

fellowship training programs or other continuing education programs; and

“(iii) foster collaboration and dissemination of information across Federal agencies, health care providers, researchers, and patient organizations.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategy under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall, as appropriate, consult with qualified stakeholder groups, including patient organizations, health care professionals, research entities, health insurance providers, accrediting organizations, and relevant Federal agencies, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the Health Resources and Services Administration.”; and

(3) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking “2020 through 2024” and inserting “2025 through 2029”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 7189, the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2024, and I urge my colleagues to support this particular bill.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation will reauthorize a national congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program at HHS for the next 5 years through FY 2029.

I am so proud to have been involved in the creation of this pivotal program and its reauthorization efforts, and I am grateful to my colleagues on this bill; Representatives SCHIFF, CARTER, SOTO, SALAZAR, and CÁRDENAS, as well as our bicameral partners, Senators DURBIN and YOUNG, and I thank them for their efforts.

I have been glad to lead the Congressional Congenital Heart Caucus with Representative SCHIFF. Over the last years, we have become all too familiar with the struggles this patient community faces on a daily basis, unfortunately.

In particular, I also thank the broad set of stakeholders that support this initiative and the thousands of advocates speaking on behalf of the approximately 2 million patients living with congenital heart defects.

This includes the Adult Congenital Heart Association, Conquering CHD, Mended Little Hearts, and The Children's Heart Foundation.

I thank them for their partnership on this issue and again for support of this bill. We have to get this done together, folks. Let's pass this in a bipartisan fashion.

Now, the advocates that come up here do an outstanding job for family members and friends that have congenital heart defects as well as the patients.

In the United States, more than 40,000 babies are born with heart defects each year, making it the most common type of birth defect.

It is estimated that more than 2 million people are currently living with a heart defect nationwide, but thankfully, they are living much longer into adulthood.

Thankfully, medical care and treatments have advanced. Individuals with heart defects, as I said, are living longer and healthier lives. Thank goodness.

This bill will continue the support for research and education regarding congenital heart disease and the impact heart defects have on individuals throughout every stage of life.

It would also require HHS to develop a strategy to address any research gaps and workforce shortages, particularly as it relates to healthcare providers who treat adult patients living with congenital heart disease.

Importantly, this strategy will be developed with the input of expert stakeholder groups and relevant Federal entities.

I urge my colleagues to support this particular bill. It is so very important, Mr. Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 7189, the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, sponsored by Representative BILIRAKIS and cosponsored by Representative SOTO. The bipartisan legislation will reauthorize a national congenital heart disease program through 2029.

In the United States, about 40,000 babies are born with congenital heart disease, or CHD, every year. Congenital heart disease prevents normal blood flow through the heart and can become a critical issue that results in a baby needing surgery or other procedures early in life.

Thanks to scientific advancements in diagnosis and treatment, many babies and children can reach adulthood living with CHD. To continue our progress, we have to continue to support research, surveillance, and awareness for CHD.

First passed in 2010, the bipartisan Congenital Heart Futures Act authorized research and data collection related to CHD.

The act expands the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's infrastructure to track epidemiological data for CHD. It also increased the National Institutes of Health's research to study lifelong CHD to see how those with the disease can still live a long and healthy life.

H.R. 7189 will reauthorize our national congenital heart disease program so we can continue to make

strides in addressing CHD. It also builds on our Nation's CHD program.

This bill will assess current research efforts at NIH to ensure we have a better understanding of CHD. The bill also expands research at the CDC by directing the agency to understand healthcare utilization, demographics, and best practices for CHD.

Finally, the bill allows CDC to establish and implement an awareness campaign so that those with CHD and their families understand the healthcare needs related to this birth defect.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Representatives BILIRAKIS and SOTO, for their leadership in reauthorizing the Congenital Heart Futures Act.

Thanks to their efforts, we can pass this bill and continue to make strides in addressing CHD.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” to reauthorize this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we support this important bill on a bipartisan basis to continue to address the Nation's CHD program effectively.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage a “yes” vote on this particular 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 Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7189, 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.

□ 1615

ONLINE DATING SAFETY ACT OF 2023

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6125) to require online dating service providers to provide fraud ban notifications to online dating service members, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6125

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 “Online Dating Safety Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. ONLINE DATING SAFETY.

(a) FRAUD BAN NOTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An online dating service provider shall provide to a member of the online dating service a fraud ban notification if the member has received a message through the online dating service from a banned member of the online dating service.

(2) **REQUIRED CONTENTS.**—A fraud ban notification under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The username or other profile identifier of the banned member, as well as the most recent time when the member to whom the notification is being provided sent or received a message through the online dating service to or from the banned member.

(B) A statement, as applicable, that the banned member may have been using a false identity or attempting to defraud members.

