

TONY GONZALES of Texas, to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, as a unit of the National Park system.

Segregation education began in Marfa in 1892 following the completion of a new school for the city's White students. The Blackwell School served as the sole public education institution for the city of Marfa, Texas', Mexican and Mexican-American children from 1909 to 1965.

Known originally as the Ward or Mexican School, the Blackwell School was later renamed for its longtime principal, Jesse Blackwell, who arrived in 1922. During Blackwell's 25-year tenure, the school grew from one building and 120 students to a multi-building campus and more than 600 students.

The original historic school building and grounds provide an authentic setting to commemorate and interpret the history of the Blackwell School. Designation as a national historic site is locally supported and the designation helps meet needs identified in the National Park Services' American Latino Theme Study completed in 2013.

Madam Speaker, I highly commend my colleague from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) for his work on commemorating this important landmark. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES), the author of this bill.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4706, the Blackwell School National Historic Site Act.

The Blackwell School is located in the heart of my district, Marfa, Texas. This week we are voting on legislation that makes this landmark a national historic site under the National Park Service.

□ 1345

When it comes to recognizing lands as national historic sites or national parks, it is paramount to look outside traditional parameters. We must identify and preserve our history from all walks of life and share stories of forgotten Americans, including the history of Mexican Americans and their struggle for equality.

The Blackwell School operated from 1909 to 1965 as a segregated school for children of Mexican descent. While segregation was mandated by law for African Americans, it was optional for school districts to segregate Mexican students. Marfa chose to segregate. Children who attended the Blackwell School were banned from speaking Spanish and even had to bury slips of paper with Spanish words in a mock funeral ceremony.

The school operated during a time of American history when separate but equal dominated our culture. Segrega-

tion is an ugly stain on America's legacy, and while we have progressed as a country, we must acknowledge the painful role segregation played in our Nation's history.

Establishing the Blackwell School as a national historic site ensures that the building is maintained properly so generations to come can understand its rich but complicated history. The impact of establishing this landmark as a national historic site goes beyond cultural influence as well. My district is home to eight of Texas' 16 national parks such as Big Bend National Park. As I traveled through my district, I have seen the positive economic and societal impacts our national parks have on our communities. Establishing the Blackwell School as a national landmark would bring increased tourism and increased economic activity to Presidio County and Marfa.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, FIL VELA, for cosponsoring this bill; Natural Resources Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA; and, of course, Ranking Member BRUCE WESTERMAN for prioritizing this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Madam Speaker, most importantly, I would like to thank the Blackwell School Alliance and the National Parks Conservation Association for their commitment to giving this landmark the recognition it deserves. The Blackwell School has been an important piece of history for west Texas and many Mexican Americans across the country, and we are ready to share it with the world.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I am ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I want to encourage adoption of this bill and, again, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work in bringing this bill forward. I hope we can all get behind it. I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I too want to recognize and acknowledge the importance of this bill and Representative GONZALES's bringing it to our attention because we must remember that all stories—all stories—whether they be good or bad, whether they concern segregation or celebration, are American stories, and this bill assists us in looking at the complexity of the American story.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in proud support of H.R. 4706, "The Blackwell School National Historic Site Act."

I would like to thank Congressman TONY GONZALES for introducing this bill.

This bill would establish Blackwell School National Historic Site as a unit of the National

Park System when the Secretary of the Interior enters into a written agreement with the Marfa Unified School District for donation or co-management of the site and acquires sufficient lands within the boundaries of the national historic site to constitute a manageable unit.

The NPS would be required to develop a management plan for the site no later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for this purpose.

The bill also directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with the Blackwell School Alliance (and other partners) for interpretive and educational programming, technical assistance, and rehabilitation for the site.

The Blackwell School operated in Marfa, Texas, as a segregated school for children of Mexican descent from 1909 until Marfa schools were integrated in 1965.

Yet this is much more than just a local story.

The original historic school building, and grounds on which it stands, provide an authentic setting to commemorate and interpret a time when "separate but equal" dominated our culture in ways currently unknown, and essential to understanding the American experience.

The Blackwell School Alliance has been working 15 years to preserve the stories, legacy, and buildings associated with the Blackwell School.

