof set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

''(D) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—A complaint under paragraph (1)(A) shall be filed with the Secretary of Labor not later than 180 days after the date on which the violation occurs.

''(E) CIVIL ACTIONS TO ENFORCE.—If a person fails to comply with an order or preliminary

order issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code, the Secretary of Labor or the person on whose behalf the order was issued may bring a civil action to enforce the order in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the violation occurred.

''(c) REMEDIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual prevailing in any action under subsection (b)(1) shall be entitled to all relief necessary to make the covered individual whole.

''(2) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—Relief for any action under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the covered individual would have had, but for the discrimination;

''(B) the amount of back pay, with interest; and

''(C) compensation for any special damages sustained as a result of the discrimination including litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorney's fees.

''(d) RIGHTS RETAINED BY WHISTLEBLOWERS.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any covered individual under any Federal or State law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act, legislation that I introduced with Chairman NADLER, Chairman CICILLINE, and Ranking Member SENSENBRENNER that would extend whistleblower protections to private-sector employees who report criminal antitrust violations to the Federal Government.

Just by way of background, the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act is based on recommendations from a 2011 Government Accountability Office report. The legislation will protect private-sector employees for simply doing the right thing and ensure that those who retaliate against whistleblowers are held accountable.

Under the legislation, an employee who believes that he or she is a victim of retaliation can file a complaint with the Secretary of Labor, and it allows for that employee to be reinstated to their former position if the Secretary finds in his or her favor.

Mr. Speaker, antitrust violations often result in higher prices, less innovation, and fundamentally less choice. Private-sector employees are integral in maintaining the integrity of our antitrust laws, without whom violations such as price and wage fixing would go unreported.

Since our Nation's founding, our country has had a rich tradition of working to protect whistleblowers. Today, more than ever, honoring that history is tremendously important. No employee should fear for their job or face retaliation for exposing illegal, anticompetitive behavior, such as price fixing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Chairman NADLER, Chairman CICILLINE, and the majority leader for bringing this bill to the House floor.

I also want to thank Senator GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY for spearheading this effort in the Senate and for working so persistently to get it passed in that Chamber.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 2258, the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act, like its House companion, H.R. 8226, protects whistleblowers who help the Federal Government investigate and prosecute criminal violations of antitrust laws.

When workers give information to law enforcement, cooperate with criminal investigations, or testify about an employer's crimes, their employer may retaliate. Retaliation can take many forms, such as firing, demotion, suspension, or other types of retaliatory discrimination. Whatever its form, retaliation is wrong.

Workers should not be punished when they help the authorities address criminal antitrust violations, violations that ultimately harm American consumers. If this retaliation goes unaddressed, it can have damaging long-term effects. For one thing, unaddressed retaliation can suppress future whistleblowers who might otherwise step forward to shine a light on any wrongdoing.

When whistleblowers are scared to speak out, law enforcement may never learn of the criminal antitrust violations in the first place. Likewise, without the help from whistleblowers during investigations, law enforcement agencies may be unable to successfully prosecute wrongdoers.

S. 2258 addresses these policy concerns by prohibiting retaliatory discrimination against whistleblowers who speak out against criminal antitrust violations.

This bill also gives whistleblowers recourse if their employers do choose to retaliate. Under the bill, a whistleblower can file a complaint through a process the Department of Labor oversees and, in limited circumstances, seek relief by suing in Federal court.

While establishing whistleblower protections, S. 2258 also puts important guardrails in place to ensure that bad actors do not abuse this law. The bill denies whistleblower protections to people who instigate the violation of criminal antitrust laws or obstruct an investigation. Instead, the bill will protect workers who are acting in good faith.

Finally, I should note that our colleague, Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER, a cosponsor of the House companion bill, has worked throughout his career to protect whistleblowers from retaliation. He has described the general policy animating this bill and highlighted the importance of whistleblowers when he said that whistleblowers help maintain the integrity of our laws. Mr. SENSENBRENNER is correct.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, how much do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the chairman of the Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law Subcommittee.

□ 1630

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2258, the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act, which was introduced in the House by Congressman NEGUSE, that is H.R. 8226, a piece of legislation that he relentlessly championed and it finally is before us for final passage.

This important legislation protects whistleblowers who report criminal misconduct under the antitrust laws.

As my good friend just mentioned, I would also like to acknowledge the leadership of JIM SENSENBRENNER, who will be retiring from Congress, but who has made protection of whistleblowers an important part of his work here, and we will miss him on the Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee.

This important bill provides employees with a mechanism for reporting retaliation to the Department of Labor. Whistleblowers who report on criminal antitrust conduct and are retaliated against, such as through wrongful discharge, demotion, or harassment will have a path for reinstatement, be able to be compensated for harms that they suffer and reimbursed for litigation expenses for meritorious claims.

By extending these protections to employees who report criminal violations of antitrust laws to the Federal Government, this important measure will encourage whistleblowers to come forward to report extreme criminal violations of the antitrust laws, such as price and wage fixing, which are the supreme evil of antitrust.

Moreover, this legislation brings the criminal antitrust laws in line with other important laws, such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, which protects whistleblowers who report corporate wrongdoing.

