



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2018

No. 74

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 8, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Charter Schools Week. It is my pleasure to celebrate alongside the students who have benefited from these innovative institutions. Charter schools serve over 3 million students nationwide, providing students in rural, urban, and suburban settings with unique educational opportunities.

The reforms in the Every Student Succeeds Act enable charter schools to serve more students and allow States to support new, high-quality charter schools to address the growing demand for these schools. And the demand is high. Currently, 5 million students are awaiting their chance to attend. Charter schools offer American families the right to choose what environment is best for their child. It is clear that parents and students want this choice available to them, and they deserve to have it.

### HONORING SEAN VESTAL

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Sean Vestal of Winston-Salem, North Carolina. This year the North Carolina High School Athletic Association awarded Mr. Vestal the Homer Thompson Memorial Eight Who Make a Difference Award. This honor is awarded each year to one coach from each region of the State for excellence in sportsmanship, dedication, and being a student role model.

Known for his supportive relationships with athletes and using the game to teach life lessons that go beyond the court, Mr. Vestal finished his career as North Forsyth's head basketball coach after 12 seasons to spend more time with his family. However, he continues his dedication to students as the school's athletic director.

Congratulations to Mr. Vestal in receiving the Eight Who Make a Difference Award. We are fortunate to have him as an example of sportsmanship and an encouraging role model in North Carolina's Fifth District. I wish him success in his future endeavors.

### HONORING RODNEY LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Rodney Lewis, a respected member of the Gila River Indian Community, a loving father, and a committed Arizonan who made a career fighting for water rights for Indian Tribes across the country.

When he was a boy, Rod, as his friends called him, remembered watching his family survive droughts that destroyed crops, and he would listen to stories about the damming of the Gila River, which gave life to those who lived in the region.

Mr. Lewis served his country in the United States Army infantry, becoming an Army Ranger and rising to the rank of first lieutenant. After being honorably discharged, Rod went to law school at the University of California, Los Angeles, where his next chapter of service began. According to his son, Governor Stephen Lewis, Rod came home to serve his people, to bring back that education, that legal expertise that the community and many Tribes did not have, which was something extraordinary and very significant to the community—and, later on, to the entire southwestern United States.

For over 30 years, Rod not only served as general counsel to his community, but he was also sought after across the country as a preeminent legal scholar on Tribal rights, water and energy law, and Tribal gaming. He was the first Native American attorney to argue and win a case before the United States Supreme Court. He was also the first Native American attorney to be admitted to the State bar and to practice law in Arizona.

One of Rod's longest lasting accomplishments is the Arizona Water Settlements Act, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush. He led the negotiations with the Federal Government, Arizona, and more than 30 non-Indian parties for settlement of the community's water rights and claims. The legislation set aside billions of gallons of water for Arizona Tribes and helped avoid lengthy lawsuits. It also helped settle the long-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3785

lasting needs of water for the entire southern region of Arizona. I had the honor of working with Rod on important water issues and saw firsthand what his knowledge and passion did for his community and the State of Arizona.

He and his wife, Willardene, met in the first grade and raised a close-knit and passionate family. According to Governor Lewis, his mother and father were the definition of soulmates.

My heart goes out to Willardene, Governor Lewis, John, Katherine, and the whole community as they mourn their loss and celebrate the legacy of a great man.

#### HONORING THE CENTRE COUNTY 4-H ROBOTICS CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Centre County 4-H Robotics Club for winning the FIRST Robotics Competition and being the first Pennsylvania team to capture the title.

The FIRST Robotics Competition is an international high school robotics competition. Each year, teams of high school students, coaches, and mentors work during a 6-week period to build game-playing robots that weigh up to 120 pounds. The Centre County 4-H Robotics Club was 1 of 405 teams from 22 States and 7 countries to compete in the late-April event which was hosted at Ford Field in Detroit, Michigan.

Each team earned a spot in the contest based on competition performance throughout the year. This year, the Centre County 4-H Robotics Club earned its spot by winning its first regional competition at the Greater Pittsburgh Regional in March. The championship entailed 10 rounds of qualification matches in six divisions. The top eight teams in each division drafted an alliance of four robots to compete in a single-elimination playoff to determine the division champion, at which time the Centre County team joined forces with Stryke Force from Kalamazoo, Michigan; Team Rush from Clarkston, Michigan; and Lake Effect Robotics from Kingston, Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing accomplishment on many fronts. The Centre County 4-H Robotics Club has created state-of-the-art technology, they have worked together with interstate and international peers to achieve success, and they have built long-lasting career skills.

I am incredibly proud of this club, and I want to highlight each team member: Tom Sowers, Mary Davis, Tate Geiger, Hannah Strouse, Petr Esakov, James Hanagan, Nathan Tack, Thad Valentine, Griffen Josephs, Roger Nagel, Emily Christensen, Zach Jester, Lachlan Sneff, Isaiah Adu, Ben Servey, A.J. Marsala, Braydon Button, Alex Mullen, Eli Johnson, and Lee Conklin.

The club had numerous mentors and community supporters who helped them to achieve this first-place international finish. This is especially important today, on National Teacher Appreciation Day. This week we celebrate America's hardworking, dedicated, and passionate teachers, who inspire scores of students. To all of our teachers and mentors, especially those who helped the Centre County 4-H Robotics Club bring home gold at the FIRST Robotics Competition, we salute you.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly congratulate the Centre County 4-H Robotics Club on this outstanding achievement in Centre County, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the United States of America, and, quite frankly, in the world. Congratulations.

#### WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND ANTI-TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the bipartisan Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act of 2018.

I want to first recognize my good friend and Republican colead on this important legislation, Congressman DON YOUNG from Alaska, dean of the House and a longtime conservation leader. I want to thank him for his support as the original cosponsor.

I also want to thank the leading wildlife and marine conservation, whistleblower, and animal welfare groups that have endorsed the bill to date. The Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act will strengthen enforcement against poachers, traffickers, and the global trade in illegal wildlife and seafood products.

Wildlife trafficking; poaching; and illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing rank among the top global crimes, generating billions in illicit profits each year for transnational criminal organizations and extremist groups. In tackling the global wildlife trafficking trade as our bill does, Congress can help to conserve iconic wildlife and cut off illicit financing for groups responsible for human rights abuses, political corruption, and even terrorism worldwide.

Our bipartisan bill includes enforcement provisions passed by the House in November of 2015, by voice vote, which will empower Federal prosecutors and law enforcement to combat the global wildlife trafficking trade. Importantly, the bill also recognizes the critical role that whistleblowers can play in providing the actionable intelligence needed to prosecute wildlife poachers and take down trafficking rings.

By incentivizing whistleblowers on wildlife trafficking and related crimes to come forward, Congress can increase enforcement and leverage existing Federal agency resources and our legal system at no cost to the taxpayers. Our

bill also includes several provisions that will support wildlife conservation worldwide by authorizing a comprehensive international wildlife conservation program within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; also, stationing law enforcement and agency personnel in wildlife trafficking-focused countries identified by the State Department; and providing dedicated funding for wildlife, marine mammal, sea turtle, and shark conservation at no expense to the taxpayers.

I am especially pleased that our bill provides for marine wildlife species which often go overlooked but are increasingly targeted by poachers, traffickers, and illegal fishing. The bill also expands the Marine Turtle Conservation Fund to make the U.S. territories eligible for funding and to provide for the conservation of endangered freshwater turtles and tortoises. Many of the world's freshwater turtle and tortoise species could become extinct in the next few decades, and all sea turtles found in our Nation's territorial waters are listed under the Endangered Species Act.

U.S. territories are home to numerous marine turtle species, including the endangered hawksbill and the green sea turtles native to Guam and the western Pacific Ocean. Lastly, the bill builds upon the success of two laws which I sponsored: the Shark Conservation Act of 2010 and the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015.

Together with Congressman YOUNG, we have put together a comprehensive bill that advances wildlife conservation and continues American leadership in tackling wildlife trafficking and the global trade in illegal wildlife and seafood products. And we do all this with existing Federal resources, at no cost to the taxpayers.

I urge all Members of the House to join me and Congressman YOUNG in cosponsoring the Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act of 2018.

□ 1015

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. JIMMY E. JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 53-year pastoral career of Dr. Jimmy E. Jackson, who is set to retire in early June.

I first met Dr. Jackson 38 years ago in 1980. Over those 38 years, I have grown to very much appreciate and admire all that Dr. Jackson has done to improve the physical and spiritual lives of Tennessee Valley residents.

Dr. Jackson has dedicated the last 40 years of his pastoral service to the congregation of Whitesburg Baptist Church in Huntsville, Alabama. My colleagues may recall when Dr. Jackson served as a guest chaplain for the House of Representatives in April of 2015.

Dr. Jackson's walk with Christ began on October 26, 1968. That day, Dr. Jackson made the solemn decision to accept Jesus Christ as his Savior and devote his whole life to serving God.

Dr. Jackson has said that he "knew about Jesus before October 1968, but on that morning when I knew myself to be lost and turned to Jesus Christ in faith, I was converted by the grace of God."

Through 40 years at Whitesburg Baptist, Dr. Jackson has remained committed to leading people in the Rocket City and Alabama to Christ and has been integral in the spiritual life of the people of the Tennessee Valley.

Under Dr. Jackson's leadership, Whitesburg Baptist Church has grown to 7,100 members, making it one of the largest and most successful churches in the Tennessee Valley.

In Matthew 28, verses 19 and 20, Jesus instructed his disciples to "therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. . . ." Dr. Jackson has lived this Great Commission through his long pastoral career at Whitesburg Baptist and in our community and the broader Christian faith.

In addition to presiding over Whitesburg Baptist Church, Dr. Jackson served in a number of distinguished capacities, including but not limited to: the executive committee of the Alabama State Board of Missions, the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, a trustee of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and on the board of regents of the University of Mobile.

I commend Dr. Jimmy Jackson on his exceptional career and service to God. I wish Dr. Jackson many years of happiness as he begins this new phase of life with his bride of nearly 58 years, Bobbi; his children; his grandchildren; and his great-grandchildren.

**HONORING OFFICER ROBERT SHAWN PITTS OF THE TERRE HAUTE POLICE DEPARTMENT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and service of Officer Robert Shawn Pitts of Terre Haute Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on Friday, May 4, 2018.

Officer Pitts was born in Vincennes, Indiana, and dedicated his life to the security and protection of his community. He proudly served with the Terre Haute Police Department for the past 16 years and with the Sullivan Police Department for 6 years prior to joining the force in Terre Haute. He was also a member of the Special Response Team and the U.S. Marshals Task Force.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies and condolences to the family and friends of Officer Pitts, especially

his three children: Brooke, Austin, and Dakota.

Law enforcement personnel across this country go to work every day to serve and protect our communities. These brave men and women risk everything to keep our cities and our families safe and secure. Events like these are somber reminders of what heroes who stand on the thin blue line and their families sacrifice on our behalf.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Help us, this day, to draw closer to You, so that with Your spirit and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

Earlier today, we remembered the fallen heroes of our Capitol Police force: Sergeant Christopher Eney, Detective John Gibson, Officer Jacob Chestnut, and Sergeant Clinton Holtz. May their families be consoled knowing that there is no greater love than to lay down one's life for another.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY**

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families.

**APPOINTMENT OF CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 208(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 5501(a)), the Chair appoints Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon to act as and to exercise temporarily the duties of Chaplain of the House of Representatives, effective Friday, May 25, 2018.

Will Father Conroy please come forward and take the oath of office.

Father Conroy appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER**

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

**RECOGNIZING CASA FAMILIA**

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Casa Familia, a nonprofit organization in my congressional district dedicated to serving individuals with special needs.

Casa Familia was founded by eight families with special needs children, and I am proud to have known one of the founders, Lourdes Sanchez, for many, many years. They came together to solve a very real problem in south Florida: the lack of affordable, quality housing for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities, or IDD.

Sadly, close to 1 million Floridians are diagnosed with an intellectual or developmental disability and are unable to live independently. That is where Casa Familia comes in. This outstanding organization provides affordable housing solutions, vocational

training, and employment services for adults with IDD.

Casa Familia is also planning an integrated residential community that will offer a variety of recreational activities and educational programs to ensure that residents continue to grow and develop.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everyone at Casa Familia for all that they do to improve the lives of so many individuals and help them achieve their full potential.

#### COMPLIANCE ASPECT OF NUCLEAR DEAL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, there was serious deliberation, prayer, much review, the utilization of experts as the House of Representatives voted for the Iran deal of the P5+6. I remember extensive deliberations and the probing of experts on the compliance aspect of this nuclear deal.

As I speak, the President has announced a pullout—or will be announcing such, I think—with drastic consequences. It is certainly appropriate to look at bilateral agreements, but to all that have reviewed, Iran is complying with this agreement. As we approach North Korea, it will be baffling to them as we try to engage in a final agreement.

This is not about campaign pledges or your dislike for the former President of the United States. It is about the safety and security of the world and the containment of nuclear products and the utilization of such.

So I would argue that the Congress needs to stand up, make good on its commitments, protect the American people and the world from nuclear catastrophe.

#### THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as President Donald Trump is set to make an announcement this afternoon regarding the failed nuclear agreement with Iran, I want to again express my continued opposition to this deal and thank President Trump for his determination.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has revealed compelling revelations in the last week of Iranian duplicity. This was a reckless and dangerous deal from the start. It never served the interests of American families, and it continues to threaten the safety and security of our allies, especially Israel.

In just 7 years, there will be nothing stopping the Iranian dictatorship from constructing nuclear weapons as they chant “death to Israel, death to America” while they oppress the Iranian people.

In addition, President Obama authorized a cash ransom of \$1.7 billion to Iran to release five innocent Americans. This deal promoted Iran’s monetary support for terrorist groups Hezbollah, Hamas, and militias that plant IEDs to murder Americans.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK MESIAH

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend Frank Messiah, the recently deceased former longtime president of the Buffalo NAACP.

After serving in the United States Armed Forces, Frank returned to Buffalo in 1950, where he would serve in law enforcement and education and would take on discrimination cases for the State Department of Labor.

Frank left an indelible mark on Buffalo, dedicating his life to fighting discrimination. Frank was a leader passionately committed to positive change. Frank was instrumental in the desegregation of Buffalo public schools and the successful integration of the Buffalo Police Department.

Western New York is grateful for Frank’s lifetime of tireless work to advance the cause of justice and equality, the impact of which we and future generations will feel for years to come.

#### MOURNING THE LOSS OF PUERTO RICO AIR NATIONAL GUARDSMEN

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the Puerto Rico Air National Guard tragically lost nine of its finest near Savannah, Georgia.

The people of Puerto Rico, especially the close-knit family of our Air Guard, share the terrible pain and join in prayer for the families of Major Jose Roman Rosado, Major Carlos Perez Serra, First Lieutenant David Albandoz, Senior Master Sergeant Jan Paravisini, Master Sergeant Jean Audriffred, Master Sergeant Mario Brana, Master Sergeant Victor Colon, Master Sergeant Eric Circuns, and Senior Airman Roberto Espada, all fallen in the line of duty.

Like all members of the Puerto Rico Air National Guard, they are an example of the best in the long tradition of Puerto Ricans in the U.S. Armed Forces. They risked and gave their lives like many others before them, serving the Nation and a community that is shattered by their loss. We are proud of their service.

As we mourn our heroes, let’s commit ourselves to honor their sacrifice

by giving their comrades in arms the adequate resources and support to do so.

God grant our fellow warriors rest, and may His eternal light shine upon them.

#### NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Teacher Appreciation Day to praise the work of educators and school staff in Arizona and across the Nation. These men and women are shaping the lives of our children and preparing them at every educational level for a successful future.

I am married to a teacher, Mr. Speaker, and she and all teachers will tell you that there is no such thing as a former teacher; they are educators for life.

I am grateful for the teachers I have had over the years, and I am proud to stand with Arizona and America’s teachers as they demand adequate pay for the important work they do.

Investing in education will spur economic growth, create jobs in communities across the country, and allow future generations to thrive.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to support our schools, our educators, and our students.

#### LEGISLATION NEEDED FOR DIGITAL CURRENCY

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss digital currency, particularly initial coin offerings.

These innovations have outpaced regulators and the courts. Now, regulators and courts are beginning to weigh in.

Meeting with agency officials and industry leaders makes one thing clear: Making the markets work in the United States of America requires legislative certainty. Failure for Congress to act produces uncertainty, and that will drive capital and innovation offshore.

Our task is to answer questions like: How are these tokens traded? Are they securities or commodities? Who is the proper regulator? How do we prevent fraud? These are just some of the questions that need answers.

Congress needs to act by passing legislation that creates certainty and turns the United States into a market maker. I intend to lead this legislation for initial coin offerings to clarify the role of regulators, protect consumers, address national security concerns, and facilitate a pro-growth environment for businesses to raise capital here in America.

### MAKE HEALTHCARE INSURANCE WORK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago this very day that Republicans in this House voted to eliminate healthcare for millions of Americans, something we knew at that point, if it went through, would increase premiums on millions of other Americans that still had coverage. And after that vote, they all boarded a bus and went over to the White House for a big celebration.

Thankfully, that bill never became law, because had it become law, people would not have been protected with health insurance if they had a pre-existing condition. There would have been a terrible age tax imposed on people ages 50-64. It would have been a massive step in the wrong direction.

