

thank the ranking member for his presentation and the gentlewoman for her presentation.

I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the Elder Abuse Protection Act, which has been supported by my colleague from Texas, the Honorable SYLVIA GARCIA.

As Chairman NADLER said and detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic minority groups. My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly concerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

That is why the thoughtful legislation offered by Congresswoman GARCIA is so very important, and its time is now.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice and require it to translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public. The cost of translating those educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline—very important. Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans who don't have access to the internet.

We all know the most vulnerable. These elders who have worked to build this country deserve to live their senior years in peace and tranquility and with respect and dignity. They do not deserve to be taken advantage of by fraudulent individuals, fraudulent schemes, and fraudulent practices. If we can do anything to help them, we should do it.

This legislation strongly helps them, and I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the "Elder Abuse Protection Act."

As Chairman NADLER detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic-minority groups.

My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly con-

cerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years old or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice, and require it translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public.

The cost of translating these educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline.

Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans don't have access to the internet.

I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the "Elder Abuse Protection Act."

As Chairman NADLER detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic-minority groups.

My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly concerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years old or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice and require it translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public.

The cost of translating these educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline.

Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans who don't have access to the internet.

I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, reports estimate that as many as 1 in 10 elders are abused every year, but less than half of these incidents are actually reported, and the COVID pandemic has left seniors isolated and more vulnerable to fraud and abuse.

All over, we are seeing scammers deceive a grandparent that their grandchild is in trouble and needs money.

We see imposters pose as IRS agents to trick an elder into paying money they do not owe.

We see fraudsters offer tech support assistance and collect money for fraudulent services.

We must hold these criminals accountable for taking advantage of and abusing our seniors.

Protecting and caring for our loved ones—who once supported and cared for us—is one of our most honorable responsibilities.

The Elder Abuse and Protection Act promotes justice for vulnerable seniors by making the Elder Justice Initiative a permanent office within the Department of Justice, which works to combat elder abuse, neglect, and financial fraud and scams that target our nation's seniors.

I thank Congresswoman GARCIA for introducing this important legislation to protect our seniors, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and support it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 2922, 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.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

JUSTICE FOR JUVENILES ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 961) to exempt juveniles from the requirements for suits by prisoners, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 961

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 "Justice for Juveniles Act".

SEC. 2. EXEMPTION OF JUVENILES FROM THE REQUIREMENTS FOR SUITS BY PRISONERS.

Section 7 of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h), by striking "sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for," and inserting "or sentenced for"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) EXEMPTION OF JUVENILE PRISONERS.—This section shall not apply to an action pending on the date of enactment of the Justice for Juveniles Act or filed on or after such date if such action is—

“(1) brought by a prisoner who has not attained 22 years of age; or

“(2) brought by any prisoner with respect to a prison condition that occurred before the prisoner attained 22 years of age.”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 961.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act.

This bipartisan bill would eliminate the administrative exhaustion requirement for incarcerated youth before they may file a lawsuit challenging the conditions of their incarceration.

By passing this bill today, the House would correct the manifest wrong currently present in Federal law and would continue bipartisan efforts to support incarcerated youth.

This bill recognizes the same conclusion that has been embraced by the Supreme Court and experts for decades, that incarcerated young people have different cognitive abilities than adults, are less mature, and have a higher chance of being assaulted while incarcerated.

In recent years, our Nation has finally come to the realization that youth and adults have fundamentally different decisionmaking abilities. The Supreme Court has repeatedly cited adolescents’ lack of maturity as a reason why they are not as culpable as adults for their actions or able to recognize certain dangers.

Yet, in current law, there are no allowances for these differences in cognitive abilities when it comes to addressing deficiencies in conditions of confinement.

Complying with current law, which requires an understanding of detailed grievance procedures and timelines, is

nearly impossible for most incarcerated youth. Compliance with grievance procedures not only requires an understanding of the grievance process but, on a more basic level, it requires that an incarcerated person be able to read, which, sadly, many incarcerated people cannot do.

According to one study, among incarcerated youth, 85 percent are functionally illiterate, and the baseline reading levels vary from grade one to grade six. In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability.

Youth are, furthermore, less likely than adults to recognize as risks the circumstances they face in a correctional facility. Youth may not recognize the impending or imminent danger of some of the risks they face.