We have partnered with many universities, state agencies, private foundations, individuals, and the City of Marfa to document and promote this important piece of Marfa history.

This park would not only have an emotional impact, but it would also help preserve key history for the people of Marfa, Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4706.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

COURTHOUSE ETHICS AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5720) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for a periodic transaction reporting requirement for Federal judicial officers and the online publication of financial disclosure reports of Federal judicial officers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5720

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 “Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. PERIODIC TRANSACTION REPORTS AND ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL OFFICERS.

(a) PERIODIC TRANSACTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL JUDICIAL OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) Each judicial officer.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to applicable transactions occurring on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL OFFICERS.—Section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF JUDICIAL OFFICERS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a searchable internet database to enable public access to any report required to be filed by a judicial officer under this title.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a report is required to be filed under this title by a judicial officer, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall make the report available on the database established under paragraph (1) in a full-text searchable, sortable, and downloadable format for access by the public.

“(3) REDACTION.—Any report made available on the database established under paragraph (1) shall not contain any information that is redacted in accordance with subsection (b)(3).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) (as amended by subsection (a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking “, as defined under section 109(12)”;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “, as defined under section 109(13)”.

(2) Section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) (as amended by subsection (b)) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “be revealing” and inserting “by revealing”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking “be,” and inserting “be,”; and

(II) in the third sentence, by striking “may be may” and inserting “may be, may”;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “described in section 109(8) or 109(10) of this Act” and inserting “who is a judicial officer or a judicial employee”.

(3) Section 107(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the last sentence by striking “and (d)” and inserting “and (e)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5720, the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act of 2021, embodies an important bipartisan effort to address an alarming lack of transparency in the personal financial holdings of Federal judges and the conflicts—or appearance of conflicts—those holdings can create in the cases those judges are asked to decide.

This legislation makes incremental but necessary progress toward accountability by building on Federal statutes that already prohibit judges from deciding cases in which they have a personal financial stake in the outcome.

It has been the law in this country since the 1970s that judges must recuse themselves from any case in which they hold a legal or equitable interest of any size in any property or party under consideration. To help ensure that recusals occur as required, Federal law also requires judges to file annual reports disclosing their personal financial interests so that litigants, the press, and the general public can check their work.

Unfortunately, recent reporting by prominent media outlets and a hearing by the Courts Subcommittee, have shown that the law is not working as intended. The infrequency of judges' financial disclosures and the inaccessibility of the reports themselves have made actual transparency practically impossible.

The result is recent investigative reporting revealing that over 130 Federal judges have decided cases in which they are part owners of the parties before them; over 60 judges have actively traded shares in the parties in their courtrooms while cases are still going on, in some cases profiting on those trades.

The consequences of these actions are both acute and widespread. Failures to recuse can cause real harm to the parties whose cases are impacted and can leave a cloud of doubt over any law created from these cases once the conflicts are uncovered. Perhaps even more concerning, when the public sees members of their judiciary behaving in such a manner, their faith in their system of justice can be withered by cynicism and suspicion.

H.R. 5720 addresses these problems by requiring Federal judges to abide by the same periodic transaction reporting laws already applicable to Members of Congress and senior executive branch officials.

Further, the bill requires the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to create an online database of judicial financial disclosure reports

and to timely update that database in searchable, sortable, and downloadable copies of disclosure reports as they become available so that litigants, the press, and the public can access and analyze that information in close to real time.

These simple solutions are long overdue and are the product of bipartisan, bicameral collaboration. I want to thank Congresswoman ROSS and Congressman ISSA for their leadership on this issue and for introducing this legislation. I also appreciate Ranking Member JORDAN for working with us on this bill, and I want to thank HANK JOHNSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet for holding a hearing exposing the issues this bill addresses.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5720 is a thoughtful piece of legislation authored by my colleague, Congresswoman ROSS. It does something that seems like common sense when you look at it. Senior members of the executive branch, not just Cabinet officers or sub-Cabinet officers, but all of the most highly compensated individuals in the executive branch, similarly, the highly compensated members of this branch and Members of Congress, both the House and Senate and the Delegates, all routinely make these filings so that if a vote appears to be self-serving, the public is aware of it. This is important when you are looking at elective office.