Despite the fact that that legislation did not become law, we are still seeing premium increases because of the undermining of the law of the land. The Affordable Care Act has been undermined by the Trump administration and by action by this Congress, and because of that, we are seeing premium increases again.

Forever, we heard from the other side criticisms of premium increases that were more in line with inflation in healthcare. Now, in Michigan, we see a 28-percent increase under this administration. Where is the outrage?

We ought to work together to fix the problem. The Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I am the first to admit it. Let's stop undermining the law and make it work.

□ 1215

### PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize our Nation's public servants and to thank them for their important contributions to our country.

In every community across America, Federal employees work to make sure our government is effective and keeps us safe. Their daily contributions to their fellow citizens, and to the cause of freedom, are simply immeasurable. In America's First District, there are many hardworking and dedicated patriots who serve the people of this Nation every day.

As we celebrate Public Service Recognition Week, which started on Sunday, May 6, and ends on Saturday, May 12, I want to express my utmost gratitude to the country's Federal employees, as well as our dedicated State, county, and local public servants for their tireless service. I am proud to represent the tens of thousands of Fed-

eral employees, retirees, and local and State government officials who live in the First District of Virginia.

The Federal workforce is full of dedicated and committed citizens who exemplify patriotism in everything they do. I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring them for their service to ensure the security of our Nation.

### NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, on National Teacher Appreciation Day, I rise to acknowledge the outstanding achievements of Virgin Island teachers and bring attention to the educational crisis occurring in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Ms. Michaelrose Ravalier, a teacher at Ivanna Eudora Kean High School, represented the Virgin Islands at the 2018 National Science Teachers Conference and was awarded the Maitland P. Simmons Memorial Award for New Teachers.

This is the first Virgin Islander to be a recipient of this award, yet she and her incredible colleagues, including Margot Oyake and Alenia Buncome Murraine of St. Thomas, and the other St. Croix teachers, do not have adequate funding to support their duties. The Virgin Islands Department of Education reported nearly 150 personnel vacancies and 12 shuttered schools following the hurricanes last year. Virgin Island students attend school in 4-hour shifts each day.

I urge my colleagues to work with me to ensure the educational system of the Virgin Islands receives the necessary funding to allow students to learn and prosper. The best way to support our teachers is by giving them the resources they need to teach our children.

Take time today to thank every teacher who supports our children.

### HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ROBERT BURKE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Private First Class Robert Burke from the United States Marine Corps, who gave the ultimate sacrifice 50 years ago during Operation Allen Brook in Le Nam, Vietnam. For his bravery, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. At the age of 18, he is the youngest Medal of Honor recipient from the Vietnam war.

Private Burke enlisted in the U.S. Marines in 1967, while he was still a student at Monticello High School in Piatt County, Illinois. He was sent to the Republic of Vietnam with India

Company of the 3rd Battalion, 27th Marines, where he was assigned as a machine gunner. During Operation Allen Brook on May 17, 1968, Private Burke and his company came under intense fire from the well-concealed North Vietnamese. With several of his fellow marines wounded, Private Burke spared no time. He immediately used his machine gun to launch several one-man assaults against the enemy, allowing upwards of three dozen casualties to be evacuated.

He relentlessly delivered fire to the enemy, even obtaining a casualty's rifle when his own malfunctioned. He continued to advance in defense of his brothers in arms until he was mortally wounded.

No words of gratitude can properly express how thankful the American people and the Congress are for Private Burke's selfless actions that saved the lives of so many. Private Burke gave his life for his friends and for his country. He is the truest example of bravery, and I am proud to honor him today.

### TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE ELISE YBARRA

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life, service, and legacy of Abilene Police Department detective, Elise Ybarra.

Detective Ybarra was tragically killed last August en route to a conference focused on her life's work: fighting crimes against children. She was just days shy of her 33rd birthday and left behind a loving husband and a 10-month-old daughter. Elise Ybarra represented the best of west Texas in her service and sacrifice for our community.

The Bible teaches us that, even in the most trying of times, the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness shall not overcome it. By carving Elise's name into the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, we ensure that her light will continue to shine, a beacon of valor for our entire Nation to see.

To her husband, Adam: God's peace and comfort to you, brother. To baby, Noelle: May your mom's strength and courage live on in you.

### VICTORY IN EUROPE DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 73 years ago, Nazi Germany's forces formally surrendered, marking the end of World War II in Europe.

Today, we commemorate Victory in Europe Day, or VE Day. Celebrations erupted throughout the world on May

8, 1945, to mark the end of the Second World War in Europe.

From Paris to London to New York and in small towns everywhere, people poured into the streets to join the revelry.

Old photos showed ticker tape parades and streamers galore, exciting and proud crowds were cheering the German surrender.

The war was over in Europe, and so many American GIs would return home to be with their loved ones.

It would take another 4 months and the use of two atomic bombs before Japan surrendered and World War II ended for good.

Mr. Speaker, the end of the war in Europe meant an end to nearly 6 years of war—a war that cost millions of lives; a war that destroyed homes, families, and cities; but a war that stamped out hatred and bigotry for the greater good.

VE Day is one that shall never be forgotten.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5645, STANDARD MERGER AND ACQUISITION REVIEWS THROUGH EQUAL RULES ACT OF 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2152, CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 57, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 872 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 872

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5645) to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be

separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The rule makes in order two bills reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee and a Senate joint resolution that gives this House an opportunity to utilize the Congressional Review Act to repeal the CFPB's onerous regulation on indirect auto lenders.

The first proposal we will consider today is the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2018. This piece of legislation, offered by my friend and colleague from Texas, Judge TED POE, will bring much-needed sunlight to the Federal pretrial services programs.

We will also consider legislation offered by my fellow Judiciary Committee member, Representative HANDEL from Georgia, which ensures companies entering into merger proceedings will receive equal treatment, whether their case is reviewed by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission.

Finally, the House will consider a joint resolution that will repeal the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's burdensome guidance on indirect auto lending. Senator MORAN's legislation previously passed the Senate 51-47 on March 22, 2018. President Trump has also signaled his support for this legislation.

The rule makes in order one amendment to the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules, or SMARTER, Act.

Why?

Because all other amendments offered were not germane to the subject matter being discussed in these important pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have an opportunity to debate a crucial component of the criminal justice system: federal pretrial release programs. Before the 1960s, defendants had three options to be released prior to trial. Individuals were either released upon one's own recognizance, or if they posted commercial bail, or the individual would remain in prison until his or her hearing date.

However, in the 1960s, the Johnson administration established a fourth option: pretrial services programs. These programs were originally intended to assist nonviolent, indigent individuals who did not possess the means to post commercial bail. The program captured information about the alleged offender's community ties and released low-risk individuals without financial obligations. The program only required a signature and a promise to appear in court.

While pretrial release programs were created to serve those individuals who do not pose a threat to the community and could not afford to post commercial bail, these taxpayer-funded programs have quickly expanded and overgrown their original intent.

Today, more than 300 pretrial release programs exist across the United States. These programs are being used to slowly eliminate a successful service that operates independently of Federal tax dollars: the commercial bail system.

In fact, a number of major cities across the country are exploring the potential of moving completely to a pretrial release system while significantly reducing the use of commercial bail.

However, the problem with this expansion and these federally funded pretrial release programs is that they allow violent individuals and repeat offenders to participate even when many of these defendants are perfectly capable of posting a commercial bond and have previously done so.

Offenders are not required to post any collateral for their release. There is no supervision to ensure that they show up in court on their hearing date. Worst of all, there is no incentive to prevent a criminal from committing another crime in the meantime.

If you have ever watched an episode of the popular television show "Dog the Bounty Hunter," you know that this is not how the commercial bail system works. These professionals ensure that defendants show up for trial on the correct date, or they will physically bring the individual in question to the courthouse for their hearing.

□ 1230

On top of these issues, federally funded pretrial release programs are not required to report to the Department of Justice any information regarding an offender's past criminal history, utilization of the pretrial release program, failure to appear before a court, and any other relevant compliance data. A judge is essentially releasing potentially dangerous individuals back into the community with so little as a wink and a promise that they will appear in court.

We cannot allow this practice to continue. Mr. Speaker, our constituents deserve to know whether their tax dollars are being spent responsibly.

Judge POE's bill, the Citizens' Right to Know Act, will address these significant concerns by ensuring that the Department of Justice and Congress have the information we need to determine whether these programs that receive millions of dollars from the Federal Government are operating effectively.

The legislation requires the Attorney General to submit a report to Congress annually that includes information regarding each defendant participating in a pretrial release program. The report will include the individual's name, each occasion the individual failed to appear for court, and the individual's previous arrest record.

Additionally, this proposal ensures that local jurisdictions will submit required data to the Department of Justice by establishing that any failure to produce this report will result in forfeiture of a portion of the jurisdiction's Federal grant funds for the following year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good government solution that will provide much-needed oversight for pretrial services programs and give communities an incentive to ensure we are not allowing violent repeat offenders back on the streets without the correct level of supervision.

Finally, this important legislation will also ensure that the millions of

taxpayer dollars we spend annually on those programs are being utilized in the best way possible.

We owe it to our constituents to make sure that we know how their hard-earned money is being spent. It is about time that we brought a little sunlight to these programs that allow potentially violent offenders to go free in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee also moved an important piece of legislation that will bring parity to the merger and acquisition process no matter which Federal agency takes charge of the antitrust review process.

Currently, both the Federal Trade Commission and Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice have authority to enforce section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits mergers and acquisitions that could undermine competition in the marketplace or create a monopoly. Both agencies receive notice of proposed mergers and are given an opportunity to review the transaction, while only one agency ends up taking custody of the transaction.

However, the FTC and DOJ maintain different standards when seeking a preliminary injunction against a proposed merger. This disparity manifests itself in multiple ways. However, one main difference is that the DOJ will often seek both a preliminary and permanent injunction before a district court, while the FTC has fought against this consolidation of injunctions. That means that two separate Federal agencies with two different legal standards oversee the merger process without any clear guidance determining which agency and standard will be used to examine the transaction.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue fostering this double standard surrounding merger and acquisition review. Businesses need certainty before attempting to enter into major transactions, and Federal regulatory bodies must be as transparent as possible when making decisions that can create major ripples in the country's economy.

Representative HANDEL's bill, the SMARTER Act, gives businesses certainty about how their merger will be reviewed before entering into a major deal. This important piece of legislation harmonizes the Federal antitrust review process by ensuring mergers and acquisitions will be treated identically no matter what Federal regulatory agency reviews the transaction. This bill will treat businesses in a way that will encourage continued economic growth, build market stability, and ensure the review process will be the same no matter which Federal agency reviews the transaction.

Mr. Speaker, while we are debating the topic of financial stability and economic growth, we are also here to discuss an important piece of legislation the Senate recently passed and we will consider on the House floor this week.

The House will debate S.J. Res. 57, Senator MORAN's legislation that offers

a resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act that would overturn the CFPB's onerous regulation of the indirect auto lending industry. In fact, despite being expressly prohibited from overseeing auto dealers in the Dodd-Frank financial reform law, the CFPB promulgated and issued guidance regulating the indirect auto lending industry.

To make matters worse, the CFPB tried to disguise this harmful regulation by issuing it in the form of a guidance document, which does not need to go through the typical notice and comment process. This arduous regulatory scheme sought to disrupt third-party lending, especially from small community banks and credit unions in the auto loan market. The CFPB did so by issuing guidance stating that, in order to avoid liability under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, institutions with indirect lending relationships with auto dealers must either place controls on dealer compensation or forbid dealers from offering a marked-up rate on loans.

The CFPB overstepped its statutory authority once again in what the agency described as an attempt to reduce discrimination in the marketplace. However, as Chairman HENSARLING testified before the Rules Committee yesterday, the House sent 13 letters to the CFPB questioning the rationale for the rule and science the agency used to determine that there was discrimination occurring in the marketplace. Not surprisingly, the CFPB could not point to sound science that led to this decision. In fact, new evidence shows that the CFPB's expected outcomes could be off by as much as 20 percent.

To make matters worse, Chairman HENSARLING also testified that this rule is expected to increase the per person cost of purchasing an automobile by \$586 per loan. I know that in eastern Colorado, \$586 makes a big difference. That is the difference between being able to put money aside for taking a family vacation or making much-needed home repairs.

This guidance has only resulted in removing options from consumers, reducing the ability to find affordable auto financing, and setting a dangerous precedent in how to dance around Federal rulemaking processes.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Congress takes steps to rein in the CFPB's unaccountable, overbroad regulatory powers. One agency should not have the ability to significantly curtail an entire facet of the lending market. Additionally, no agency should be able to skirt formal rulemaking procedures when issuing guidance of this magnitude.

The CFPB's indirect auto lending rules create an unworkable situation where an independent agency, manned by unaccountable bureaucrats, flagrantly ignored Federal statute to do what it thinks is best for the American people. Instead of benefiting the American people, though, this guidance

threatens to raise the cost of credit, cut back opportunity for indirect lending, and has created disincentives for financial companies to provide customers with discounted auto loans.

Congress must take this opportunity to overturn a detrimental guidance that is not only circumventing the rule of law by disguising new regulations in an effort to draw less scrutiny, but is also raising rates and providing fewer choices for consumers.

This resolution of disapproval will accomplish all of these goals. The legislation, which recently passed in the Senate 51–47, will utilize the Congressional Review Act process to overturn the CFPB's guidance while also sending a clear message that agencies should not be circumventing congressional oversight.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week, many of us spent our time in the district working, meeting with our constituents, seeing the good work that people are doing, and learning what issues people want us to take up when we return to voting.

I wish I were before you lauding the majority's leadership for finally taking up the most important and pressing work for our constituents, but, unfortunately, that is not the case. Instead, this rule brings three bills to the floor, three bills none of my constituents have been pleading for, three bills that don't require immediate action, bills that may not even see Senate consideration.

Last year, this majority set the record for the most closed rules in a session, and it seems that nothing has changed.

The first bill considered in this rule is H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act. While I understand the goal of this legislation, by attempting to improve the pretrial services programs to keep dangerous criminals off the streets, this bill fails to accomplish the real need to improve how our Nation's flawed bail systems operate. While this bill received a markup, it received no hearings and was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on a straight party-line vote. Surely, we can do better than this.

The second bill we are considering is H.R. 5645, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act, or SMARTER Act. Quite simply, this bill aims to weaken the Federal Trade Commission's ability to carry out the agency's antitrust responsibilities.

Maybe things are different elsewhere in the country, but I have not had one constituent call my office complaining about the need to weaken the FTC's antitrust enforcement abilities. No. People in southern California are more concerned about good wages, finding

affordable housing, and getting their children a good education. However, again, we will take up this legislation, which already died in the Senate last Congress. This legislation undermines the independence of the FTC and undercuts the congressional intent and purpose for the agency's creation.

There are far more important issues under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee that we should be considering instead, including bipartisan gun safety measures and legislation to protect Dreamers. However, instead of considering these very important issues facing our Nation, we are debating a bill to make technical changes to antitrust laws that, if enacted, would only be used in exceedingly rare situations.

Finally, the third legislation included in this rule is S.J. Res. 57, a Congressional Review Act disapproval resolution of a CFPB rule relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act." Unlike the other two bills included in this rule, this joint resolution hasn't seen a single hearing or markup in the House.

If the majority is fine with bringing up legislation that has yet to have a hearing, why not bring up the Dream Act?

Two weeks ago, I spoke about some of the more important issues our constituents care about, and nothing about my time back home in California changed my beliefs of what we should be working on. In fact, over the past 2 weeks, we have seen even more Members sign on to Representative DENHAM's Queen of the Hill resolution. Three more Members of the majority now support an open process.

For those who may not understand what Queen of the Hill means, it is really quite simple: let the best idea win.

If Speaker RYAN allows us, Queen of the Hill would give all the competing immigration proposals in Congress a vote on the floor. All of us would have an opportunity to vote on the four most well-known proposals: the Dream Act, Chairman GOODLATTE's bill, the USA Act, and any other bill the Speaker sees fit for a vote. This is how the House should work: an open process where we take up the most important issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule we have before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends like to claim that their tax scam bill they jammed through Congress last year, skewing all the benefits to the wealthy and rich corporations, is some sort of panacea that will eventually trickle down all of its benefits to American workers, curing all the ills in

our economy. That tired idea hasn't worked before, and it isn't working now.

But don't take my word for it. Just ask the Republican Senator from Florida, MARCO RUBIO, who said in a recent interview: "There is still a lot of thinking on the right that, if big corporations are happy, they're going to take the money they're saving and reinvest in American workers. In fact, they bought back shares; a few gave out bonuses; there's no evidence whatsoever that money's been massively poured back into the American worker."

All this Republican majority seems intent on doing is bringing up bills that benefit large banks and big businesses. When are we going to do something for workers?

As we toil on rolling back the Wall Street regulations and cutting taxes for the richest corporations, the 21st century economy is changing. Mr. Speaker, over the next decade, approximately 45 percent of all jobs will be in middle-skill occupations, which require more than a high school diploma but less than a bachelor's degree. Registered apprenticeship programs are a vital element of training for these middle-skill occupations and helping individuals contribute to an effective workforce.