Compounding these challenges, incarcerated youth, as a group, experience extraordinarily high rates of mental illness. Nearly 50 percent of incarcerated 16- to 18-year-olds suffer from a mental illness. Juveniles housed with adults are 10 times more likely to have psychotic episodes, and they have a suicide rate that is 7.7 times higher than those housed in juvenile facilities.

In recent years, the public has become more aware of the many dangers that lurk in correctional facilities. Hurricanes have flooded facilities; cold snaps have left prisoners freezing to death; and heat waves have killed prisoners when they lacked proper ventilation or air conditions. These conditions pose a special danger to youth, who do not have the ability or experience to recognize that they are in immediate danger.

While natural disasters can pose an extraordinary risk to youth, prison life itself may also pose life-threatening dangers. Adolescents incarcerated with adults are also more prone to both physical and mental abuse. Youth are 50 percent more likely to be physically assaulted when they are housed in adult facilities than in juvenile facilities.

Taken together, most incarcerated youth are simply not able to recognize or to effectively communicate when their prison conditions become dangerous or unconstitutionally deficient.

There remains little doubt that the current process needs to be changed.

This bill proposes a modest reform to the Prison Litigation Reform Act. It simply exempts youth in correctional facilities from having to comply with technical grievance procedures before they can go to court to challenge the unconstitutional conditions of their confinement. While I would like to see us do much more to protect incarcerated youth, this bill is a necessary first step.

I thank Ms. SCANLON and Mr. ARMSTRONG for introducing this bipartisan legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act. This bill eliminates some of the administrative hurdles for juvenile prisoners seeking relief in Federal court.

Juvenile offenders often lack the knowledge to pursue and exhaust all the complex administrative rules and grievance procedures in correctional facilities. H.R. 961 will address that problem by providing juvenile offenders with quicker access to courts when they feel they are being abused or mistreated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here today to advance the Justice for Juveniles Act. I thank Chairman NADLER, Leader HOYER, and my colleague, Congressman ARMSTRONG, for their support and partnership on this effort.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act, or PLRA, was passed in 1996 in an effort to decrease so-called frivolous lawsuits brought by prisoners. Chief among the PLRA’s mandates was a requirement that before seeking relief for civil rights violations in court, a detained person must exhaust administrative remedies.

Whatever the merits of that underlying legislation, we now have broad bipartisan agreement that the language is overbroad in its application to juveniles.

Studies have consistently shown that juveniles are both more likely to be abused while in detention and less likely to navigate the administrative remedies that bar them from seeking relief.

For those of us who have kids or who have worked with children, it is easy to imagine the difficulty a young person in detention might have navigating complex legal systems necessary to raise a complaint.

Young people in the criminal or juvenile justice system are more likely than not to be functionally illiterate, and science has shown that the brain is not fully developed until a person is in their mid-twenties. It is one of the many reasons our justice system makes a distinction between juvenile and adult offenses.

That is what we hope to acknowledge with the Justice for Juveniles Act by exempting juveniles from the requirements of the PLRA.

In addition, the PLRA also limits the kind of relief that juveniles might seek for civil rights violations while in detention. They cannot seek relief now for emotional injuries without physical ones as well, but studies show that youth are especially prone to psychological injury and abuse, which they often face in detention.

Finally, the PLRA limits the recovery of attorney’s fees in such cases. Again, juveniles are less likely to have

independent resources to fund an attorney, so that makes it harder for young people to find an attorney to vindicate their rights.

To those who might question whether we need to correct the PLRA, I offer the story of the Glen Mills Schools, which inspired this bill.

For almost 200 years, youth from across the United States were sent to Glen Mills when they ran afoul of the law. But the school's bucolic campus and renowned athletic teams masked serious daily violence inflicted upon children placed there.

An explosive 2019 report by The Philadelphia Inquirer revealed years of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse of the young residents, including broken bones, threats of retaliation, and sustained physical assaults at the hands of staff members. Although the stories from Glen Mills are heart-breaking, they are not unique.

□ 1615

Reports show that mistreatment of young people in juvenile facilities happens all the time across the country.

Just this past March, despite the recent example of Glen Mills, children were removed from yet another juvenile detention facility, just a few miles away, after horrifying new allegations of abuse.

This commonsense, bipartisan legislation passed unanimously on the House floor last Congress and has the support of over 60 organizations.

I, again, thank Chairman NADLER and the committee members and staff who helped advance this bill, and I thank the dedicated leadership team who brought the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation again.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager and the chairman of the full committee, Committee on the Judiciary, and to the manager for our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act.