But it is even more important, Madam Speaker, when you are looking at people who have a lifetime appointment, people who do not stand for election, and cases that may involve 10s or 100s of millions of dollars of company or individual money and the outcome, if later overturned due to the potential malpractice, such as the 60 judges who actually traded while cases were in front of them, the cost can be devastating in dollars.

But as the chairman so rightfully said, the cost can be more devastating in public confidence. I want to commend, on a bipartisan and bicameral basis, the work that has been done to recognize this oversight and, quite frankly, push against the members of the court who have not yet supported this and who somehow believe that these are exceptions and that somehow those exceptions are not sufficient to create a mandate on the third branch of government that is the equivalent almost identically of the first two.

It is a small step, and it does not affect a vast amount of judges who routinely look carefully at this.

There is one more thing that I think needs to be understood that members of the committee understand, and that is the available databases for these judges to appropriately do these tests

to find out whether they do have a potential conflict will need to be added.

So the legislation talks about reporting, but we will work diligently with the members of all the Federal courts to make sure the assets are available for them to quickly and routinely make these checks—the same as lawyers have had in the private sector for conflicts for many, many years now.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act. This common-sense, bipartisan, bicameral legislation would serve to fill a transparency void that plagues our current Federal judicial system as recently exposed in a Wall Street Journal series of reports.

According to these reports, 131 Federal judges broke the law by hearing cases where they had a financial interest. From 2010 to 2018, these judges failed to recuse themselves from 685 lawsuits involving firms in which they or their families held stock, and today the number could be much higher.

□ 1400

This failure has real-world repercussions for the American public and American families.

Take, for example, Jacob and Jeanetta Springer. They were foreclosed upon in 2018 after Jeanetta's ailing father missed one mortgage payment 3 months before his passing.

Upon inheriting the property, the Springers sought to challenge the foreclosure in Federal court, believing they were behind on fewer payments than the bank had claimed. The case was dismissed on the recommendation of the magistrate judge and again on appeal. But the Springers were soon notified by the court that their judge had purchased the bank's stock before issuing the ruling.

As a result, their case was reopened and assigned to a different judge. In frustration, Jacob Springer asked: "How was I supposed to know the judge owned the stock?"

The Springer family's experience demonstrates the importance of ensuring both justice and the appearance of justice in our courtrooms. The impression of impropriety threatens the trust litigants place in judges to be impartial and disinterested arbiters of justice and the very institutional legitimacy of our judiciary.

The Springer family's experience was not the first time a litigant has had their faith in the promise of blind justice shaken by the lack of transparency in our judiciary. But today, we can move toward making it the last by passing the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act.

This bill will make Federal judges more accountable, transparent, and ethical, and restore confidence in our Federal courts. The legislation will en-

sure Federal judges face the same financial transaction disclosure requirements as members of the legislative and executive branches, eliminating an unwarranted transparency gap.

It also requires the online publication of judges' financial disclosures on a publicly accessible database. This online database will add another layer of protection from potential conflicts.

Litigants like the Springer family would be able to identify conflicts sooner instead of solely relying on the ineffective recusal processes that currently are in place. This bill does so without compromising the safety of Federal judges or their families because it incorporates existing confidentiality rules that enable judges to redact sensitive information. The database will simply streamline access to information already legally required to be available to the public.

I want to thank Judiciary Committee Chairman NADLER, Subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON, cosponsor and Subcommittee Ranking Member ISSA, and Representative CHIP ROY for working with me to introduce this crucial legislation. We must restore trust in the American promise of free and fair administration of justice in our courtrooms.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill to increase transparency and accountability in our courtrooms.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the majority is prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we have additional speakers. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important legislation that will bring greater transparency to the judges adjudicating cases every day all across this country.

Most high-level government officials in all three branches of government, including Federal Justices and judges, must file annual financial disclosure reports. For Members of Congress, as well the President, Vice President, and other executive branch officials, these disclosures are readily available and searchable online. This makes the information easy for the American people to obtain, and this tool is vital to a transparent government.

Federal judges and Justices, however, do not have to make their disclosures readily available to the public online. It often takes the public months to request this information under the current disclosure system.

This delay in information often prevents the public from being able to determine if a judge has a financial interest in a certain court case in a timely manner, effectively weakening the enforcement of recusal requirements even if there is a conflict of interest.