A highly skilled workforce is necessary to compete in today's global economy, but this Republican majority has given working Americans a raw deal instead of extending a helping hand. Luckily for my Republican colleagues, today we will give them an opportunity to vote on legislation that will actually benefit American workers and finally help them get a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative POCAN's LEARNS Act, H.R. 2933, which would promote effective registered apprenticeships that would give students and workers the skills they need to find well-paying jobs.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule for an important resolution, S.J. Res. 57. I proudly sponsor the House companion legislation to this Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal ill-founded guidance issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau relating to the dealer-directed auto lending market.

Mr. Speaker, only to a group of unaccountable bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., would it make sense to raise the

cost of lending for some of the most vulnerable consumers while, at the same time, claiming you are doing this edict to help them.

The indirect auto lending market, also known as dealer-directed financing, is loans offered to car buyers in the dealership where they are purchasing the vehicle, as opposed to direct auto loans which consumers get from banks or other financial institutions.

Dealer-directed financing is an important option for consumers and provides them and the dealership they are purchasing the vehicle from with the flexibility to meet a consumer's needs based on their budget and credit score.

In 2013, in an attempt to shut down this market, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, under the leadership of Richard Cordray, issued this flawed guidance based on questionable "disparate impact" statistics. To justify this illegal and secretive edict, the CFPB falsely accused honest automobile dealerships and the financial institutions they work with of unproven violations of fair lending practices.

The CFPB, through its own admission, noted a 20 percent error rate in its data, and an independent audit of the data used to justify this ruling showed an error rate as high as 41 percent.

If the CFPB had followed the law, most notably, the Administrative Procedure Act, which requires public notice and comment on any pending regulations, they could have been held accountable for their use of deeply flawed data to justify a questionable regulation. To get around the law, however, the CFPB issued the ruling as "guidance," but then proceeded to enforce this mandate as a Federal regulation. Through this flawed attempt to take control of the \$1.1 trillion auto lending market by effectively barring dealer-directed financing, this Obama-era CFPB ruling could raise the cost of auto loans by nearly \$600 for each consumer.

Let's be absolutely clear: discrimination of any kind, whether in lending, housing, or other financial services, is morally repugnant and also very illegal under various Federal and State laws, including the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, or ECOA.

But what is also very wrong and illegal is when a rogue Federal agency sidesteps the law and common sense by creating a false claim of unfair lending practices with zero proof, transparency, or accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the hard work of Director Mulvaney in undoing so much of the damage caused by his predecessor, but it is critical we assist him by changing the law. Through passage of this resolution, Congress will use its Article I powers and our authority under the Congressional Review Act to strike down this flawed regulation.

Once a regulation is repealed through passage of a CRA resolution into law,

Federal agencies are barred from issuing a similar regulation in the future. Through this resolution, we can assure that this Warren-Cordray-Obama attack on automobile dealerships and their customers will never be revived by a future administration.

Just 2 years ago, a similar measure to rein in a flawed CFPB ruling passed this Chamber with overwhelming bipartisan support. I hope this continues to be a priority on both sides of the aisle, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule.

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

As I mentioned, this rule includes three bills. One of those is H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act. The Citizens' Right to Know Act fails to address the real problems in our Nation's bail system and, instead, threatens to make things much, much worse.

I don't think many of us disagree with the need to assist our local governments in keeping dangerous criminals off the streets while respecting the rights of those who may be innocent of crimes and have yet to have had their day in court. This legislation makes things worse. It threatens Federal assistance and would encourage local governments to lean more on high bail demands.

Unlike many bipartisan proposals in Congress which seek to make real improvements to bail, this bill will likely result in more low-income individuals being kept in jail simply because they aren't one of the fortunate who can afford to pay bail. This is a real issue in southern California and why I have worked with my colleagues on legislation to implement "ability-to-pay" rules to bail demands. Your income shouldn't determine your freedom.

In our community, bail was so excessive that private companies found a way to get rich off people who couldn't afford to pay the high costs. We ended up with people stuck in permanent contracts, paying hundreds of dollars a month to companies that found ways to skirt the rules of bail bondsmen.

We support greater transparency in our criminal justice system; however, this bill falls short of that goal. Rather than shedding the light on our trial system, this bill undermines Americans' privacy rights and exposes defendants to vulnerability.

The American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, has come out in strong opposition to this bill, citing privacy concerns due to the personally identifiable information that will be collected and publicly reported by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of the ACLU's position letter.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2018.

Re ACLU Opposes H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER NADLER: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), we write to express our opposition to H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2017," as the House Judiciary Committee considers this bill. This legislation raises privacy concerns for the ACLU given the personally identifiable data that is to be collected and publicly reported by the federal government. The bill also undermines efforts to eliminate or reduce jurisdictions' reliance on money bail systems. We urge the Committee to instead consider H.R. 1437, the "No Money Bail Act of 2017," and H.R. 4019, the bipartisan "Pretrial Integrity and Safety Act of 2017," two bills endorsed by the ACLU.

For nearly 100 years, the ACLU has been our nation's guardian of liberty, working in courts, legislatures, and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and the laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country. The ACLU takes up the toughest civil liberties cases and issues to defend all people from government abuse and overreach. With more than two million members, activists, and supporters, the ACLU is a nationwide organization that fights tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, DC, for the principle that every individual's rights must be protected equally under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or national origin. The Citizens' Right to Know Act is inconsistent with the ACLU's mission.

THE CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT RAISES  
PRIVACY CONCERNS

The Citizens' Right to Know Act requires jurisdictions receiving funds from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to report to the Attorney General the names, arrest records, and appearance failures for those participating in DOJ funded pretrial services programs. The legislation allows the Attorney General to make public the names, arrest records, and failure appearances that jurisdictions report. Except for a clause that subjects the data "to any applicable confidentiality requirements," the bill does not provide any explicit privacy protections for those whose personally identifiable information has been collected by the federal government and is subject to public release. The bill requires that the Attorney General penalize noncompliant jurisdictions by denying them 100% of the DOJ grant program funds that are used to support pretrial services programs.

While the ACLU appreciates the need for the federal government to collect and report data, personal privacy interests must be balanced with public interests. When personally identifiable information is being collected and publicly reported, the ACLU largely believes that such information should be obtained and disseminated only with individuals' informed consent. We also believe that the potential to harm individual reputations should be considered when arrest records are publicly shared. We are troubled that the Citizens' Right to Know Act would collect and publicly report personally identifiable information of individuals participating in pretrial services programs—individuals who have not been convicted of a crime given their pretrial status.

THE CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT UNDERMINES  
BAIL REFORM EFFORTS

The Citizens' Right to Know Act is inconsistent with bipartisan efforts to reform money bail systems, like the Pretrial Integrity and Safety Act, which the ACLU endorses. By collecting and reporting only certain data about pretrial services programs and those participating in them, the Citizens' Right to Know Act will depict a one-sided picture of pretrial services programs and participants. For example, the legislation's focus on when an individual has failed to appear promises a negative narrative around the pretrial stage. If this bill were serious about measuring the true impact of pretrial services programs, it would collect a more robust data set and not that which is of interest only to the bail bonds industry.

The ACLU supports bail reform that corrects the injustice of basing a defendant's release on how much money the person has. Instead of considering the Citizens' Right to Know Act, the Committee should take up the Pretrial Integrity and Safety Act. This legislation would incentive jurisdictions to reform their money bail systems through federal resources rather than penalize them like the Citizens' Right to Know Act, which denies DOJ grants to noncompliant jurisdictions. The Pretrial Integrity and Safety Act would build safer communities, stronger families, and a fairer criminal justice system by ensuring that people who are innocent in the eyes of the law are not deprived of their freedom because they cannot afford money bail.

For the above described reasons, the ACLU urges Members of the House Judiciary Committee against favorably reporting out the Citizens' Right to Know Act. Instead, we encourage the Committee to give serious consideration to bail reform bills through legislative and oversight hearings on the issue. If you have any questions, please contact Kanya Bennett, Legislative Counsel with the ACLU.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,  
*National Political Director.*  
KANYA BENNETT,  
*Legislative Counsel.*

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this bill fails to provide explicit privacy protections for the individuals whose personal information will be collected and subject to public release, and jurisdictions that fail to comply with these reporting requirements face the severe penalty of losing 100 percent of their DOJ pretrial services grant funding.

Not only does this bill fail to require consent from the defendants to publicly release information about their alleged crimes and their private information, but it also poses the very real threat of destroying their reputation. These individuals have not been convicted of a crime nor have they had their day in court, given their pretrial status.

These are the concerns that could have been raised if this legislation was given a full, robust debate through committee hearings.

I am disappointed that my amendment to this bill, which would have addressed one of the many abuses perpetrated by the money bail system, was not made in order. My amendment would have prohibited predatory companies from locking people into seem-

ingly lifetime contracts of monthly fees.

We can do better. These are bipartisan issues. For this reason and many other concerns I have with the closed process we are operating under, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We have before us a rule that makes three pieces of legislation in order: a bill that increases transparency for pretrial release programs, legislation that streamlines the review process for mergers and acquisitions, and a resolution of disapproval for the CFPB's harmful indirect auto lending rule.

The Federal Government's greatest responsibility to its citizens is to secure their safety and security. Congress has a duty to recognize when there is a security problem that is putting people in jeopardy, especially when it is a Federal pretrial release program that is putting potentially violent offenders onto the streets without any supervision. The American people deserve to know that their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent in the most responsible way possible. We cannot continue pushing millions of dollars into broken programs that release dangerous individuals back on the street.

Additionally, Congress has a statutory duty to ensure that businesses are not pursuing anticompetitive mergers and acquisitions. However, that does not mean that we should continue fostering the current climate that features the DOJ and FTC maintaining two distinctly different processes for reviewing these transactions. We have the unique opportunity to create certainty for businesses while harmonizing the review process with the SMARTER Act.

Finally, the House must take advantage of this opportunity to rein in the CFPB utilizing the Congressional Review Act's power to overturn harmful regulations on the indirect auto lending industry. Not only will this resolution of disapproval end a detrimental piece of guidance, but it will also send a strong message to regulatory agencies that they cannot overstep their statutory boundaries and will not get away with attempting to cloak major regulatory actions merely as guidance documents.

I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 872 OFFERED BY  
MS. TORRES

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC.4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2933) to promote effec-

tive registered apprenticeships, for skills, credentials, and employment, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC.5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2933.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member

who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

---

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES FOR COOPERATION IN PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-116)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to subsections 123b. and 123d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States for Cooperation in Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. In accordance

with section 123 of the Act, a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately. A joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of Mexico with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The Agreement contains all of the provisions required by subsection 123a. of the Act. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with Mexico based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of material, equipment (including reactors), components, and information for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It would not permit the transfer of Restricted Data or sensitive nuclear technology. Any special fissionable material transferred could only be in the form of low enriched uranium, with the exception of small quantities of material for use in samples, standards, detectors, or targets or for such other purposes as the parties may agree.

Through the Agreement, Mexico would affirm its intent to rely on existing international markets for nuclear fuel services involving sensitive nuclear technologies (i.e. enrichment and reprocessing), and the United States would affirm its intent to support these international markets and would agree to endeavor to take necessary and feasible actions to ensure a reliable supply of low enriched uranium fuel to Mexico.

The Agreement has a term of 30 years, although it can be terminated by either party on one year's advance written notice. In the event of termination or expiration of the Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any material, equipment, or component subject to the Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that such material, equipment, or components are no

longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of safeguards.

Mexico has a strong track record on nonproliferation and has consistently reiterated its commitment to nonproliferation. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has concluded a Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement and Additional Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Mexico has a strong system of nuclear export controls and has harmonized its controls with the Nuclear Suppliers Group guidelines. A more detailed discussion of Mexico's domestic civil nuclear activities and its nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices is provided in the NPAS and its classified annex.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both subsections 123b. and 123d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as provided in subsection 123b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in subsection 123b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in subsection 123d. shall commence.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2018.

---

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 872; and

Adoption of House Resolution 872, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5645, STANDARD MERGER AND ACQUISITION REVIEWS THROUGH EQUAL RULES ACT OF 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2152, CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 57, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 872) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5645) to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 177, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—226

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham     | Burgess       | Duffy         |
| Aderholt    | Byrne         | Duncan (SC)   |
| Allen       | Calvert       | Duncan (TN)   |
| Amash       | Carter (GA)   | Dunn          |
| Amodei      | Carter (TX)   | Emmer         |
| Arrington   | Chabot        | Estes (KS)    |
| Babin       | Cheney        | Faso          |
| Bacon       | Coffman       | Ferguson      |
| Banks (IN)  | Cole          | Fitzpatrick   |
| Barletta    | Collins (GA)  | Fleischmann   |
| Barr        | Collins (NY)  | Flores        |
| Barton      | Comer         | Fortenberry   |
| Bergman     | Comstock      | Fox           |
| Biggs       | Conaway       | Frelinghuysen |
| Bilirakis   | Cook          | Gaetz         |
| Bishop (MI) | Costello (PA) | Gallagher     |
| Bishop (UT) | Cramer        | Garrett       |
| Black       | Crawford      | Gianforte     |
| Blackburn   | Culberson     | Gibbs         |
| Blum        | Curbelo (FL)  | Gohmert       |
| Bost        | Curtis        | Goodlatte     |
| Brady (TX)  | Davidson      | Gosar         |
| Brat        | Davis, Rodney | Gowdy         |
| Brooks (AL) | Denham        | Granger       |
| Brooks (IN) | Dent          | Graves (GA)   |
| Buchanan    | DeSantis      | Graves (LA)   |
| Buck        | DesJarlais    | Graves (MO)   |
| Bucshon     | Diaz-Balart   | Griffith      |
| Budd        | Donovan       | Grothman      |

|                 |                 |               |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Guthrie         | Marino          | Rutherford    |
| Handel          | Marshall        | Sanford       |
| Harper          | Massie          | Scalise       |
| Harris          | Mast            | Schweikert    |
| Hartzler        | McCarthy        | Scott, Austin |
| Hensarling      | McCaul          | Sensenbrenner |
| Herrera Beutler | McClintock      | Sessions      |
| Hice, Jody B.   | McHenry         | Shimkus       |
| Higgins (LA)    | McKinley        | Shuster       |
| Hill            | McMorris        | Simpson       |
| Holding         | Rodgers         | Smith (MO)    |
| Hollingsworth   | McSally         | Smith (NE)    |
| Hudson          | Meadows         | Smith (NJ)    |
| Huizenga        | Mitchell        | Smith (TX)    |
| Hultgren        | Moolenaar       | Smucker       |
| Hunter          | Mooney (WV)     | Stefanik      |
| Hurd            | Mullin          | Stewart       |
| Issa            | Newhouse        | Stivers       |
| Jenkins (KS)    | Noem            | Taylor        |
| Johnson (LA)    | Norman          | Tenney        |
| Johnson (OH)    | Nunes           | Thompson (PA) |
| Johnson, Sam    | Olson           | Thornberry    |
| Jordan          | Palazzo         | Tipton        |
| Joyce (OH)      | Palmer          | Trott         |
| Katko           | Paulsen         | Turner        |
| Kelly (MS)      | Pearce          | Upton         |
| Kelly (PA)      | Perry           | Valadao       |
| King (IA)       | Poliquin        | Wagner        |
| King (NY)       | Posey           | Walberg       |
| Kinzinger       | Ratcliffe       | Walden        |
| Knight          | Reed            | Walker        |
| Kustoff (TN)    | Reichert        | Walorski      |
| LaHood          | Rice (SC)       | Walters, Mimi |
| LaMalfa         | Roe (TN)        | Weber (TX)    |
| Lamborn         | Rogers (AL)     | Webster (FL)  |
| Lance           | Rohrabacher     | Wenstrup      |
| Latta           | Rooney, Francis | Westerman     |
| Lesko           | Rooney, Thomas  | Williams      |
| Lewis (MN)      | J.              | Wilson (SC)   |
| LoBiondo        | Ros-Lehtinen    | Wittman       |
| Long            | Roskam          | Womack        |
| Loudermilk      | Ross            | Woodall       |
| Love            | Rothfus         | Yoder         |
| Lucas           | Rouzer          | Yoho          |
| Luetkemeyer     | Royce (CA)      | Young (AK)    |
| MacArthur       | Russell         | Young (IA)    |
| Marchant        |                 | Zeldin        |