This is very close to my heart as the chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security working on these juvenile justice issues. And this is a necessary and important bipartisan bill that will save incarcerated young persons' lives.

As indicated, chairing the subcommittee, we recently held a hearing titled, "Juvenile Justice Pipeline and the Road Back to Integration." I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for this very effective and important initiative.

During the hearing, we heard testimony from witness after witness who

acknowledged the body of scientific research that has been embraced by experts and the Supreme Court—and that I have known and seen over the years as we have written legislation—demonstrating that juveniles do not have the same cognitive and emotional maturity as adults.

In fact, there is data that says that the brain does not fully mature until age 25. This bill makes a good change to the Prison Litigation Reform Act to take into account that the overwhelming majority of juveniles cannot comply with the law's complex grievance procedures by themselves. This bill is an important bipartisan step to ensuring incarcerated juveniles are rehabilitated and given the best chance possible to reintegrate into society.

Just some statistics that I saw recently when I received a note about a graduation of foster children from high school, saying about 60 percent of those children not having a complete opportunity in life did not graduate from high school. And so these children wind up in these facilities. They should not; they should have a life. And therefore, we should be able—not associating foster care children with those incarcerated—but we do know the susceptibility to these children and others who don't have a steady hand in their life. So this is an important step.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON, for authoring this bill.

As I worked on this legislation, it is important to note that to deal with a grievance system, it requires an understanding of the grievance process. But on a more basic level, it requires that an incarcerated person be able to read.

According to one study, we know that incarcerated youth are functionally illiterate in many instances, and the baseline reading levels vary from grade 1 to 6. That is a plague, if you will, on children in our society that can have a bright and wonderful life.

In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability. And we know that because of what happens in schools in the recently changed State laws where juveniles have been sent from the schoolhouse to juvenile detention.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this alone justifies the changes in the bill, which simply allow incarcerated juveniles to go directly to court to have serious deficiencies in their incarceration, including allegations of assault, corrected.

As I said, I thank my colleague, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON. As I work on legislation to achieve more extensive juvenile justice reform, I support the passage of this bill—common-

sense, overdue—and ask that my colleagues support this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the "Justice for Juveniles Act." This is a necessary and important bipartisan bill that will save incarcerated young people's lives.

The Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, which I chair, recently held a hearing titled the "Juvenile Justice Pipeline and the Road Back to Integration."

During the hearing, we heard testimony from witness after witness who acknowledged the body of scientific research, that has been embraced by experts and the Supreme Court, demonstrating that juveniles do not have the same cognitive and emotional maturity as adults.

This bill makes a modest change to the Prison Litigation Reform Act to take into account that the overwhelming majority of juveniles cannot comply with the law's complex grievance procedures.

These requirements not only require an understanding of the grievance process, but on a more basic level, require that an incarcerated person be able to read. According to one study, among incarcerated youth, 85 percent are functionally illiterate, and the "baseline reading levels var[y] from grade 1 to grade 6."

In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability.

This alone justifies the changes in the bill, which simply allow incarcerated juveniles to go directly to court to have serious deficiencies in their incarceration, including allegations of assault, corrected.

This bill is a small but important bipartisan step to ensuring incarcerated juveniles are rehabilitated and given the best chance possible to reintegrate into society.

I thank my colleague on the Crime Subcommittee, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON, for authoring this bill.

As I work on legislation to achieve more extensive juvenile justice reform, I support passage of this bill today and ask that my colleagues do the same.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to note my agreement with the gentlewoman from Texas' point, that the cognition of juveniles is not fully developed and that they should not be called upon to make unalterable, lifelong decisions under those circumstances.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our prison systems are ideally meant to rehabilitate, but all too often, they do exactly the opposite. They are frequently home to widespread, horrible abuse, including physical and sexual violence and unsanitary living conditions.

It is unacceptable to subject any person to such conditions—but, particularly, our youth to this kind of mistreatment. Our system makes it incredibly difficult for young people to

file a legal complaint with huge burdens imposed if they want to file a lawsuit, and major barriers to legal representation.

Mr. Speaker, I was a public defender here in Washington, D.C., at the start of my career, and I am certain that this is no way to treat children that we are trying to rehabilitate and prepare for society and prepare for success in their communities.

These circumstances only make it more difficult for young people and children and, in fact, they keep them in abusive and delinquency cycles.