(C) A statement that a member should not send money or personal financial information to another member.

(D) An online link to information regarding ways to avoid online fraud or being defrauded by a member of an online dating service.

(E) Contact information to reach the customer service department of the online dating service provider.

(3) **MANNER AND TIMING.**—

(A) **MANNER.**—A fraud ban notification under paragraph (1) shall be—

(i) clear and conspicuous; and

(ii) provided by email, text message, or other appropriate means of communication consented to by the member.

(B) **TIMING.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), an online dating service provider shall provide a fraud ban notification under paragraph (1) not later than 24 hours after the fraud ban is initiated against the banned member.

(ii) **DELAY BASED ON JUDGMENT OF PROVIDER.**—If, in the judgment of the online dating service provider, the circumstances require a fraud ban notification under paragraph (1) to be provided after the 24-hour period described in clause (i), the online dating service provider shall, except as provided in clause (iii), provide the notification not later than 3 days after the day on which the fraud ban is initiated against the banned member.

(iii) **DELAY UPON REQUEST OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL.**—If, due to an ongoing investigation, a law enforcement official requests an online dating service provider to delay providing a fraud ban notification under paragraph (1) beyond the time when the notification is required to be provided under clause (i) or (ii), the online dating service provider—

(I) may not provide the notification before the end of the period of delay (including any extension of such period) requested by the law enforcement official; and

(II) shall provide the notification not later than 3 days after the last day of the period of delay (including any extension of such period) requested by the law enforcement official.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.**—A violation of this section shall be treated as a violation of a regulation under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

(2) **POWERS OF COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this section, and any person who violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(c) **ACTIONS BY STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the attorney general of a State, or an official or agency of a State, has reason to believe that an in-

terest of the residents of such State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by an act or practice in violation of this section, the State, as *parens patriae*, may bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) **NOTICE.**—Before filing an action under this subsection, the attorney general, official, or agency of the State involved shall provide to the Commission a written notice of such action and a copy of the complaint for such action. If the attorney general, official, or agency determines that it is not feasible to provide the notice described in this paragraph before the filing of the action, the attorney general, official, or agency shall provide written notice of the action and a copy of the complaint to the Commission immediately upon the filing of the action.

(3) **AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On receiving notice under paragraph (2) of an action under this subsection, the Commission shall have the right—

(i) to intervene in the action;

(ii) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein; and

(iii) to file petitions for appeal.

(B) **LIMITATION ON STATE ACTION WHILE FEDERAL ACTION IS PENDING.**—If the Commission or the Attorney General of the United States has instituted a civil action for violation of this section (referred to in this subparagraph as the “Federal action”), no State attorney general, official, or agency may bring an action under this subsection during the pendency of the Federal action against any defendant named in the complaint in the Federal action for any violation of this section alleged in such complaint.

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of bringing a civil action under this subsection, nothing in this section may be construed to prevent an attorney general, official, or agency of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general, official, or agency by the laws of such State to conduct investigations, administer oaths and affirmations, or compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(d) **ONE NATIONAL STANDARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State, or political subdivision of a State, may not maintain, enforce, prescribe, or continue in effect any law, rule, regulation, requirement, standard, or other provision having the force and effect of law of the State, or political subdivision of the State, that requires an online dating service provider to notify, prohibits an online dating service provider from notifying, or otherwise affects the manner in which an online dating service provider is required or permitted to notify, a member of the online dating service that the member has received a message from or sent a message to a banned member through the online dating service.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—This subsection may not be construed to preempt any law of a State or political subdivision of a State relating to contracts or torts.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BANNED MEMBER.**—The term “banned member” means a member of an online dating service whose account or profile on the online dating service is the subject of a fraud ban.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) **FRAUD BAN.**—The term “fraud ban” means the termination or suspension of the account or profile of a member of an online dating service because, in the judgment of the online dating service provider, there is a significant risk the member will attempt to obtain money from another member through fraudulent means.

(4) **MEMBER.**—The term “member” means an individual who—

(A) submits to an online dating service provider the information required by the provider to establish an account or profile on the online dating service; and

(B) is allowed by the provider to establish such an account or profile.

(5) **ONLINE DATING SERVICE.**—The term “online dating service” means a service that—

(A) is provided through a website or a mobile application; and

(B) offers members access to dating or romantic relationships with other members by arranging or facilitating the social introduction of members.

(6) **ONLINE DATING SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term “online dating service provider” means a person engaged in the business of offering an online dating service.

(7) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the **RECORD** on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6125, the Online Dating Safety Act of 2023, sponsored by my good friend and colleague, DAVID VALADAO.

Over the last three decades, online dating platforms have transformed the way people find their partners. According to the Pew Research Center, 30 percent of U.S. adults say they have used a dating app or site, many of whom say it has made the dating process much easier.