NAYS—177

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Aguilar         | Doyle, Michael | Lofgren        |
| Barragán        | F.             | Lowenthal      |
| Bass            | Ellison        | Lowey          |
| Beatty          | Engel          | Lujan, Ben Ray |
| Bera            | Eshoo          | Lynch          |
| Beyer           | Españillat     | Maloney,       |
| Bishop (GA)     | Esty (CT)      | Carolyn B.     |
| Blumenauer      | Evans          | Maloney, Sean  |
| Blunt Rochester | Foster         | Matsui         |
| Bonamici        | Fudge          | McEachin       |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Gabbard        | McGovern       |
| F.              | Gallego        | McNerney       |
| Brady (PA)      | Garamendi      | Meeks          |
| Brown (MD)      | Gomez          | Meng           |
| Brownley (CA)   | Gonzalez (TX)  | Moore          |
| Bustos          | Gottheimer     | Moulton        |
| Butterfield     | Green, Al      | Murphy (FL)    |
| Capuano         | Green, Gene    | Nadler         |
| Carbajal        | Grijalva       | Napolitano     |
| Cárdenas        | Hanabusa       | Nolan          |
| Cartwright      | Hastings       | Norcross       |
| Castor (FL)     | Heck           | O'Halleran     |
| Castro (TX)     | Higgins (NY)   | O'Rourke       |
| Chu, Judy       | Himes          | Pallone        |
| Cicilline       | Hoyer          | Panetta        |
| Clark (MA)      | Huffman        | Pascrell       |
| Clarke (NY)     | Jackson Lee    | Payne          |
| Clay            | Jayapal        | Pelosi         |
| Cleaver         | Jeffries       | Perlmutter     |
| Cohen           | Kaptur         | Peters         |
| Connolly        | Keating        | Peterson       |
| Cooper          | Kelly (IL)     | Pingree        |
| Correa          | Kennedy        | Pocan          |
| Costa           | Khanna         | Polis          |
| Courtney        | Kihuen         | Price (NC)     |
| Crist           | Kildee         | Quigley        |
| Crowley         | Kilmer         | Raskin         |
| Cuellar         | Kind           | Rice (NY)      |
| Davis (CA)      | Krishnamoorthi | Rosen          |
| Davis, Danny    | Lamb           | Roybal-Allard  |
| DeFazio         | Langevin       | Ruiz           |
| DeGette         | Larsen (WA)    | Ruppersberger  |
| Delaney         | Larson (CT)    | Rush           |
| DeLauro         | Lawrence       | Ryan (OH)      |
| DeBene          | Lawson (FL)    | Sanchez        |
| Demings         | Lee            | Sarbanes       |
| DeSaulnier      | Levin          | Schakowsky     |
| Deutch          | Lewis (GA)     | Schneider      |
| Dingell         | Lieu, Ted      | Schrader       |
| Doggett         | Loeb sack      | Scott (VA)     |

|              |               |                |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Scott, David | Swalwell (CA) | Velázquez      |
| Serrano      | Takano        | Visclosky      |
| Sewell (AL)  | Thompson (CA) | Walz           |
| Shea-Porter  | Thompson (MS) | Wasserman      |
| Sherman      | Titus         | Schultz        |
| Sinema       | Tonko         | Watson Coleman |
| Sessions     | Torres        | Welch          |
| Smith (WA)   | Tsongas       | Wilson (FL)    |
| Soto         | Vargas        | Yarmuth        |
| Speier       | Veasey        |                |
| Suozi        | Vela          |                |

NOT VOTING—25

|                |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams          | Jones          | Pittenger      |
| Carson (IN)    | Kuster (NH)    | Poe (TX)       |
| Clyburn        | Labrador       | Renacci        |
| Cummings       | Lipinski       | Richmond       |
| Frankel (FL)   | Lujan Grisham, | Rogers (KY)    |
| Gutiérrez      | M.             | Rokita         |
| Jenkins (WV)   | McCollum       | Schiff         |
| Johnson (GA)   | Messer         | Waters, Maxine |
| Johnson, E. B. | Neal           |                |

□ 1329

Mses. HANABUSA, TSONGAS, and WILSON of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SIMPSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 169.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—227

|             |               |                 |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham     | Coffman       | Gaetz           |
| Aderholt    | Cole          | Gallagher       |
| Allen       | Collins (GA)  | Garrett         |
| Amash       | Collins (NY)  | Gianforte       |
| Amodei      | Comer         | Gibbs           |
| Arrington   | Comstock      | Gohmert         |
| Babin       | Conaway       | Goodlatte       |
| Bacon       | Cook          | Gosar           |
| Banks (IN)  | Costello (PA) | Gowdy           |
| Barletta    | Cramer        | Granger         |
| Barr        | Crawford      | Graves (GA)     |
| Barton      | Culberson     | Graves (LA)     |
| Bergman     | Curbelo (FL)  | Graves (MO)     |
| Biggs       | Curtis        | Griffith        |
| Bilirakis   | Davidson      | Grothman        |
| Bishop (MI) | Davis, Rodney | Guthrie         |
| Bishop (UT) | Denham        | Handel          |
| Black       | Dent          | Harper          |
| Blackburn   | DeSantis      | Harris          |
| Blum        | DesJarlais    | Hartzler        |
| Bost        | Diaz-Balart   | Hensarling      |
| Brady (TX)  | Donovan       | Herrera Beutler |
| Brat        | Duffy         | Hice, Jody B.   |
| Brooks (AL) | Duncan (SC)   | Higgins (LA)    |
| Brooks (IN) | Duncan (TN)   | Hill            |
| Buchanan    | Dunn          | Holding         |
| Buck        | Emmer         | Hollingsworth   |
| Bucshon     | Estes (KS)    | Hudson          |
| Budd        | Faso          | Huizenga        |
| Burgess     | Ferguson      | Hultgren        |
| Byrne       | Fitzpatrick   | Hunter          |
| Calvert     | Fleischmann   | Hurd            |
| Carter (GA) | Flores        | Issa            |
| Carter (TX) | Fortenberry   | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Chabot      | Fox           | Johnson (LA)    |
| Cheney      | Frelinghuysen | Johnson (OH)    |

Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lesko  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pausen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus

Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NOES—181

Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Ciциline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat

Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McEachin

McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suo zzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey

Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz

Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Adams  
Carson (IN)  
Clyburn  
Cummings  
Gutiérrez  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson, E. B.

Jones  
Kuster (NH)  
Labrador  
Lipinski  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
McCollum

Messer  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Renacci  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Schrader

□ 1338

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 8, 2018.

HON. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you that I will resign from the office of United States Representative effective 11:59 PM EST, Saturday, May 12, 2018. It has been a privilege to serve with you throughout my time in Congress and I thank you for your leadership and friendship throughout those years.

I wish you, and all of our colleagues in Congress, the best as you make the difficult decisions necessary to guide the nation forward and work to improve the lives of all Americans.

Sincerely,  
HON. CHARLES W. DENT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 8, 2018.

Hon. TOM WOLF,  
*Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA.*

DEAR GOVERNOR WOLF: I am writing to inform you that I will resign from my seat effective at 11:59 PM EST, Saturday, May 12, 2018.

After my family, serving the people of the 15th Congressional District in the United States Congress has been the greatest responsibility and honor of my life. I would like to thank the people of the 15th District and the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for putting their trust and faith in me to serve as their Representative. I am forever grateful.

Sincerely,  
HON. CHARLES W. DENT.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER TRAINING ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3170) to amend the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 3170

*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 “Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. DUTIES OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER COUNSELORS.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) CYBER STRATEGY TRAINING FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—  
“(A) the term ‘cyber strategy’ means resources and tactics to assist in planning for cybersecurity and defending against cyber risks and cyber attacks; and  
“(B) the term ‘lead small business development center’ means a small business development center that has received a grant from the Administration.

“(2) CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a cyber counseling certification program, or approve a similar existing program, to certify the employees of lead small business development centers to provide cyber planning assistance to small business concerns.

“(3) NUMBER OF CERTIFIED EMPLOYEES.—The Administrator shall ensure that the number of employees of each lead small business development center who are certified in providing cyber planning assistance under this subsection is not fewer than the lesser of—

“(A) 5; or  
“(B) 10 percent of the total number of employees of the lead small business development center.

“(4) CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—In carrying out this subsection, the Administrator, to the extent practicable, shall consider any cyber strategy methods included in the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 1841(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2662).

“(5) REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTIFICATION.—  
“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations and subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall reimburse a lead small business development center for costs relating to the certification of an employee of the lead small business development center under the program established under paragraph (2).  
“(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount reimbursed by the Administrator under subparagraph (A) may not exceed \$350,000 in any fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, before we get into the business at hand, I would like to thank our ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, all of our minority and majority members on the committee, and their staffs for working in a bipartisan manner to produce this strong package of small business bills.

Our committee strives to be bipartisan and an example, really, for our fellow Members. That can't be done without equal effort on both sides.

Again, I want to thank Ms. VELÁZQUEZ for always working with us—usually working with us—in a bipartisan manner, and I want to thank all the members in the committee for doing that as well.

Mr. Speaker, last week was National Small Business Week all across America. I like to call small businesses our biggest asset as a Nation. And because of the actions of this Congress and our President, small businesses are the most optimistic they have been in more than three decades.

It is vital to our Nation's economy that these small businesses succeed. As technology evolves, so must our small businesses. Just as important as the ice cream shop on Main Street is the online startup company.

We have an obligation to do everything we can to create an economy where all small businesses flourish, because a community that has successful small businesses thrives, and this is good for all of us all across the country.

This leads us to the first piece of legislation before us today.

Advances in information technology, or IT, have helped small businesses to rapidly increase their productivity, enter new markets, and offer consumers new and innovative services and products.

However, IT has advanced so quickly that it has been difficult to keep pace with the ever-growing cyber threats. Unfortunately, small businesses are becoming increasingly targeted by cyber criminals.

While larger companies have more resources to detect and combat cyber attacks, small businesses often do not learn they have been hacked until it is too late. As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, I have heard too many firsthand accounts of this occurring.

□ 1345

One story that stands out to me is the story of a small-business owner

who owned an indoor go-karting facility in Maine and had a number of employees and their families who depended on it. He told our committee that he was struck by a phishing scam. He logged on to his business account, and, to his utter disbelief, his bank account was zero. This happened on a payday, no less. So all these people, who are depending on him to pay them, his bank account is zero because some hacker got into it.

Stories like these are why Congressman EVANS and I have introduced H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act of 2017. This bipartisan and bicameral legislation would establish a cyber counseling certification program in lead small business development centers, or SBDCs, to assist small businesses with planning and implementing cybersecurity measures to defend against cyber attacks. The cyber assistance offered by trained staff at SBDCs would be provided at no cost, or low cost, to small businesses.

Cyber planning assistance will encourage small businesses to take a more proactive approach to defending themselves from cyber attacks by leveraging the expertise from SBDCs and their partner agencies and institutions, rather than being forced to react after an attack.

When provided with the right resources, small businesses can be assured that they have an effective cyber plan in place. I would like to thank Mr. EVANS for his collaboration on this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Let me take this opportunity to thank the chairman, Mr. CHABOT; his staff; and all the members of the Small Business Committee for working in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear about cyber breaches and unauthorized data collection. Cybersecurity must be our Nation's top priority, especially as it pertains to the health of our small business community.

The Small Business Committee has taken steps to leverage the Small Business Administration's network of resource partners to assist in education and development of cyber infrastructure. Clearly, we must do more to combat rogue nation-states and cybercriminals.

The key lies in a properly trained workforce at our small business development centers who are tasked in educating, developing, and implementing cybersecurity measures for small companies of all kinds.

H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act does this by creating a certification program at SBDCs to develop staff who are prepared to combat cyber attacks. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act of 2017. In today's increasingly cyber world, information technology is vital for small businesses. It equips them with the necessary tools and allows them to remain competitive in the global economy.

However, the same tools that allow small businesses to stay on the cutting edge of technology have also caused them to be increasingly targeted by cybercriminals. And, unfortunately, a simple cyber attack can destroy a small business.

According to the National Small Business Association, the average cost of a cyber attack on a small business is \$32,000. Many small businesses fear such an attack but lack the resources or the technical knowledge to prevent one. That is where H.R. 3170 comes into play.

This legislation would equip lead small business development centers with a cyber counseling certification program to educate small businesses and help them to implement a cybersecurity plan to protect their business. Due to the high cost of hiring cyber experts, many small businesses could not otherwise afford to take such precautions.

H.R. 3170 would offer cyber assistance at no or low cost to small businesses. This bipartisan bill would help America's nearly 30 million small businesses stay ahead of cyber attacks so that they are not forced to react once it is too late. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act. As a member of the House Small Business Committee, we look to find solutions to problems and address gaps in policy relating to small businesses.

H.R. 3170, which was introduced last year, is yet another example of a tool in the toolbox for small businesses and illustrates the important role that government can play in areas of cybersecurity, which continues to develop and is ripe for direction and collaboration.

This is an extremely important bicameral bill. Our small-business owners and entrepreneurs are the engines that drive people to live, grow, and succeed in our neighborhoods. We know that our small business community faces increasing cyber threats in our ever-changing global economy.

As seen by the glaring number of cyber attacks on American businesses in the past few years, it is critical that we work with the private sector to ensure that these businesses are not stifled. Many large companies have the resources to fight these attacks by cybercriminals, but a lot of small businesses just do not have the time, money, or expertise.

Every day we hear about issues relating to national security and cyber attacks. They are threats to us all. We are all a part of cyberspace, and we have to ensure that proper safety precautions are in place.

We know that small businesses are especially at risk as it relates to cyber attacks; therefore, we must ensure that all small businesses have the ability to invest in the protection needed, but we must ensure proper coordination. I look forward to working with the chairperson and the ranking member.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership in continuing to fight for small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act of 2017. Cybersecurity has become an increasing issue for small businesses, as many small firms have less time than larger firms to develop cybersecurity defense strategies, fewer staff to monitor systems, and less access to capital to purchase computer security hardware and software.

As more businesses embrace online tools, such as social media, mobile services, and cloud data storage, the need for stronger information security and cybersecurity systems has grown. Small business development centers provide important resources and business assistance programs for entrepreneurs and small-business owners.

In Kansas, small business development centers have aided hundreds of businesses across the State, many of which I visited across the district. H.R. 3170 acknowledges the importance of cybersecurity, as well as the broad reach of SBDCs, and instructs the small-business administrator to establish a cybersecurity program for SBDC employees.

Adding this training to the SBDC toolkit will allow SBDC employees to assist businessowners with cyber planning and strategy and is critical in ensuring that small businesses and entrepreneurs are able to securely compete in today's digital marketplace. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, does the chairman have any further speakers?

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers on this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, expanding access to a skilled cyber workforce focused on small businesses has been a top priority for both sides of the aisle. We cannot let our Nation's job creators go without the assistance they need to develop, implement, and monitor their online presence.

H.R. 3170 will help boost SBDC's ability to engage and protect their small-business clients, and, therefore, also protect the interests of American workers and consumers.

This legislation ensures that our national efforts combating cyber attacks can be utilized by our Nation's most vulnerable businesses. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close, and I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, America's small business development centers must have the best possible cybersecurity training so that they can better assist small businesses to detect and combat cyber attacks.

In our committee's efforts to spotlight these serious and growing threats, it has become clear that we need to think outside the box as we work to thwart cyber attacks, and the bipartisan bill before us today is a step in that direction.

I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I want to again thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member, for her leadership on this.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 3170, the Small Business Development Center Cyber Security Training Act of 2017.

H.R. 3170 amends the Small Business Act to require the Small Business Administration to establish a program for certifying employees of small business development centers to provide cybersecurity planning assistance to small businesses.

Cybersecurity threats faced by small businesses are as serious as those faced by large businesses and government agencies.

According to the Better Business Bureau's 2017 report "State of Cybersecurity Among Small Businesses in North America" found that small business owners are becoming more and more aware of cyber threats, continue to be concerned about cyber risks, and are taking some proactive security steps in spite of their unique challenges in regard to cybersecurity.

Global spending on cybersecurity is expected to reach \$170 billion by 2020 as businesses and governments work to security networks and the data they contain.

Cyberattacks in the form of ransomware, phishing, point-of sale malware, keyloggers, tech support phone scam, remote access Trojan or rat are some of the threats faced by small businesses.

According to the trade journal Small Business Trends:

43 percent of cyberattacks target small businesses;

14 percent of small businesses rate their ability to mitigate cyber risks, vulnerabilities, and attacks as highly effective;

60 percent of small companies go out of business within six months of a cyberattack;

48 percent of data security breaches are caused by acts of malicious intent, human error, or system failure; and

Small businesses are most concerned about the security of customer data.

Cyber criminals are not only interested in what may be of value on a small business computer or computing device.

Criminals can also see value in taking control of a small business' computers or computing devices to launch an attack on a third party.

These types of attacks can shield the attacker from being identified and cause problems for the small business as networks label their computing devices or web addresses as the source of an attack.

The overall impact of a cybersecurity incident according to the National Institute for Standards and Technology could include:

- damage to information or information systems;
- regulatory fines and penalties/legal fees;
- decreased productivity;
- loss of information critical to running your business;
- damage to reputation or loss of consumer confidence;
- damage to credit and loan worthiness; or
- loss of business income.

There is a growing shortage of cybersecurity professionals with over a quarter-million positions remaining unfilled in the U.S. alone and a predicted shortfall of 1.5 million cybersecurity professionals by 2019.

Solutions like the ones contained in the bill before us would increase the number of cybersecurity professionals in the Small Business Administration to serve the cybersecurity needs of small businesses.

The bill would require the SBA to have staff at their Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) receive training in cybersecurity so that they will be prepared to assist businesses with cybersecurity planning.

Small Business Development Centers provide an array of technical assistance to small businesses and aspiring entrepreneurs.

By supporting business growth, sustainability and enhancing the creation of new businesses entities, SBDCs foster local and regional economic development through job creation and retention.

As a result of the no-cost, extensive, one-on-one, long-term professional business advising, low-cost training and other specialized services SBDC clients receive, the program remains one of the nation's largest small business assistance programs in the federal government.