This legislation, however, will remove some of those barriers for incarcerated juveniles to take their abusers to court and to seek remedies for mistreatment by their correctional institutions. This bill will take us one step closer to desperately needed reform in our criminal justice system and will help to protect our incarcerated youth.

Mr. Speaker, I really thank and applaud Congresswoman SCANLON for this important and bipartisan legislation, and it is my honor to support it today.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in urging Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 961, 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.

MR. ROSENDALE. 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 IMPROVEMENTS IN ENACTMENT OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO A POSITIVE LAW TITLE AND TO IMPROVE CODE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3239) to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3239

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

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1.	Table of contents.
Sec. 2.	Purpose.
Sec. 3.	Title 2, United States Code.
Sec. 4.	Title 5, United States Code.
Sec. 5.	Title 6, United States Code.
Sec. 6.	Title 7, United States Code.
Sec. 7.	Title 8, United States Code.
Sec. 8.	Title 10, United States Code.
Sec. 9.	Title 12, United States Code.
Sec. 10.	Title 14, United States Code.
Sec. 11.	Title 15, United States Code.
Sec. 12.	Title 16, United States Code.
Sec. 13.	Title 18, United States Code.
Sec. 14.	Title 19, United States Code.
Sec. 15.	Title 20, United States Code.
Sec. 16.	Title 21, United States Code.
Sec. 17.	Title 22, United States Code.
Sec. 18.	Title 23, United States Code.
Sec. 19.	Title 24, United States Code.
Sec. 20.	Title 25, United States Code.
Sec. 21.	Title 26, United States Code.
Sec. 22.	Title 28, United States Code.
Sec. 23.	Title 29, United States Code.
Sec. 24.	Title 30, United States Code.
Sec. 25.	Title 31, United States Code.
Sec. 26.	Title 33, United States Code.
Sec. 27.	Title 35, United States Code.
Sec. 28.	Title 38, United States Code.
Sec. 29.	Title 40, United States Code.
Sec. 30.	Title 41, United States Code.
Sec. 31.	Title 42, United States Code.
Sec. 32.	Title 43, United States Code.
Sec. 33.	Title 44, United States Code.
Sec. 34.	Title 45, United States Code.
Sec. 35.	Title 46, United States Code.
Sec. 36.	Title 48, United States Code.
Sec. 37.	Title 49, United States Code.
Sec. 38.	Title 50, United States Code.
Sec. 39.	Title 51, United States Code.
Sec. 40.	Title 52, United States Code.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code.

SEC. 3. TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The paragraph under the heading "GENERAL PROVISION, THIS CHAPTER" in chapter 5 of title II of division B of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (2 U.S.C. 141a) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(2) Section 114 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104-53, 2 U.S.C. 471 note) is amended by striking "the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended" and substituting "chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code".

(3) Section 6(a) of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 475(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code"; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)" and substituting "section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code".

(4) Section 119(a)(6) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1108(a)(6)) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(5) Section 3011(b)(4)(B) of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106-31, 2 U.S.C. 1151 note) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(6) Section 1308(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008 (2 U.S.C. 1816a(a)) is amended by striking "section 303M of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253m)" and substituting "section 3309 of title 41, United States Code".

(7) Public Law 96-558 (2 U.S.C. 1816b) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(8) Section 1201(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1821(a)(1)) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(9) Section 308(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 1964(b)) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(10) Section 1(d) of Public Law 102-330 (2 U.S.C. 2021 note) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(11) Section 307E(b)(3) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146(b)(3)) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(12) Section 202(i)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)(2)) is amended by striking "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(13) Section 195(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (2 U.S.C. 6157(b)) is amended by striking "section 5 of title 41" and substituting "section 6101 of title 41, United States Code".

(14) Section 117(1) of Public Law 97-51 (2 U.S.C. 6599(1)) is amended by striking "section 5" and substituting "section 6101".

SEC. 4. TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 3(d)(2)(B) of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (Public Law 101-552, 5 U.S.C. 571 note) is amended by striking "section 6(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(a))" and substituting "section 1121(b) of title 41, United States Code".

(2) Section 595(c)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 251-260)" and substituting "the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41".

(3) Section 206 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-174, 5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking "section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612)" and substituting "section 7108 of title 41, United States Code"; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking "the Contracts Dispute Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 note; Public Law 95-563)" and substituting "chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code".

(4) Section 3109(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 6101(b) to (d)" and substituting "section 6101".

(5) Section 1110(e)(2)(G) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84, 5 U.S.C. 3702 note) is amended by striking "section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act" and substituting "chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code".