I am sure many or most judges willingly recuse themselves from cases in which they have an interest, but a Wall

Street Journal investigation found that this is not always the case. That investigation found that since 2010, more than 130 Federal judges have not recused themselves in nearly 700 cases where they or a family member had a financial interest, an unacceptable breach of the public's trust.

For example, in one case, a judge denied a class action motion against Microsoft, which he held stock in, potentially saving the company more than \$45 million. These kinds of conflicts must be transparent.

The bipartisan Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act of 2021 would increase transparency and empower the public by mandating that Federal judges' financial disclosures are publicly available and searchable within 90 days of filing. This will allow the public to access these disclosure forms more easily, providing the information we need to ensure fair proceedings and necessary recusals.

I thank Congresswoman ROSS for introducing this extremely important legislation, and I thank her for her leadership. I also want to thank Representative JOHNSON and Representatives ROY and ISSA for taking the lead on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5720, which I hope will be only the first in a series of reforms from this body to assist our courts in maintaining the appearance of impartiality, which is so essential to the judicial function.

Perhaps more than any other branch, the judiciary relies on the public's perception of its rectitude, its rejection of bias, and its commitment to fairness as a necessary predicate to the accomplishment of its work. The more the public trusts our judges, the more willing the public is to accept their judgments.

Alexander Hamilton wrote that judges do not have armies to enforce. They do not have appropriations to encourage. They have only their impeccable reasoning and their unimpeachable objective, which together ensure acceptance of their decisions.

That is why after The Wall Street Journal's investigative reporting revealed widespread failures in the judiciary's compliance with a straightforward conflict of interest statute, my Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet Subcommittee promptly held a hearing to examine why those failures occurred and what we could do to help the judiciary avoid making them in the future.

I am pleased that Representative ROSS and the ranking member of the

subcommittee, Representative ISSA, immediately advanced a bill designed specifically to rectify this systemic problem, and I am proud to support it.

This bill provides the judiciary with much-needed tools to ensure not only its actual objectivity but the appearance of actual objectivity, both of which are critical to ensure the continued vitality of the judiciary.

It also welcomes the public, the press, and the parties to lawsuits into the process for ensuring judicial impartiality by making records of judges' financial interests publicly available and freely available.

This interbranch cooperation, as the Constitution intends, is what is needed at this time. Congress needs the courts because justice is the foundation of our democracy. The courts need Congress to furnish them with the statutory tools necessary to ensure that justice satisfies the appearance of justice.

Our courts and our country will be better for the passage of this bill.

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

Once again, I want to thank the chairman, Ms. Ross, and the others who worked so diligently on this legislation.

In closing, I think the judicial branch needs to take notice of the vote here today, not because we vote overwhelmingly in support of this legislation, but because we stand here today trying to vividly separate 130 judges who either didn't know or knew and did not do the right thing from 600 or so that sit on the bench today, and, over the period of this investigation, more than 1,000 Federal judges who do the right thing, who are careful in their personal life and in their disclosures, who do recuse themselves.

The confidence in the court belongs to the overwhelming majority of judges at the district court, at the appellate court, at the Federal circuit, and, yes, at the Supreme Court, who carefully maintain their personal lives, personal matters, and their family assets in a way that they can be accountable. And when in doubt, many of them recuse themselves even when it is a judgment call.

So I want to thank the many in our third branch of government who do the right thing as we bring about this new era of transparency that has become necessary because of the bad action of 130 judges.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5720 would make a meaningful difference in the accessibility and transparency of an entire branch of our Federal Government. It would strengthen trust in our courts and, in doing so, would strengthen our courts.

H.R. 5720 would establish a level playing field for access to critical government documents, allowing litigants, the public, and the press to enforce and ensure accountability.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIEU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5720, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

MAKING TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN PROVISIONS CLASSIFIED TO TITLE 2, TITLE 50, AND TITLE 52, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5677) to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, title 50, United States Code, and title 52, United States Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5677

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

DIVISION A—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO UPDATE STATUTORY REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS CLASSIFIED TO TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE

Sec. 101. Title 2, United States Code.
Sec. 102. Title 5, United States Code.
Sec. 103. Title 39, United States Code.
Sec. 104. Title 42, United States Code.
Sec. 105. Title 44, United States Code.