The SBDCs are comprised of a unique collaboration of SBA federal funds, state and local governments, and private sector resources.

SBDCs provide services through professional business advisors such as:

- development of business plans; manufacturing assistance;
- financial packaging and lending assistance; exporting and importing support;
- disaster recovery assistance; procurement and contracting aid; market research services;
- aid to 8(a) firms in all stages; and

healthcare information.

H.R. 3170, would add to this list cybersecurity planning assistance.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3170.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHANGE ORDER TRANSPARENCY FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS ACT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4754) to amend the Small Business Act to provide prospective construction contractors with information about an agency's policies on the administration of change orders to allow such contractors to make informed business decisions regarding the pricing of bids or proposals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4754

*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 "Change Order Transparency for Federal Contractors Act".

##### SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION.

Section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(w) SOLICITATION NOTICE REGARDING ADMINISTRATION OF CHANGE ORDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any solicitation for the award of a contract for construction anticipated to be awarded to a small business concern, the agency administering such contract shall provide a notice along with the solicitation to prospective bidders and offerors that includes—

“(A) information about the agency's policies or practices in complying with the requirements of the Federal Acquisition Regulation relating to the timely definitization of requests for an equitable adjustment; and

“(B) information about the agency's past performance in definitizing requests for equitable adjustments in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENCIES.—An agency shall provide the past performance information described under paragraph (1)(B) as follows:

“(A) For the 3-year period preceding the issuance of the notice, to the extent such information is available.

“(B) With respect to an agency that, on the date of the enactment of this subsection, has not compiled the information described under paragraph (1)(B)—

“(i) beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, for the 1-year period preceding the issuance of the notice;

“(ii) beginning 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, for the 2-year period preceding the issuance of the notice; and

“(iii) beginning 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection and each year thereafter, for the 3-year period preceding the issuance of the notice.

“(3) FORMAT OF PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.—In the notice required under paragraph (1), the agency shall ensure that the past performance information described under paragraph (1)(B) is set forth separately for each definitization action that was completed during the following periods:

“(A) Not more than 30 days after receipt of a request for an equitable adjustment.

“(B) Not more than 60 days after receipt of a request for an equitable adjustment.

“(C) Not more than 90 days after receipt of a request for an equitable adjustment.

“(D) Not more than 180 days after receipt of a request for an equitable adjustment.

“(E) More than 365 days after receipt of a request for an equitable adjustment.

“(F) After the completion of the performance of the contract through a contract modification addressing all undefinitized requests for an equitable adjustment received during the term of the contract.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I thank Mr. BACON for introducing this good government legislation. It is a protransparency bill, and it addresses an often overlooked problem facing small Federal construction contractors. He has been a leader on this issue, and we appreciate that very much because it is an important bill.

Our Federal Government spends billions of dollars on construction annually, an industry that is critical to rebuilding our Nation's aging infrastructure. Small businesses are the lifeblood of construction, performing in various roles across the entire supply chain.

Unfortunately, no construction project is immune to change. Contract modifications or change orders are prevalent in construction contracts—in fact, in virtually all construction contracts. The issue arises when the Federal agency delays executing a change order or issuing payment for the work completed. This leaves the small contractor responsible for financing the work out-of-pocket while also paying for overhead costs.

Extended delays in payment can result in severe financial consequences, sometimes including bankruptcy for small contractors. Agencies currently do not publish information regarding their contract modification processes

or payment records, leaving contractors basically in the dark.

Without this information, small prime contractors and subcontractors take an enormous risk every time they submit an offer with an agency that may be acting in less than good faith. Furthermore, small contractors are often unable to develop accurate bid prices if they choose to risk working with the agency.

To offset the risk of delayed or non-payment, contractors may inflate the cost of their bids, passing on these costs to the taxpayer. Due to the lack of transparency promoting a high-risk, high-stakes environment, working with the Federal Government becomes less appealing. Small contractors are leaving the marketplace in favor of private sector projects, which reduces competition.

This bill, Mr. BACON's bill, takes a critical step forward by requiring the contracting agency to disclose, in their solicitations, the details of their change order procedures, as well as a historical record showing whether change orders are resolved in a timely manner.

□ 1400

Contractors can use this information to decide, first and foremost, if they want to bid; and if so, they can formulate more realistic cost estimates and better prepare for delays in payment.

This bill, Mr. BACON's bill, should also encourage agencies to improve their own internal change order processes, making the Federal construction marketplace attractive again. Ultimately, this legislation will result in expanding the industrial base, improving transparency and government accountability, and ensuring that high-quality structures are built at a reasonable cost.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4754, the Change Order Transparency for Federal Contractors Act.

As this body seeks ways to foster small business growth and expansion, we must always carefully consider what is being done to maximize entrepreneurs' participation in the Federal marketplace.

As we all know, when small companies are awarded Federal contracts, the result is a win-win. Small businesses provide quality goods and services at affordable prices, meaning a better deal for the government and the taxpayer. At the same time, it can mean significant growth opportunity for small businesses and even the need for new employees.

Yet one longstanding barrier remains to small business participation in the Federal marketplace. The practice of contract modifications drastically delays the payment to contractors

while increasing the risk they take on, and processing change orders slows down other parts of the project, jeopardizing the ability of contractors to meet their obligations.

All of this results in significant financial burdens on contractors, often ending in bankruptcy. This is particularly true when liquidity is slim and the burden of insurance and licensures is high.

H.R. 4754 provides much-needed certainty to prospective Federal construction contractors and subcontractors so they can appropriately plan their operations before submitting their bid for Federal work. This level of transparency is vital to securing the survival of small construction contractors.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the principal sponsor of this legislation, Mr. BACON, I would like to thank my colleague STEVE KNIGHT from California for working on this as well; and also AL LAWSON from Florida, and also STEPHANIE MURPHY from Florida. So we have two Republicans and two Democrats again working together on this on behalf of small businesses all across the country, and I want to thank all four of those Members for their leadership on this on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CHABOT for his leadership for the part of our country that is the engine of our economy, small businesses, of which 47 percent of our American workers are a part. So we appreciate his leadership.

I also want to thank the ranking member for her support of this bill. I appreciate the bipartisan effort to get this bill done. In fact, they both summarized the benefits of this bill very well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4754, the Change Order Transparency for Federal Contractors Act.

This bill is a commonsense, preventative measure designed to protect small businesses from loss by providing them with critical information up front, prior to submitting a bid on a Federal construction project. Ultimately, and this is the bottom line, this legislation is about the Federal Government paying its bills on time.

Currently, small businesses are flying blind. Before they bid, they have no knowledge of an agency's change order process or history of payment. Construction is an inherently complex industry that inevitably requires changes to the original plan. Construction contractors must deal with this inevitability, but without knowledge of their customer's business practices, they cannot formulate accurate offers or sufficiently plan their operations

prior to bidding. As a result, they may unknowingly place their business in jeopardy by working with an agency with a poor track record of timely payment.

This is not a hypothetical problem. In our committee, we have heard businesses over and over again go through this problem. We have to address it. Actual businesses should not have to worry about being paid by the Federal Government on time.

While large contractors may have the resources and capital to absorb some of the loss, small businesses struggle to stay afloat as they wait for payment. In addition to financing the cost of the changed work, small businesses are forced to pay their own bills while waiting for the agency to act. This includes payroll, material costs, and even taxes. This problem is compounded and made even worse for small subcontractors, who are often the last in line to receive payment.

H.R. 4754 will provide prospective Federal construction contractors and subcontractors with the information they need prior to submitting a bid. Agencies would be required to publish, as part of their solicitation, detailed information about their change order processes and timely payment data. This information could preserve the role of small contractors as part of our industrial base by making Federal contracts more attractive to small businesses and make the process more competitive. A more competitive bidding process for Federal contractors would benefit both small businesses and taxpayers.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON), who is the lead cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4754, the Change Order Transparency for Federal Contractors Act. This is an important piece of legislation that guarantees that small businesses have the necessary information regarding change order policies from Federal agencies.

The work of the Federal Government relies heavily on the support of our Nation's small businesses. For everything from construction of important military infrastructure to guaranteeing the proper design for Federal facilities, small businesses are at the center of infrastructure for the Federal workplace.

When taking on Federal contracts, small businesses are also taking a great risk. With Federal funds not always guaranteed in a timely fashion, change orders make the work that small businesses perform for the Federal Government complicated and unpredictable.

H.R. 4754 requires agencies to outline in a clear and defined manner the policies they have regarding change orders. This will make it easier for small businesses to compete for and understand the contracts which they are awarded.

It is vital for small-business owners to not only get a seat at the table, but to also have the same vantage point when competing for Federal contracts. This legislation will alleviate red tape and open more doors for opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to work with my colleague DON BACON on this bipartisan piece of legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on the bill at this time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, it is obvious that we must take this historic step in providing transparency in the contract modification process. As we contemplate ways to bolster our infrastructure with the goal of employing millions, H.R. 4754 provides certainty to the many small firms potentially involved in that process.

By requiring Federal agencies to prospectively notify contractors of the agency processes they would be subject to if awarded a contract, the Federal marketplace is once again attainable to small construction contractors.

It is critical that this Congress work to remove barriers preventing small firms from successfully performing Federal work and getting paid for all of the work they perform.

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

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

In closing, this legislation provides a level of certainty for small businesses who contract with the Federal Government. It is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that benefits small firms and ought to improve efficiency within the Federal contracting arena.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Ms. VELÁZQUEZ for her work in a bipartisan manner on this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4754.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1680) to amend the Small Business Act to improve the women's business center program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1680

*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 “Women’s Business Centers Improvements Act of 2018”.

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.**

Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 29. WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Assistant Administrator’ means the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Women’s Business Ownership established under subsection (1).

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) an organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

“(B) a State, regional, or local economic development organization, so long as the organization certifies that grant funds received under this section will not be co-mingled with other funds;

“(C) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), unless such institution is currently receiving a grant under section 21;

“(D) a development, credit, or finance corporation chartered by a State, so long as the corporation certifies that grant funds received under this section will not be commingled with other funds; or

“(E) any combination of entities listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

“(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—The term ‘small business concern owned and controlled by women’ has the meaning given under section 3(n).

“(4) WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER.—The term ‘women’s business center’ means the location at which counseling and training on the management, operations (including manufacturing, services, and retail), access to capital, international trade, Government procurement opportunities, and any other matter that is needed to start, maintain, or expand a small business concern owned and controlled by women.

“(b) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Women’s Business Center Program under which the Administrator may provide a grant to any eligible entity to operate 1 or more women’s business centers for the benefit of small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The women’s business centers shall be designed to provide counseling and training that meets the needs of the small business concerns owned and controlled by women, especially socially or economically disadvantaged women, and shall provide—

“(A) financial assistance, including training and counseling in how to apply for and secure business credit and investment capital, preparing and presenting financial statements, and managing cash flow and other financial operations of a small business concern;

“(B) management assistance, including training and counseling in how to plan, organize, staff, direct, and control each major activity and function of a small business concern; and

“(C) marketing assistance, including training and counseling in identifying and seg-

menting domestic and international market opportunities, preparing and executing marketing plans, developing pricing strategies, locating contract opportunities, negotiating contracts, and utilizing varying public relations and advertising techniques.

“(3) TYPES OF GRANTS.—

“(A) INITIAL GRANT.—The amount of an initial grant provided under this subsection to an eligible entity shall be not more than \$185,000 (as such amount is annually adjusted by the Administrator to reflect the change in inflation).

“(B) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an eligible entity that has received a grant, the Administrator may award an additional grant of up to \$65,000, to be dispersed after the expiration of the term of the initial grant under this subsection if the Administrator determines that the eligible entity—

“(I) has agreed to obtain, after its application has been approved and notice of award has been issued, cash contributions from non-Federal sources of 1 non-Federal dollar for each Federal dollar;

“(II) is in good standing with the Women’s Business Center Program; and

“(III) has met performance goals for grant term of the initial grant, if applicable.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—The Administrator may only award additional grants under clause (i)—

“(I) during the 3rd and 4th quarters of the grant term of the initial grant; and

“(II) from unobligated amounts made available to the Administrator to carry out this section.

“(C) CONTINUATION GRANTS.—The Administrator may award a continuation grant of up to \$150,000 to an eligible entity that received an initial grant under subparagraph (A). There shall be no limitation on the number of continuation grants an eligible entity may receive under this section.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) INITIAL GRANTS AND CONTINUATION GRANTS.—To receive an initial grant or continuation grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Administrator in such form, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator may require, including—

“(A) a certification that the eligible entity—

“(i) has designated an executive director or program manager, who may be compensated using grant funds awarded under this section or other sources, to manage the women’s business center for which a grant under subsection (b) is sought; and

“(ii) meets the accounting and reporting requirements established under guidance issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for the eligible entity;

“(B) information demonstrating the experience and effectiveness of the eligible entity in—

“(i) provide counseling and training described under subsection (b)(2);

“(ii) providing training and services to a representative number of women who are socially or economically disadvantaged; and

“(iii) working with resource partners of the Administration and other entities; and

“(C) a 5-year plan that—

“(i) includes information relating to the assistance to be provided by the women’s business center in the area in which the women’s business center is located

“(ii) describes the ability of the eligible entity to meet the needs of the market to be served by the women’s business center, including the ability to fundraise to obtain the matching funds required under subsection (e)

“(iii) describes the ability of the eligible entity to provide counseling and training described under subsection (b)(2), including to

a representative number of women who are socially or economically disadvantaged.

“(2) RECORD RETENTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain a copy of each application submitted under this subsection for not less than 5 years.

“(B) PAPERWORK REDUCTION.—The Administrator shall take steps to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the paperwork burden associated with carrying out subparagraph (A).

“(d) SELECTION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In selecting recipients of initial grants, the Administrator shall consider—

“(A) the experience of the applicant in providing entrepreneurial training;

“(B) the amount of time needed for the applicant to commence operation of a women’s business center;

“(C) the capacity of the applicant to meet the accreditation standards established under subsection (1)(4) in a timely manner;

“(D) the ability of the applicant to sustain operations, including its ability to obtain sufficient non-Federal funds, for a 5-year period;

“(E) the proposed location of a women’s business center to be operated by the applicant eligible entity and its proximity to Veteran Business Outreach Centers and to recipients of grants under section 8(b)(1) or 21; and

“(F) the population density of the area to be served by the women’s business center operated by the applicant eligible entity.

“(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

“(A) RULEMAKING.—The Administrator shall issue regulations to specify the criteria for review and selection of applicants under this subsection.

“(B) MODIFICATIONS PROHIBITED AFTER ANNOUNCEMENT.—With respect to a public announcement of any opportunity to be awarded a grant under this section made by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (j)(1), the Administrator may not modify regulations issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to such opportunity unless required to do so by an Act of Congress or an order of a Federal court.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this clause may be construed as prohibiting the Administrator from modifying the regulations issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) (after providing an opportunity for notice and comment) as such regulations apply to an opportunity to be awarded a grant under this section that the Administrator has not yet publicly announced pursuant to subsection (j)(1).

“(e) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (5), upon approval of an application submitted under subsection (c), the eligible entity shall agree to obtain contributions from non-Federal sources—

“(A) in the first and second year of the term of an initial grant, if applicable, 1 non-Federal dollar for each 2 Federal dollars; and

“(B) in each year of the term of an initial grant, if applicable, 1 non-Federal dollar for each Federal dollar;

“(2) FORM OF MATCHING FUNDS.—Not more than one-half of non-Federal matching funds described under paragraph (1) may be in the form of in-kind contributions that are budget line items only, including office equipment and office space.

“(3) DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.—The Administrator may disburse an amount not greater than 25 percent of the total amount of a grant awarded to an eligible entity before such eligible entity obtains the non-Federal matching funds described under paragraph (1).

“(4) FAILURE TO OBTAIN MATCHING FUNDS.—If an eligible entity fails to obtain the required matching funds described under paragraph (1), the eligible entity may not be eligible to receive advance disbursements pursuant to paragraph (3) during the remainder of the term, if applicable, of a grant awarded under this section. Before approving such eligible entity for an additional grant or continuation grant under this section, the Administrator shall make a written determination, including the reasons for such determination, of whether the Administrator believes that the eligible entity will be able to obtain the requisite funding under paragraph (1) for such additional grant or continuation grant.

“(5) WAIVER OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by an eligible entity, and in accordance with this paragraph, the Administrator may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement to obtain non-Federal matching funds for a grant awarded under this section for the eligible entity for a fiscal year. The Administrator may not issue such a waiver for more than a total of 2 consecutive fiscal years.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to issue a waiver under this paragraph, the Administrator shall consider—

“(i) the economic conditions affecting the eligible entity;

“(ii) the impact the waiver would have on the credibility of the Women’s Business Center Program under this section;

“(iii) the demonstrated ability of the eligible entity to raise non-Federal funds; and

“(iv) the performance of the eligible entity under the initial grant.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not issue a waiver under this paragraph if granting the waiver would undermine the credibility of the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(6) EXCESS NON-FEDERAL DOLLARS.—The amount of non-Federal dollars obtained by an eligible entity that is above the amount that is required to be obtained by the eligible entity under this subsection shall not be subject to the requirements of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, if such amount of non-Federal dollars—

“(A) is not used as matching funds for purposes of implementing the Women’s Business Center Program; and

“(B) was not obtained using funds from the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(f) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) SEPARATION OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity shall—

“(A) operate a women’s business center under this section separately from other projects, if any, of the eligible entity; and

“(B) separately maintain and account for any grants received under this section.