However, these technologies have also led to the rise of dating scams and fraud, unfortunately, and the FTC reported that romance scams resulted in victims losing \$1.3 billion in 2022.

There are countless examples of victims losing their investments and retirements. One victim was tragically driven to suicide after losing his life savings. That is terrible.

H.R. 6125 seeks to protect users of online dating platforms against harmful and fraudulent accounts by requiring platforms to send a fraud ban notification to a user who has been communicating with a suspended account or profile.

This crucial step of communication and transparency has been missing from online dating platforms. This is an opportunity to create a safety mechanism to better protect Americans from falling victim to such devastating scams.

The bill advanced out of committee with unanimous support, a bipartisan

vote of 44-0. I look forward to the bill passing the House this week. Really, we have got to take care of this. Too many people are being taken advantage of, particularly our seniors. We can't have this happen.

I strongly support H.R. 6125 and ask my colleagues to vote "yes." I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 6125, the Online Dating Safety Act. I thank the sponsors of this bill, Representatives VALADAO and PETTERSEN, for their leadership on the issue of online dating safety. I also thank Chair RODGERS for her willingness to work with me at committee to improve the bill.

As more and more consumers report using online dating services, it is important that they are made aware of potential harms. This bill ensures that when an online dating app bans someone for fraud, it notifies all the other users who have been in contact with that banned person on the app. This will help to reduce the number of people who fall victim to identified fraudsters looking to extort money from dating app users.

While there is more to be done to address harms that have arisen in the online dating space, this bill is an important step forward. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank my colleague, my coauthor, BRITTANY PETTERSEN, for her support on this. I also thank the members and staff of the committee. They have been very, very helpful in us moving this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, the Online Dating Safety Act. Each year, millions of people are deceived, defrauded, and misled by users of online dating apps.

While it is sadly common to see people lie about things like their age or occupation, this bill takes aim at the more sinister fraudsters who make their livelihoods preying on vulnerable individuals.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, romance scams resulted in victims losing \$1.3 billion in 2022 alone, with senior citizens being the most at-risk age group.

There are countless horror stories of people being conned out of their entire life savings, all because they trusted someone they met online. Individuals who meet online often take their conversations to other communication platforms, so even when the fraudulent account is removed, someone might not even know they are talking to someone who has been removed from that original platform.

This bill requires that the dating platform issue a fraud ban notification to users who have ever interacted with

the person who has been removed from the app for fraudulent activity. While we can't stop all criminals, this is a simple and important step to fill a communication gap and help people make more informed decisions about who they are really communicating with.

These apps have been around for years, but still there are few safeguards in place to protect users. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and prevent the widespread fraud.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me just say that this is an important step forward in dealing with online dating safety, and I support the bill and urge my colleagues to support it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate Mr. VALADAO putting forth this bill. We have got to do it. We have got to protect our seniors and others who use these apps. I encourage a "yes" vote on this particular 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 Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6125, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6231) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a prioritized policy issuance review process for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6231

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 "Department of Homeland Security Policy Issuance Review Act".

SEC. 2. POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW PROCESS.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) Overseeing the Department's process for review and approval of policy issuance documents.";

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (e) (relating to the definition of interoperable communications) as subsection (f); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW PROCESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Under Secretary for Management shall require a prioritized periodic review process (in this subsection referred to as the 'Review Process') of Department policy issuance documents.

"(2) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary for Management shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a briefing on the Review Process, including relating to the Department's record of reviewing and updating existing policy issuance documents. Each such briefing shall include information relating to the following:

"(A) All policy issuance documents, including, with respect to each such document, the title, policy number, revision number, issue date, and last reviewed date.

"(B) All policy issuance documents canceled in the prior year.

"(C) An explanation of the methodology used to prioritize the review of policy issuance documents.

"(D) The procedures used by the Department to track and coordinate with Department components the issuance, review, and cancellations of policy issuance documents.

"(E) The number of staff and vacancies within the Management Directorate responsible for supporting the Review Process.

"(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection the term 'policy issuance document'—

"(A) means a Department-level directive, instruction, designation, or delegation, issued in accordance with the process referred to in subsection (a)(13) or any process for issuing such documents consistent with Department policy as may be in effect; and

"(B) does not include documents—

"(i) issued in accordance with a process other than a process referred to in subsection (a)(13) or the Review Process; or

"(ii) documents published in the Federal Register.

"(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to—

"(A) invalidate any policy issuance document created on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this subsection;

"(B) serve as a basis for action to challenge the validity of such a policy issuance document; or

"(C) create any right or benefit, whether substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person in any administrative or judicial proceeding."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6231.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 6231, the Department of Homeland Security Policy