DIVISION B—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO UPDATE STATUTORY REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS CLASSIFIED TO CHAPTERS 44, 45, 46, AND 47 OF TITLE 50, UNITED STATES CODE

Sec. 201. Title 3, United States Code.
Sec. 202. Title 5, United States Code.
Sec. 203. Title 6, United States Code.
Sec. 204. Title 8, United States Code.
Sec. 205. Title 10, United States Code.
Sec. 206. Title 12, United States Code.
Sec. 207. Title 15, United States Code.
Sec. 208. Title 18, United States Code.
Sec. 209. Title 18 Appendix, United States Code.

Sec. 210. Title 19, United States Code.
Sec. 211. Title 21, United States Code.
Sec. 212. Title 22, United States Code.
Sec. 213. Title 28, United States Code.
Sec. 214. Title 31, United States Code.
Sec. 215. Title 41, United States Code.
Sec. 216. Title 42, United States Code.
Sec. 217. Title 44, United States Code.
Sec. 218. Title 50, United States Code.

DIVISION C—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO UPDATE STATUTORY REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS CLASSIFIED TO TITLE 52, UNITED STATES CODE

Sec. 301. Title 2, United States Code.

Sec. 302. Title 3, United States Code.
Sec. 303. Title 5, United States Code.
Sec. 304. Title 6, United States Code.
Sec. 305. Title 10, United States Code.
Sec. 306. Title 18, United States Code.
Sec. 307. Title 20, United States Code.
Sec. 308. Title 22, United States Code.
Sec. 309. Title 26, United States Code.
Sec. 310. Title 28, United States Code.
Sec. 311. Title 29, United States Code.
Sec. 312. Title 31, United States Code.
Sec. 313. Title 36, United States Code.
Sec. 314. Title 39, United States Code.
Sec. 315. Title 42, United States Code.
Sec. 316. Title 47, United States Code.
Sec. 317. Title 48, United States Code.
Sec. 318. Title 50, United States Code.
Sec. 319. Title 52, United States Code.

DIVISION A—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO UPDATE STATUTORY REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS CLASSIFIED TO TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE

SECTION 101. TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 701(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (2 U.S.C. 288(c)) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 72a(i))” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4301(i))”.

(2) Section 716 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (2 U.S.C. 288m) is amended by striking “Act of October 1, 1888 (28 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C. 68)” and inserting “Act of October 2, 1888 (25 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C. 6503)”.

(3) Section 201(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601(g)) is amended by striking “Act of October 1, 1888 (28 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C. 68)” and inserting “Act of October 2, 1888 (25 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C. 6503)”.

(4) Section 104(a) of the Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1997 (2 U.S.C. 605(a)) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 111b)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4103)”.

(5) Section 1101(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2009 (2 U.S.C. 1824(a)(2)) is amended as follows:

(A) Subparagraph (A) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 117)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 6516)”.

(B) Subparagraph (B) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 117e)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 5540)”.

(C) Subparagraph (C) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 121f)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 2026)”.

(6) Section 104(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 88-454, 2 U.S.C. 1927 note) is amended by inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4507(b))” after “section 106(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963”.

(7) Section 9A(a) of the Act of July 31, 1946 (2 U.S.C. 1966(a)) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 60-1(b))” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4101(b))”.

(8) Section 2(c) of Public Law 96-444 (2 U.S.C. 2025 note) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 60j)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4507)”.

(9) Section 1(e) of Public Law 110-279 (2 U.S.C. 2051(e)) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 60q)” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4505)”.

(B) Paragraph (2)(A) (matter before clause (i)) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 60q(e))” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4505(e))”.

(C) Paragraph (2)(A)(i) is amended by inserting “(2 U.S.C. 4505)” after “section 210 of that Act”.

(10) Section 312(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (2 U.S.C. 2062(e)) is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 95b(a))” and inserting “(2 U.S.C. 5507(a))”.

(11) Section 316(a) of the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Assistance, Food Stamps, Unemployment Compensation Administration, and Other Urgent Needs, and Transfers, and Reducing Funds Budgeted for Military Spending Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 2107(a)) is amended by striking