“(2) EXAMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(A) REQUIRED SITE VISIT.—Before receiving an initial grant under this section, each applicant shall have a site visit by an employee of the Administration, in order to ensure that the applicant has sufficient resources to provide the services for which the grant is being provided.

“(B) ANNUAL REVIEW.—An employee of the Administration shall—

“(i) conduct an annual review of the compliance of each eligible entity receiving an initial grant under this section with the grant agreement, including a financial examination; and

“(ii) provide such review to the eligible entity as required under subsection (j)(3).

“(3) REMEDIATION OF PROBLEMS.—

“(A) PLAN OF ACTION.—If a review of an eligible entity under paragraph (2)(B) identifies any problems, the eligible entity shall, within 45 calendar days of receiving a copy of

such review, provide the Assistant Administrator with a plan of action, including specific milestones, for correcting such problems.

“(B) PLAN OF ACTION REVIEW BY THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—The Assistant Administrator shall review each plan of action submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 calendar days of receiving such plan. If the Assistant Administrator determines that such plan—

“(i) will bring the eligible entity into compliance with all the terms of the grant agreement, the Assistant Administrator shall approve such plan; or

“(ii) is inadequate to remedy the problems identified in the annual review to which the plan of action relates, the Assistant Administrator shall set forth such reasons in writing and provide such determination to the eligible entity within 15 calendar days of such determination.

“(C) AMENDMENT TO PLAN OF ACTION.—An eligible entity receiving a determination under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall have 30 calendar days from the receipt of the determination to amend the plan of action to satisfy the problems identified by the Assistant Administrator and resubmit such plan to the Assistant Administrator.

“(D) AMENDED PLAN REVIEW BY THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—Within 15 calendar days of the receipt of an amended plan of action under subparagraph (C), the Assistant Administrator shall either approve or reject such plan and provide such approval or rejection in writing to the eligible entity.

“(E) APPEAL OF ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR DETERMINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Assistant Administrator rejects an amended plan under subparagraph (D), the eligible entity shall have the opportunity to appeal such decision to the Administrator, who may delegate such appeal to an appropriate officer of the Administration.

“(ii) OPPORTUNITY FOR EXPLANATION.—Any appeal described under clause (i) shall provide an opportunity for the eligible entity to provide, in writing, an explanation of why the eligible entity’s amended plan remedies the problems identified in the annual review conducted under paragraph (2)(B).

“(iii) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—The Administrator shall provide to the eligible entity a determination of the appeal, in writing, not later than 15 calendar days after the eligible entity files an appeal under this subparagraph.

“(iv) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Administrator fails to act on an appeal made under this subparagraph within the 15-day period specified under clause (iii), the eligible entity’s amended plan of action submitted under subparagraph (C) shall be deemed to be approved.

“(4) TERMINATION OF GRANT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall terminate a grant to an eligible entity under this section if the eligible entity fails to comply with—

“(i) a plan of action approved by the Assistant Administrator under paragraph (3)(B)(i); or

“(ii) an amended plan of action approved by the Assistant Administrator under paragraph (3)(D) or approved on appeal under paragraph (3)(E).

“(B) APPEAL OF TERMINATION.—An eligible entity shall have the opportunity to challenge the termination of a grant under subparagraph (A) on the record and after an opportunity for a hearing.

“(C) FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—A determination made pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be considered final agency action for the purposes of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

“(5) SOLICITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity may—

“(A) solicit cash and in-kind contributions from private individuals and entities to be used to operate a women’s business center; and

“(B) use amounts made available by the Administrator under this section for the cost of such solicitation and management of the contributions received.

“(6) NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIRED.—The Administrator may only make a change to the standards by which an eligible entity obtains or maintains grants under this section, the standards for accreditation, or any other requirement for the operation of a women’s business center if the Administrator first provides notice and the opportunity for public comment, as set forth in section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, without regard to any exceptions provided for under such section.

“(g) PROGRAM EXAMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administration shall—

“(A) develop and implement an annual programmatic and financial examination of each eligible entity, under which each such eligible entity shall provide to the Administration—

“(i) an itemized cost breakdown of actual expenditures for costs incurred during the preceding year; and

“(ii) documentation regarding the amount of matching assistance from non-Federal sources obtained and expended by the eligible entity during the preceding year in order to meet the requirements of subsection (e) and, with respect to any in-kind contributions described in subsection (e)(2) that were used to satisfy the requirements of subsection (e), verification of the existence and valuation of those contributions; and

“(B) analyze the results of each such examination and, based on that analysis, make a determination regarding the programmatic and financial viability of each women’s business center operated by the eligible entity.

“(2) CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUED FUNDING.—In determining whether to award a continuation grant, the Administrator—

“(A) shall consider the results of the most recent examination of the eligible entity under paragraph (1); and

“(B) shall determine if—

“(i) the eligible entity has failed to provide, or provided inadequate, information under paragraph (1)(A); or

“(ii) the eligible entity has failed to provide any information required to be provided by the women’s business center for purposes of the management report under subsection (k)(1), or the information provided by the center is inadequate.

“(h) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may enter into a contract with a Federal department or agency to provide specific assistance to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and other underserved small business concerns, if performance of such a contract does not hinder the ability of the eligible entity to carry out the terms of a grant received under this section.

“(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The authority of the Administrator to enter into contracts shall be in effect for each fiscal year only to the extent and in the amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts. After the Administrator has entered into a contract, either as a grant or a cooperative agreement, with any applicant under this section, the Administrator shall not suspend, terminate, or fail to renew or extend any such contract unless the Administrator provides the applicant with written notification setting forth

the reasons therefore and affords the applicant an opportunity for a hearing, appeal, or other administrative proceeding under chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(1) PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A women’s business center may not disclose the name, address, or telephone number of any individual or small business concern receiving assistance under this section without the consent of such individual or small business concern, unless—

“(A) the Administrator is ordered to make such a disclosure by a court in any civil or criminal enforcement action initiated by a Federal or State agency; or

“(B) the Administrator considers such a disclosure to be necessary for the purpose of conducting a financial audit of a women’s business center, except that such a disclosure shall be limited to the information necessary for such audit.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION USE OF INFORMATION.—This subsection shall not—

“(A) restrict Administration access to women’s business center data; or

“(B) prevent the Administration from using information about individuals who use women’s business centers (other than the information described in subparagraph (A)) to conduct surveys of such individuals.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue regulations to establish standards for disclosures for purposes of a financial audit under paragraph (1)(B).

“(j) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall provide the following:

“(1) A public announcement of any opportunity to be awarded grants under this section, to include the selection criteria under subsection (d) and any applicable regulations.

“(2) To any applicant for a grant under this section that failed to obtain such a grant, an opportunity to debrief with the Administrator to review the reasons for the applicant’s failure.

“(3) To an eligible entity that receives an initial grant under this section, if a site visit or review of the eligible entity is carried out by an officer or employee of the Administration (other than the Inspector General), a copy of the site visit report or evaluation, as applicable, within 30 calendar days of the completion of such visit or evaluation.

“(k) REPORTS.—

“(1) MANAGEMENT REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of women’s business centers operated through a grant awarded under this section.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include information concerning, with respect to each women’s business center established pursuant to a grant awarded under this section—

“(i) the number of individuals receiving assistance;

“(ii) the number of startup business concerns formed;

“(iii) the gross receipts of assisted concerns;

“(iv) the employment increases or decreases of assisted concerns;

“(v) to the maximum extent practicable, increases or decreases in profits of assisted concerns; and

“(vi) the most recent analysis, as required under subsection (g)(1)(B), and the subsequent determination made by the Administrator under that subsection.

“(2) STUDY AND REPORT ON REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN.—

“(A) STUDY.—The Administrator shall periodically conduct a study to identify industries, as defined under the North American Industry Classification System, underrepresented by small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the results of each study under paragraph (1) conducted during the 5-year period ending on the date of the report.

“(1) OFFICE OF WOMEN’S BUSINESS OWNERSHIP.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Administration an Office of Women’s Business Ownership, which shall be responsible for the administration of the Administration’s programs for the development of women’s business enterprises (as defined in section 408 of the Women’s Business Ownership Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 7108)). The Office of Women’s Business Ownership shall be administered by an Assistant Administrator, who shall be appointed by the Administrator.

“(2) ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF WOMEN’S BUSINESS OWNERSHIP.—

“(A) QUALIFICATION.—The position of Assistant Administrator shall be a Senior Executive Service position under section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code. The Assistant Administrator shall serve as a noncareer appointee (as defined in section 3132(a)(7) of that title).

“(B) DUTIES.—The Assistant Administrator shall administer the programs and services of the Office of Women’s Business Ownership and perform the following functions:

“(i) Recommend the annual administrative and program budgets of the Office and eligible entities receiving a grant under the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(ii) Review the annual budgets submitted by each eligible entity receiving a grant under the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(iii) Collaborate with other Federal departments and agencies, State and local governments, not-for-profit organizations, and for-profit organizations to maximize utilization of taxpayer dollars and reduce (or eliminate) any duplication among the programs overseen by the Office of Women’s Business Ownership and those of other entities that provide similar services to women entrepreneurs.

“(iv) Maintain a clearinghouse to provide for the dissemination and exchange of information between women’s business centers.

“(v) Serve as the vice chairperson of the Interagency Committee on Women’s Business Enterprise and as the liaison for the National Women’s Business Council.

“(3) MISSION.—The mission of the Office of Women’s Business Ownership shall be to assist women entrepreneurs to start, grow, and compete in global markets by providing quality support with access to capital, access to markets, job creation, growth, and counseling by—

“(A) fostering participation of women entrepreneurs in the economy by overseeing a network of women’s business centers throughout States and territories;

“(B) creating public-private partnerships to support women entrepreneurs and conduct outreach and education to small business concerns owned and controlled by women; and

“(C) working with other programs of the Administrator to—

“(i) ensure women are well-represented in those programs and being served by those programs; and

“(ii) identify gaps where participation by women in those programs could be increased.

“(4) ACCREDITATION PROGRAM.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall publish standards for a program to accredit eligible entities that receive a grant under this section.

“(B) PUBLIC COMMENT; TRANSITION.—Before publishing the standards under subparagraph (A), the Administrator—

“(i) shall provide a period of not less than 60 days for public comment on such standards; and

“(ii) may not terminate a grant under this section absent evidence of fraud or other criminal misconduct by the recipient.

“(C) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may provide financial assistance, by contract or otherwise, to a relevant national women’s business center representative association to provide assistance in establishing the standards required under subparagraph (A) or for carrying out an accreditation program pursuant to such standards.

“(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration to carry out this section, to remain available until expended, \$21,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2022.

“(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts made available under this subsection for fiscal year 2018, and each fiscal year thereafter, may only be used for grant awards and may not be used for costs incurred by the Administration in connection with the management and administration of the program under this section.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year, the following amounts shall be available:

“(i) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, 2.65 percent.

“(ii) For the second fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2022, 2.5 percent.

“(3) EXPEDITED ACQUISITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may use such expedited acquisition methods as the Administrator determines to be appropriate to carry out this section, except that the Administrator shall ensure that all small business sources are provided a reasonable opportunity to submit proposals.”

**SEC. 3. EFFECT ON EXISTING GRANTS.**

(a) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to receive the grant under the terms and conditions in effect for the grant on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, except that the nonprofit organization may not apply for a continuation of the grant under section 29(m)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)(5)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) LENGTH OF CONTINUATION GRANT.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may award a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act, as amended by this Act, to a nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, for the period—

(1) beginning on the day after the last day of the grant agreement under such section 29(m); and

(2) ending at the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of Small Business Administration shall publish in the Federal Register such regulations as are necessary to carry out section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656), as amended by this Act. The Administrator shall accept public comments on such proposed regulations for a period of not less than 60 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1680, the Women's Business Centers Improvements Act of 2018, which was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce and who has been a very active member of that committee for quite some time now.

This legislation makes key updates to the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership and the Women's Business Center, or WBC, program.

The WBC program provides grants to over 100 nonprofit organizations across the country to provide socially and economically disadvantaged women with technical and managerial training designed to meet the needs of women entrepreneurs. Many women's business centers offer training at night, or in multiple languages, to ensure that all women have the small business knowledge, tools, and support they need when creating or sustaining a business.

Last year, WBCs trained over 114,000 clients and advised over 26,000 individuals. This training and counseling contributed to the creation of more than 17,000 new small businesses in the United States. Clearly, the Women's Business Center program has a profound impact not only in our local communities, but also on our Nation's economy overall.

H.R. 1680 authorizes the WBC program, requiring specific conditions for participation and application criteria for organizations seeking a WBC grant.

While many of these requirements have been met in practice, the inclusion of these standards in statute allows for increased congressional oversight and program confidence.

H.R. 1680 also increases the WBC grant award to reflect inflation. This minor increase provides new and existing women's business centers with the support they need to provide an effective course curriculum to small business clients.

Additionally, H.R. 1680 requires the SBA to establish a WBC accreditation program. This program, similar to the successful small business development center accreditation program, will ensure pragmatic consistency among WBC locations and guarantee that each center is providing women entrepreneurs with effective training opportunities. These updates will ensure that the funds supporting the WBC program are used efficiently and to foster economic growth.

H.R. 1680 is an important step to ensuring that the more than 11.6 million women-owned small businesses continue to grow and that the next generation of women entrepreneurs have the opportunity to pursue business creation. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1680.

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

□ 1415

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1680, the Women's Business Centers Improvements Act of 2018.

Small businesses are as diverse as our Nation, and the SBA entrepreneurial development initiatives are no different.

Women's business centers, or WBCs, are a critical initiative for female entrepreneurs. WBCs provide in-depth counseling, training, and mentoring to small firms, resulting in substantial economic impact.

Women businessowners have used this program to develop business plans, obtain financing, and expand their operations. As more women turn to entrepreneurship as a career path, it is critical this initiative remain in place to close these gaps.

Women are the fastest growing sector of entrepreneurs, and as more women establish home-based businesses, downsize from corporate executive positions, these centers are crucial in addressing the whole range of women's entrepreneurial needs.

The Women's Business Centers Improvements Act builds upon their success by creating uniformity through accreditation for WBCs and increasing maximum grant levels to ensure they have the resources to meet the growing demand for their services.

We all agree that women businessowners offer invaluable contributions to our economy, so we must step up to help them, and this legislation achieves that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, before I turn it over to the gentleman, the principal sponsor of the bill, I want to thank our colleague Mr. LAWSON for his work on this bill as well. Again, we have been bipartisan, Republican and Democrat, working together to advance, in this case, women entrepreneurs all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership. I thank Mr. LAWSON and Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for their leadership in this very, very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Women's Business Centers Improvements Act of 2018.

I introduced H.R. 1680 so that the outstanding growth our country has seen within women's entrepreneurship within the last decade can continue.

Over the last 10 years, the number of women-owned small businesses has increased by 114 percent. With women-owned firms growing more than two and a half times faster than the average business, we must recognize women entrepreneurs as a driving force in the U.S. economy.

The legislation modernizes both the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership and the SBA's Women's Business Centers program.

The Office of Women's Business Ownership administers the grant program that funds women's business centers. H.R. 1680 would require consistent standards and application requirements for grant recipients, ensuring that those centers have the ability to provide women with small business counseling and training.

The bill also institutes commonsense oversight requirements, standards for continued funding, and conditions of participation. This will increase congressional accountability and responsibility.

H.R. 1680 will allow millions of women throughout the country continued access to reliable and effective small business resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1680.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and Technology.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1680, the Women's Business Centers Improvements Act. This is a critically important piece of legislation that supports our Nation's women-owned small businesses.

Women's Business Centers support women-owned businesses through counseling and technical assistance. This

network of educational centers is the nexus for women who are either looking to start a business or looking to grow their business to the next level.

This bill clarifies the work of the Office of Women's Business Ownership within the SBA to help women entrepreneurs compete in a global market.

Specifically, there are more than 11.6 million small businesses owned by women, who employ nearly 9 million people. Further, there are roughly 5.4 million businesses owned by women of color, employing over 2.1 million people.

I am proud to work with my colleague, Mr. STEPHEN KNIGHT, on a bipartisan bill to increase the level of support for women businessowners so that we can guarantee that women entrepreneurs have the on-the-ground resources for them to strive.

I might point out that in the committee we learned that women-owned businesses are the fastest growing businesses in America.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this nonpartisan bill, H.R. 1680.

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States has over 9 million women-owned firms, over one-third of all firms. Our economy relies heavily on women-owned small businesses, as they generate over \$1 trillion in revenues and employ over 8 million workers. H.R. 1680 ensures that they have access to the tools they need to succeed.

Because nearly half of aspiring women businessowners report a lack of available mentors, we must take action to break down the barriers hindering their success. That is why it is imperative for us to pass this legislation today, ensuring access to mentorship and professional guidance to the fastest growing group of entrepreneurs.