No worker in America should fear for their job or economic livelihood for exposing corporations that engage in criminal activity, and exposing this misconduct is critical for antitrust enforcement purposes.

I want to end where I began by applauding Congressman NEGUSE, the vice chair of the House Judiciary Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee, a really valued and deeply respected member of the subcommittee, for his extraordinary leadership on this vital legislation, which has already been passed unanimously by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

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

I thank the chairman of the Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee, Mr. CICILLINE, for his leadership, his thoughtfulness, and for making consumer protection the central focus of his work and the Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee's work over this past Congress.

I also thank Mr. ARMSTRONG, my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

I would lend my voice, as well, to those who have rightfully praised the work of Mr. SENSENBRENNER who, for many years in the United States Congress, has served with distinction representing the people of Wisconsin. And I know that this bill was certainly important to him, and we appreciate his efforts on that front.

Finally, I would close with this: It can be lost on the American public as we talk about things like price fixing and the antitrust laws that are currently on the books how that connects to the everyday life of Americans. Fundamentally, this bill is about consumer protection. It is about protecting the public.

Before I came to Congress, I served several years in the cabinet of then-Governor John Hickenlooper, leading our State's Consumer Protection Agency, the Department of Regulatory Agencies' 600-person department with a $100 million budget, civil servants from across our State working hard each and every day to protect the consuming public and the people of the State of Colorado, the same work that folks do at the FTC and the Department of Justice in the Antitrust Division each and every day.

This is another tool that can be used in the toolbox of regulators here in Washington as we work to make consumer protection a priority and ultimately partner with those in the private sector who wish to report abusive and anticompetitive conduct that might be happening in the broader marketplace.

Again, I am thankful to the sponsors of this bill in the Senate, to the leadership in the House for bringing this bill forward to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation before the House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2258.

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.

PUERTO RICO RECOVERY ACCURACY IN DISCLOSURES ACT OF 2020

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 683) to impose requirements on the payment of compensation to professional persons employed in voluntary cases commenced under title III of the Puerto Rico Oversight Management and Economic Stability Act (commonly known as ''PROMESA''), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 683

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 ''Puerto Rico Recovery Accuracy in Disclosures Act of 2020'' or ''PRRADA''.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE BY PROFESSIONAL PERSONS SEEKING APPROVAL OF COMPENSATION UNDER SECTION 316 OR 317 OF PROMESA.

(a) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In a voluntary case commenced under section 304 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2164), no attorney, accountant, appraiser, auctioneer, agent, consultant, or other professional person may be compensated under section 316 or 317 of that Act (48 U.S.C. 2176, 2177) unless prior to making a request for compensation, the professional person has submitted a verified statement conforming to the disclosure requirements of rule 2014(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure setting forth the connection of the professional person with—

(A) the debtor;

(B) any creditor;

(C) any other party in interest, including any attorney or accountant;

(D) the Financial Oversight and Management Board established in accordance with section 101 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2121); and

(E) any person employed by the Oversight Board described in subparagraph (D).

(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A professional person that submits a statement under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) supplement the statement with any additional relevant information that becomes known to the person; and

(B) file annually a notice confirming the accuracy of the statement.

(b) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trustee shall review each verified statement submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and may file with the court comments on such verified statements before the professionals filing such statements seek compensation under section 316 or 317 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2176, 2177).

(2) OBJECTION.—The United States Trustee may object to compensation applications filed under section 316 or 317 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2176, 2177) that fail to satisfy the requirements of subsection (e).

(3) RIGHT TO BE HEARD.—Each person described in section 1109 of title 11, United States Code, may appear and be heard on any issue in a case under this section.

(c) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of all cases under this section.

(d) RETROACTIVITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a court has entered an order approving compensation under a case commenced under section 304 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2164), each professional person subject to the order shall file a verified statement in accordance with subsection (a) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) NO DELAY.—A court may not delay any proceeding in connection with a case commenced under section 304 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2164) pending the filing of a verified statement under paragraph (1).

(e) LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In a voluntary case commenced under section 304 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2164), in connection with the review and approval of professional compensation under section 316 or 317 of PROMESA (48 U.S.C. 2176, 2177), the court may deny allowance of compensation for services and reimbursement of expenses, accruing after the date of the enactment of this Act of a professional person if the professional person—

(A) has failed to file statements of connections required by subsection (a) or has filed inadequate statements of connections;

(B) except as provided in paragraph (3), is on or after the date of enactment of this Act not a disinterested person, as defined in section 101 of title 11, United States Code; or

(C) except as provided in paragraph (3), represents, or holds an interest adverse to, the interest of the estate with respect to the matter on which such professional person is employed.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making a determination under paragraph (1), the court may take into consideration whether the services and expenses are in the best interests of creditors and the estate.

(3) COMMITTEE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS.—An attorney or accountant described in section 1103(b) of title 11, United States Code, shall be deemed to have violated paragraph (1) if the attorney or accountant violates section 1103(b) of title 11, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 683, the Puerto Rico Recovery Accuracy in Disclosures Act, or PRRADA, is bipartisan legislation that would promote greater transparency and integrity with respect to