Today's measure is endorsed by the Association of Women's Business Centers, along with other organizations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, almost 40 percent of all firms in the United States are women-owned, and over the last 10 years that number has more than doubled.

It is important to recognize women entrepreneurs as a driving force in the American economy. This legislation, I think, goes a long way in recognizing that and actually improving it over the upcoming years.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1680, 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.

#### SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1702) to amend the Small Business Act to improve the small business development centers program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1702

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

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act of 2018".

##### SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 47 as section 48; and

(2) by inserting after section 46 the following new section:

##### "SEC. 47. USE OF AUTHORIZED ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

"(a) EXPANDED SUPPORT FOR ENTREPRENEURS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall only deliver entrepreneurial development services, entrepreneurial education, support for the development and maintenance of clusters, or business training through a program authorized under—

"(A) section 7(j), 7(m), 8(a), 8(b)(1), 21, 22, 29, or 32 of this Act; or

"(B) sections 358 or 389 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to services provided to assist small business concerns owned by an Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 8(a)(13)).

"(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning on the first December 1 after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall annually report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on all entrepreneurial development activities undertaken in the current fiscal year through a program described in subsection (a). Such report shall include—

"(1) a description and operating details for each program and activity;

"(2) operating circulars, manuals, and standard operating procedures for each program and activity;

"(3) a description of the process used to award grants under each program and activity;

"(4) a list of all awardees, contractors, and vendors (including organization name and location) and the amount of awards for the current fiscal year for each program and activity;

"(5) the amount of funding obligated for the current fiscal year for each program and activity; and

"(6) the names and titles for those individuals responsible for each program and activity."

##### SEC. 3. MARKETING OF SERVICES.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(o) NO PROHIBITION OF MARKETING OF SERVICES.—The Administrator shall not prohibit applicants receiving grants under this section from marketing and advertising their services to individuals and small business concerns."

##### SEC. 4. DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking "as provided in this section and" and inserting "as provided in this section,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "; and (iv) governing data collection activities related to applicants receiving grants under this section".

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON DATA COLLECTION.—Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p) ANNUAL REPORT ON DATA COLLECTION.—The Administrator shall report annually to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on any data collection activities related to the Small Business Development Center Program."

(c) WORKING GROUP TO IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND STUDY.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish a group to be known as the "Data Collection Working Group" consisting of members from entrepreneurial development grant recipients associations and organizations and officials from the Small Business Administration, to carry out a study to determine the best way to capture data collection and create or revise existing systems dedicated to data collection.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Data Collection Working Group shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate containing the findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under paragraph (1), including—

(A) recommendations for revising existing data collection practices; and

(B) a proposed plan for the Small Business Administration to implement such recommendations.

##### SEC. 5. FEES FROM PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND COSPONSORSHIPS.

Section 21(a)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)(C)), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) FEES FROM PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND COSPONSORSHIPS.—A small business development center that participates in a private partnership or cosponsorship with the Administration shall not be prohibited from collecting fees or other income related to the operation of such a private partnership or cosponsorship."

##### SEC. 6. EQUITY FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Subclause (I) of section 21(a)(4)(C)(v) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(v)) is amended to read as follows:

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available in any fiscal year to carry out this section, not more than \$600,000 may be used by the Administration to pay expenses enumerated in subparagraphs (B) through (D) of section 20(a)(1)."

##### SEC. 7. CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 21(a)(7)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(7)(A)) is amended by inserting after "under this section" the following: "to any State, local, or Federal agency, or to any third party".

**SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON AWARD OF GRANTS TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by section 4, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “any women’s business center operating pursuant to section 29,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(q) LIMITATION ON AWARD OF GRANTS.—Except for not-for-profit institutions of higher education, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not award grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) under this section to any entity other than those that received grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) under this section prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, and that seek to renew such grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) after such date.”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section may not be construed as prohibiting a women’s business center (as described under section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656)) from receiving a subgrant from an entity receiving a grant under section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1702, the Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act of 2018, will expand the resources available to America’s entrepreneurs through the nearly 1,000 small business development centers, or SBDCs, located throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) for introducing this bill.

Over 99 percent of all businesses in our Nation are small, and those businesses employ nearly 60 million Americans. The U.S. economy depends on the success of small businesses. Providing support to entrepreneurs and small-business owners must be a priority for this Congress, and SBDCs offer that support.

Small business development centers offer low- or no-cost business counseling and training to aspiring entrepreneurs and existing small-business owners alike. The support offered at these centers ranges from creating the first business plan, commercial advertising and branding, and navigating the international trade market.

The importance of the assistance offered at SBDCs really cannot be overstated. In fiscal year 2017 alone, last year, SBDCs trained over 245,000 clients and advised over 188,000 individuals, resulting in the creation of over 14,000 new small businesses and the infusion of roughly \$5.6 billion into the American economy.

For every Federal dollar appropriated to the SBDC program, \$43.50 in new capital was generated. The legislation we are discussing today will only serve to increase the impact of SBDCs.

H.R. 1702 includes a number of commonsense updates to the SBDC program. This legislation will increase awareness of the technical and managerial training opportunities offered at centers by allowing SBDCs to market and advertise their products and services. This simple change can have a significant impact on our economy by ensuring that those entrepreneurs seeking to start or scale a business know where to turn for help.

Additionally, H.R. 1702 will strengthen the SBDC accreditation process and ensure client information remains confidential. These changes facilitate the efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars at every SBDC.

Through H.R. 1702, this legislation, we will provide greater support to the men and women throughout our country who are working tirelessly to create jobs, enhance our communities, and support our economies.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1702, the Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act.

Whether it is helping to create a business plan, navigate the procurement process, market a new product, or identify international trade opportunities, the SBA’s entrepreneurial development programs provide an array of services to help small firms navigate obstacles, grow, and thrive.

Entrepreneurs, therefore, significantly benefit from having tools to identify, fiscally plan for, and maintain critical business improvements.

Entrepreneurs located throughout the country, including in underserved rural and inner-city communities, benefit from accessible, affordable technical assistance. This reduces their isolation from buyers and other businesses.

In addition to outreach, hands-on counseling is critical for businesses to obtain information pertinent to their local market and capacities. That is why SBDCs are so critical to our local communities.

Today’s bill modernizes and strengthens the SBDC network by improving data collection, streamlining collaboration, reducing paperwork, and allowing additional outreach on marketing to be performed.

H.R. 1702 is a comprehensive bill providing necessary steps forward to advance our Nation’s entrepreneurial economic system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), a very valuable member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1709, the Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act of 2018, expands support for entrepreneurs by modernizing the statute governing the Small Business Administration’s Small Business Development Centers program.

Small Business Development Centers, or SBDCs, provide entrepreneurs and small-business owners with business counseling and training at roughly 1,000 locations throughout the country.

These centers, spanning rural and urban areas alike, have had an immense impact on the American economy. As a result of SBDC training, a new job is created every 5½ minutes, a new business is created every 30 minutes, and \$100,000 in sales is generated every 8.2 minutes.

The SBDC program is providing small-business owners and entrepreneurs with the resources they need to be successful.

H.R. 1702 further expands support for entrepreneurs by ensuring that the SBA focuses its resources and attention on congressionally authorized entrepreneurial development programs, such as SBDCs. This provision will promote operational efficiency within these programs, to the benefit of both small-business owners and taxpayers.

Additionally, this legislation allows SBDCs to market or advertise their business counseling and training programs. This will increase the impact of SBDCs by ensuring that entrepreneurs and small-business owners are aware of the resources available to them.

□ 1430

Finally, H.R. 1702 includes minor programmatic updates, including confidentiality requirements and data collection requirements that allow for the continued integrity of the SBDC program overall.

Small business development centers serve an important purpose in furthering entrepreneurship and business creation throughout the United States. H.R. 1702 allows SBDCs to continue to fulfill this purpose.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access and also a sponsor of the bill.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1702, the Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act of 2018.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman BLUM of Iowa, for working with me to help American small businesses via this critical Small Business Development Centers bill.

The small business development centers provide assistance in Philadelphia and nationwide to small businesses and aspiring entrepreneurs throughout the United States and its territories. SBDCs help entrepreneurs from Ogontz Avenue to Broad Street to realize the dream of owning a business and help existing businesses remain competitive in a complex, ever-changing global marketplace.

SBDCs are hosted by leading universities and State economic development agencies and funded, in part, through a partnership with SBA. SBA advisers provide aspiring and current small-business owners a variety of free business counseling and low-cost training centers and business development plans, manufacturing assistance, financial packaging, lending assistance, exporting and importing support, disaster recovery assistance, procurement and contracting aid, market research help and program support, and healthcare guidance.

Mr. Speaker, last week, at the Enterprise Center Minority Business Development Center in Philadelphia, run by an incredibly capable woman by the name of Della Clark, I had the honor of hosting the gentlewoman from New York, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, at a roundtable for women entrepreneurs.

I want to take a moment to thank the participants, the audience, and the community, as this is the type of collaboration necessary to ensure that we use small businesses and the SBDCs as another tool in the toolbox to help revitalize our city and remake it. Roundtables like those last week in Philadelphia are where entrepreneurs can share information, resources, and expertise, like background on small business development centers, with those who may not be aware of them.

Access to capital is key for entrepreneurs in Philadelphia that look to start new business ventures and expand existing ones. Economic development, both long- and short-term, is a by-product of small businesses receiving affordable financing to help them create jobs in their local communities.

This is an example of small business firms utilizing other financial programs, but this is where SBDCs are so critical because they help us make the connection to financing that otherwise would be missing. Traditional lending sources often ignore many communities around the country, resulting in small business utilization of other financial programs.

SBDCs began in 1976 with only eight participating universities. In fiscal year 2017, 188,225 entrepreneurs now receive business consulting, over 245,000

entrepreneurs are trained, and 14 million new businesses were created because of SBDCs.

Sometimes small businesses will utilize traditional sources such as their local banks, but many small bank owners will attest, sometimes avenues are not available, and that is where the SBA can be a lifesaver. Among the improvements we can make, we can work to make SBDCs better through the grants, loans, and other assistance to make SBDCs the garage of today, so that when an entrepreneur from North Philly has a dream, guts, and moxie to walk into one, they are not laughed at and turned away or spurned away. Let's face it: many of the people who have that dream and inspiration are not experts at spreadsheets, invoice management, and contract jargon.

This is a goal, as a member of this important committee, to ensure that any American can use the SBDC as a garage, like the Steve Jobs, Bill Gates, and Angela Riches of the world. Mr. Speaker, that is what the American Dream is all about.

I look forward to working with my colleague, Congressman BLUM, and other members of the committee. I especially want to thank all of the members of the committee working together because, when areas such as North Philly, West Philly, South Philly, Narberth, Bala Cynwyd, or Ardmore have investment and capital needs, they know where to go and whom to ask for the SBA assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, and I encourage them to vote "yes" on H.R. 1702.

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

There is no question that we need to support the cornerstone of the SBA's entrepreneurial programs, the small business development centers. H.R. 1702 does just that by updating marketing strategies and requiring more reporting so we can better understand the system provided to our constituencies.

Today's bill is endorsed by America's SBDCs, an association representing the 63 SBDC networks and their nearly 1,000 centers.

I would like to thank Representative EVANS for leading this bill and all his efforts to improve the program. I would also like to thank Halimah Locke and Veena Srinivasa for their dedicated work on this legislation.

I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) for his leadership on this and many other issues on the committee.

The small business development centers, SBDCs, serve, really, a very important purpose in furthering entrepreneurship and business creation throughout the United States. Many of the Nation's nearly 30 million small businesses have utilized the services of-

fered by the SBDCs, and this bill improves and modernizes that network.

I again want to commend Mr. EVANS for formulating this bill, pushing it through, and now taking this important step in actually entering it into the law.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1702, 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.

#### SPURRING BUSINESS IN COMMUNITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4111) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4111

*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 "Spurring Business in Communities Act of 2017".

#### SEC. 2. IMPROVING THE NUMBER OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES IN UNDERLICENSED STATES.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103 (15 U.S.C. 662)—

(A) in paragraph (18)(E), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in paragraph (19), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(20) the term 'underlicensed State' means a State in which the number of licensees per capita is less than the median number of licensees per capita for all States, as calculated by the Administrator.";

(2) in section 301(c) (15 U.S.C. 681(c))—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) shall give first priority to an applicant that is located in an underlicensed State with below median financing, as determined by the Administrator."; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) by striking clause (i);

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(iii) by amending clause (i), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

"(i) is located in a State that—

"(I) is not served by a licensee; or

"(II) is an underlicensed State; and"; and

(3) in section 308(g) (15 U.S.C. 687(g))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "and licensing" after "financing";

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (J) as subparagraphs (E) through (L), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) Steps taken by the Administration to improve the number of licensees in underlicensed States.

“(D) The Administration’s plans to support States that seek to increase the number of licensees in the State.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the geographic dispersion of licensees in each State compared to the population of the State, identifying underlicensed States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, despite an improving lending environment, small businesses still face challenges financing their projects and their growth plans. Equity markets, which are regularly used by large businesses, often prove out of reach for the Nation’s true job creators, small businesses.

To bridge the equity gap that exists for small businesses, the SBA offers the Small Business Investment Company program, also known as the SBIC program. The program utilizes a privately owned, SBA-regulated and licensed model to deliver equity to the Nation’s smallest businesses.

While running at zero cost to the American taxpayer, the SBIC program creates a unique public-private partnership that translates into job expansion and job creation.

In fiscal year 2017, SBIC financing supported more than 100,000 jobs all across the Nation—100,000 jobs, so this is an important program. However, the program can do more.

With only about 300 SBICs currently operating in the United States, the program often does not geographically extend to those who truly need it the most. To address this problem, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) introduced H.R. 4111, the Spurring Business in Communities Act of 2017, which expands the reach of the SBIC program by requiring the SBA to focus on areas that are underrepresented in the program as they review and license SBIC applications.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this particular issue.

She has definitely taken a very important and active role on it in looking for ways to expand the reach of the SBIC program.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this commonsense reform within H.R. 4111, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4111, a bill that will improve access to the Small Business Investment Company program in underserved communities.

SBICs have assisted thousands of high-growth companies over the years by “filling the gap” in the capital markets for businesses that have outgrown the SBA’s 7(a) guaranteed loan program but remain too small or too risky for traditional private equity markets to bear.

SBICs operate in a unique public-private partnership with SBA. Once managers raise enough private capital, the agency provides matching funds which are pooled together and invested in high-growth small businesses.

To maximize the impact of the program, it is essential that SBIC licenses are processed in a timely fashion and also geographically spread across the country. As it stands now, nearly three-quarters of SBICs are located in just 10 States.

Today’s bill will address these points by prioritizing those license applications from managers that will invest in our underserved communities.

The SBIC program has done a lot of good for the small business community over the years. Enabling SBA to fast-track more capital into the hands of small-business owners is a top priority for both sides of the aisle in this committee.

I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the principal sponsor of this legislation, who also has the number four ranking leadership role on the Republican side of the House.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I appreciate his leadership on all of these bills that are going to help our small businesses.

I rise today in support of my legislation, the Spurring Business in Communities Act, which would encourage investment in small businesses through incentivizing small business investment companies, or SBICs, to form and invest in communities all across the country.

Small businesses are the backbone of our community and our economy, providing two out of three new jobs in America. SBICs serve an important function in providing capital and support to startup businesses across the country and are a significant source of

job creation. A 2017 Library of Congress study found that SBIC-backed small businesses created 3 million new jobs and supported an additional 6.5 million.

According to SBA’s most recent report, SBICs reported nearly \$1 billion in financing during the fourth quarter of 2017 and created more than 16,000 jobs. Over the same period, SBICs were able to finance 210 companies across the U.S., including 25 businesses in low- and moderate-income areas, and 12 businesses owned by women, minorities, or veterans.

Many well-known companies have achieved success through support from SBICs, including Apple, Buffalo Wild Wings, Costco, and Staples.

While SBICs invest broadly in businesses across the country, the location of the firms receiving SBA backing is not geographically diverse. Instead, SBICs are primarily located in larger urban and financial centers, which only further concentrates lending and investment activity. Washington, my home State, has none. In fact, 72 percent of SBICs are located in 10 States.

□ 1445

This legislation will change that by easing the process for SBICs to form in underlicensed States like Washington, invest in people in our community, grow our local economy, and create jobs.

This legislation would increase SBA’s accountability to Congress and the public by exempting SBIC applicants from underlicensed States from the full capital requirements, give first priority to new applications from underlicensed or underfinanced States, and establish annual reporting requirements on SBA’s progress to increase the geographical dispersment of SBICs.

Last week was Small Business Week, an important reminder of the critical role small businesses play in our communities.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 declares a mission to ensure the provision of Small Business Investment Company financing to all of the country. This legislation will help meet that mission by encouraging SBICs to form in the underlicensed areas and invest in all corners of the country, which is why I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Spurring Business in Communities Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to recognize and thank Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS for her leadership on this really very important issue which will make a big difference in various parts of our country in the area of small business development and job creation. The SBIC program continues to produce results for job creators and job seekers.

To ensure the program reaches underserved areas, H.R. 4111, Mrs.

McMORRIS RODGERS' bill, institutes reforms to show how the SBA reviews and processes SBIC applications and to improve those. This legislation will grow the reach of a program that currently runs at zero cost to the American taxpayer, which is certainly a mark that we should all recognize and appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS for this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4111, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4111.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### MAIN STREET EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5236) to expand opportunities available to employee-owned business concerns through Small Business Administration loan programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5236

*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 "Main Street Employee Ownership Act of 2018".*

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

*In this Act—*

(1) the terms "Administration" and "Administrator" means the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof, respectively;

(2) the term "cooperative" means an entity that is determined to be a cooperative by the Administrator, in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and regulations;

(3) the term "employee-owned business concern" means—

(A) a cooperative in which employees are eligible for membership; and

(B) a qualified employee trust;

(4) the terms "qualified employee trust" and "small business concern" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(5) the term "small business development center" means a small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648).

#### SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF 7(A) LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "this subsection to qualified employee trusts" and inserting "this subsection—

"(i) to qualified employee trusts";

(ii) in clause (i), as so designated—

(I) by inserting "; and for any transaction costs associated with purchasing," after "purchasing";

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) to a small business concern under a plan approved by the Administrator, if the proceeds from the loan are only used to make a loan to a qualified employee trust, and for any transaction costs associated with making that loan, that results in the qualified employee trust owning at least 51 percent of the small business concern.";

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "or by the small business concern" after "the trustee of such trust";

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking "and" at the end;

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

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) with respect to a loan made to a trust, or to a cooperative in accordance with paragraph (35)—

"(I) a seller of the small business concern may remain involved as an officer, director, or key employee of the small business concern when a qualified employee trust or cooperative has acquired 100 percent of ownership of the small business concern; and

"(II) any seller of the small business concern who remains as an owner of the small business concern, regardless of the percentage of ownership interest, shall be required to provide a personal guarantee by the Administration.";

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(F) A small business concern that makes a loan to a qualified employee trust under subparagraph (A)(ii) is not required to contain the same terms and conditions as the loan made to the small business concern that is guaranteed by the Administration under such subparagraph.

"(G) With respect to a loan made to a qualified employee trust under this paragraph, or to a cooperative in accordance with paragraph (35), the Administrator may, as deemed appropriate, elect to not require any mandatory equity to be provided by the qualified employee trust or cooperative to make the loan.";

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(35) LOANS TO COOPERATIVES.—

"(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'cooperative' means an entity that is determined to be a cooperative by the Administrator, in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and regulation.

"(B) AUTHORITY.—The Administration shall guarantee loans made to a cooperative for the purpose described in paragraph (15)."

(b) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO PREFERRED LENDERS.—Section 5(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 634(b)(7)) is amended by inserting "including loans guaranteed under paragraph (15) or (35) of section 7(a)" after "deferred participation loans".

#### SEC. 4. SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM OUTREACH.

The Administrator shall provide outreach and educational materials to companies licensed under section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681(c)) to increase the use of funds to make investments in company transitions to employee-owned business concerns.

#### SEC. 5. SMALL BUSINESS MICROLOAN PROGRAM OUTREACH.

The Administrator shall provide outreach and educational materials to intermediaries under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) to increase the use of funds to make loans to employee-owned business concerns, including transitions to employee-owned business concerns.

#### SEC. 6. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall establish a Small Business Employee Ownership and Cooperatives Promotion Program to offer

technical assistance and training on the transition to employee ownership through cooperatives and qualified employee trusts.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Administrator shall enter into agreements with small business development centers under which the centers shall—

(A) provide access to information and resources on employee ownership through cooperatives or qualified employee trusts as a business succession strategy;

(B) conduct training and educational activities; and

(C) carry out the activities described in subparagraph (U) of section 21(c)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)).

(2) ADDITIONAL SERVICES.—Section 21(c)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (S), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (T), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(U) encouraging and assisting the provision of succession planning to small business concerns with a focus on transitioning to cooperatives, as defined in section 7(a)(35), and qualified employee trusts (collectively referred to in this subparagraph as 'employee-owned business concerns'), including by—

"(i) providing training to individuals to promote the successful management, governance, or operation of a business purchased by those individuals in the formation of an employee-owned business concern;

"(ii) assisting employee-owned business concerns that meet applicable size standards established under section 3(a) with education and technical assistance with respect to financing and contracting programs administered by the Administration;

"(iii) coordinating with lenders on conducting outreach on financing through programs administered by the Administration that may be used to support the transition of ownership to employees;

"(iv) supporting small business concerns in exploring or assessing the possibility of transitioning to an employee-owned business concern; and

"(v) coordinating with the cooperative development centers of the Department of Agriculture, the land grant extension network, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, community development financial institutions, employee ownership associations and service providers, and local, regional and national cooperative associations.".

#### SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator (or a designee of the Administrator) shall coordinate and chair an interagency working group, which shall—

(1) develop recommendations on how Federal programs can promote, support, and increase the number of employee-owned business concerns;

(2) ensure coordination with Federal agencies and national and local employee ownership, cooperative, and small business organizations; and

(3) publish a report on the activities of the interagency working group that is indexed and maintained for public review.

(b) MEETINGS.—The interagency working group shall meet at such times as determined necessary by the, but not less than biannually. Such meetings may occur in person or via electronic resources.

#### SEC. 8. AMENDMENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS ON STATUS OF EMPLOYEE-OWNED FIRMS.

Section 7(a)(15)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(15)(E)) is amended by striking

“Administration.” and inserting “Administration, which shall include—

“(i) the total number of loans made to employee-owned business concerns that were guaranteed by the Administrator under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) or section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696), including the number of loans made—

“(I) to small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals; and

“(II) to cooperatives in which employees are eligible for membership;

“(ii) the total number of financings made to employee-owned business concerns by companies licensed under section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696(c)), including the number of financings made—

“(I) to small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals; and

“(II) to cooperatives in which employees are eligible for membership; and

“(iii) any outreach and educational activities conducted by the Administration with respect to employee-owned business concerns.”.

#### SEC. 9. REPORT ON COOPERATIVE LENDING.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that cooperatives have a unique business structure and are unable to access the lending programs of the Administration effectively due to loan guarantee requirements that are incompatible with the business structure of cooperatives.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Administrator, in coordination with lenders, stakeholders, and Federal agencies, shall study and recommend practical alternatives for cooperatives that will satisfy the loan guarantee requirements of the Administration.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) and a plan to implement such recommendations.

#### SEC. 10. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE TRUST.

Section 3(c)(2)(A)(ii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(c)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) which provides that each participant is entitled to direct the plan trustee as to the manner of how to vote the qualified employer securities (as defined in section 4975(e)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), which are allocated to the account of such participant with respect to a corporate matter which (by law or charter) must be decided by a vote conducted in accordance with section 409(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, ownership structures of businesses come in numerous shapes

and sizes. Whether they follow a traditional model or an employee-owned structure, small businesses across the Nation continue to face a difficult lending environment.

Although the SBA bridges the gap for many of the Nation's small firms, 100-percent-employee-owned firms face uncertainty as they navigate the SBA's 7(a) Loan Program.

To strengthen the 7(a) Loan Program for employee-owned small businesses and worker cooperatives, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ introduced H.R. 5236, the Main Street Employee Ownership Act of 2018.

In order to provide clarity for program participants, H.R. 5236 would update reporting statistics to ensure accurate data is captured.

The bill also codifies ownership transition plans.

Additionally, H.R. 5236 requires the SBA's resource partners to have educational material available to explain the nuances of these uniquely structured businesses.

Although the requirements for personal guarantees within the 7(a) Loan Program prove challenging to some of these business structures, H.R. 5236 importantly preserves this hallmark and requires the SBA to work with industry representatives to develop ways to satisfy the guarantee while reducing its burdens.

Employee-owned small businesses are an important part of the small business ecosystem. We must continue to streamline the processes and procedures in place at the SBA for all small businesses. H.R. 5236, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ's legislation, is a step in the right direction that provides clarity for employee-owned small businesses and worker cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, who has spearheaded this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 5236, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5236, the Main Street Employee Ownership Act, a commonsense measure to improve SBA's lending and training programs to enable employees to purchase the companies they work for.

As baby boomers near retirement, the country faces a substantial dilemma: Roughly half of privately held companies are owned by baby boomers, and fewer than 15 percent have a formal exit plan in place. And while it is wonderful to think that family members will take over the business, this is a relatively rare occurrence. Some will be bought out; others will close. This will have significant secondary economic impacts that will ripple through our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working with Senator GILLIBRAND's office to help address this looming problem.

The bill before us will reward workers and invest in our Main Street econ-

omy by improving the lending landscape for employee-owned businesses, such as employee stock ownership plans and co-ops.

There are 7,000 such companies in existence all over the Nation, contributing to our local communities and economies. However, businesses seeking to transition to employee-owned status face difficulty in obtaining adequate capital to cover the oftentimes prohibitive costs.

The SBA was authorized to loan to ESOPs in 1979. Unfortunately, this tool has rarely been used due to misunderstanding of the business structure and cumbersome transition requirements.

This bill seeks to align common industry practices with SBA protocols to encourage more lending to ESOPs and co-ops. By codifying current SBA standards of practice and easing some burdensome guarantee restrictions, it is my hope we will keep local enterprises in their communities, saving jobs along the way and preventing economic dislocation for many workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5236, the Main Street Employment Act of 2018, that will help employee-owned companies.

Employee ownership is an important part of helping workers build wealth. In addition to the income gap in this country, we also have a wealth gap. When a company does well, everybody should do well, not just the investors.

This bill helps promote employee-owned businesses by making changes to the Small Business Administration's loan program that helps employee-owned businesses access capital. It is currently a barrier in the rules that actually gives a disadvantage to employee-owned businesses, when, as a society, as a Nation, we should be encouraging employee ownership.

The SBA Loan Guarantee Program is often the only financing that many small businesses can get early on to get off the ground. This bill would open up SBA lending for cooperatives, which we often call co-ops, and also strengthens the lending program for ESOPs, which is another form of employee-owned company.

There is a very successful ESOP in the district I am honored to represent called New Belgium Brewery that makes among the best beer in the world.

This bill also creates a small business employee ownership and cooperative program, which helps employers and employees understand how to create employee-owned businesses, providing some of the help for succession planning, coordinating with other programs

to help employee-owned businesses succeed.

Employee-owned businesses are anchor businesses in our communities. They provide good, stable jobs and help employees build value and wealth over time and participate in the governance of the company. They align the incentives of workers with owners and management and are good for overall economic productivity as well.

This bill builds on the bipartisan language that I helped secure in the omnibus appropriations bill directing the SBA to encourage employee ownership. Passing this bill will make those changes in the 1-year spending bill that expires September 30 permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this very important piece of bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we need to support our Main Street small businesses, especially those that fall outside of traditional business structures. H.R. 5236 does just that by requiring more training and clarifying lending protocols.

Today's bill is endorsed by at least 25 organizations, including America's SBDCs, the American Sustainable Business Council, the Association for Enterprise Opportunity, ESCA, and a variety of co-ops and employee-owner associations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Justin Pelletier and Jon Cardinal for their tireless work on this complex topic.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that employee-owned businesses really populate the streets and neighborhoods of many cities across this Nation. They are unique in form but face many of the same hurdles that other small businesses face.

H.R. 5236 streamlines how employee-owned businesses operate under the important rules of the SBA 7(a) Loan Program. While preserving important characteristics of the program, H.R. 5236 will help employee-owned businesses as they seek capital to grow, expand, and create much-needed jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank and commend the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for her leadership on this legislation.

I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5236, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5236, 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.

### SMALL BUSINESS 7(A) LENDING OVERSIGHT REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4743) to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4743

*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 "Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "Administration" and "Administrator" mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof, respectively.

#### SEC. 3. CODIFICATION OF THE OFFICE OF CREDIT RISK MANAGEMENT AND THE LENDER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 47 as section 49; and

(2) by inserting after section 46 the following new sections:

##### "SEC. 47. OFFICE OF CREDIT RISK MANAGEMENT.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Administration the Office of Credit Risk Management (in this section referred to as the 'Office').

"(b) DUTIES.—The Office shall be responsible for supervising—

"(1) any lender making loans under section 7(a) (in this section referred to as a '7(a) lender');

"(2) any Lending Partner or Intermediary participant of the Administration in a lending program of the Office of Capital Access of the Administration; and

"(3) any small business lending company or a non-Federally regulated lender without regard to the requirements of section 23.

"(c) DIRECTOR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall be headed by the Director of the Office of Credit Risk Management (in this section referred to as the 'Director'), who shall be a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service (as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code).

"(2) DUTIES.—The Director shall be responsible for oversight of the lenders and participants described in subsection (b), including by conducting periodic reviews of the compliance and performance of such lenders and participants.

"(d) SUPERVISION DUTIES FOR 7(A) LENDERS.—With respect to 7(a) lenders, an employee of the Office shall—

"(1) be present for and supervise any such review that is conducted by a contractor of the Office on the premise of the 7(a) lender; and

"(2) supervise any such review that is not conducted on the premise of the 7(a) lender.

"(e) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY AGAINST 7(A) LENDERS.—

"(1) INFORMAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Director may take an informal enforcement action against a 7(a) lender if the Director finds that the 7(a) lender has violated a statutory or regulatory requirement under

section 7(a) or any requirement in a Standard Operating Procedures Manual or Policy Notice related to a program or function of the Office of Capital Access.

"(2) FORMAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—With the approval of the Lender Oversight Committee established under section 48, the Director may take a formal enforcement action against any 7(a) lender if the Director finds that the 7(a) lender has violated—

"(i) a statutory or regulatory requirement under section 7(a), including a requirement relating to credit elsewhere; or

"(ii) any requirement described in a Standard Operating Procedures Manual or Policy Notice, related to a program or function of the Office of Capital Access.

"(B) ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—An enforcement action imposed on a 7(a) lender by the Director under subparagraph (A) shall be based on the severity or frequency of the violation and may include assessing a civil monetary penalty against the 7(a) lender in an amount that is not greater than \$250,000.

"(3) APPEAL BY LENDER.—A 7(a) lender may appeal an enforcement action imposed by the Director described in this subsection to the Office of Hearings and Appeals established under section 5(i) or to an appropriate district court of the United States.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall issue regulations, after opportunity for notice and comment, to carry out subsection (e).

"(g) SERVICING AND LIQUIDATION RESPONSIBILITIES.—During any period during which a 7(a) lender is suspended or otherwise prohibited from making loans under section 7(a), the 7(a) lender shall remain obligated to maintain all servicing and liquidation activities delegated to the lender by the Administrator, unless otherwise specified by the Director.

"(h) PORTFOLIO RISK ANALYSIS OF 7(A) LOANS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall annually conduct a risk analysis of the portfolio of the Administration with respect to all loans guaranteed under section 7(a).

"(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On December 1, 2018, and every December 1 thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of each portfolio risk analysis conducted under paragraph (1) during the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, which shall include—

"(A) an analysis of the overall program risk of loans guaranteed under section 7(a);

"(B) an analysis of the program risk, set forth separately by industry concentration;

"(C) without identifying individual 7(a) lenders by name, a consolidated analysis of the risk created by the individual 7(a) lenders responsible for not less than 1 percent of the gross loan approvals set forth separately for the year covered by the report by—

"(i) the dollar value of the loans made by such 7(a) lenders; and

"(ii) the number of loans made by such 7(a) lenders;

"(D) steps taken by the Administrator to mitigate the risks identified in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C);

"(E) the number of 7(a) lenders, the number of loans made, and the gross and net dollar amount of loans made;

"(F) the number and dollar amount of total losses, the number and dollar amount of total purchases, and the percentage and dollar amount of recoveries at the Administration;

"(G) the number and type of enforcement actions recommended by the Director;

"(H) the number and type of enforcement actions approved by the Lender Oversight Committee established under section 48;

“(I) the number and type of enforcement actions disapproved by the Lender Oversight Committee; and

“(J) the number and dollar amount of civil monetary penalties assessed.

“(1) BUDGET SUBMISSION AND JUSTIFICATION.—The Director shall annually provide, in writing, a fiscal year budget submission for the Office and a justification for such submission to the Administrator. Such submission and justification shall—

“(1) include salaries and expenses of the Office and the charge for the lender oversight fees;

“(2) be submitted at or about the time of the budget submission by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31; and

“(3) be maintained in an indexed form and made available for public review for a period of not less than 5 years beginning on the date of submission and justification.

**“SEC. 48. LENDER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Administration the Lender Oversight Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘Committee’).

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall consist of at least 8 members selected by the Administrator, of which—

“(1) 3 members shall be voting members, 2 of whom shall be career appointees in the Senior Executive Service (as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code); and

“(2) the remaining members shall be non-voting members who shall serve in an advisory capacity on the Committee.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Committee shall—

“(1) review reports on lender oversight activities;

“(2) review formal enforcement action recommendations of the Director of the Office of Credit Risk Management with respect to any lender making loans under section 7(a) and any Lending Partner or Intermediary participant of the Administration in a lending program of the Office of Capital Access of the Administration;

“(3) in carrying out paragraph (2) with respect to formal enforcement actions taken under subsection (d) or (e) of section 23, vote to recommend or not recommend action to the Administrator or a designee of the Administrator;

“(4) in carrying out paragraph (2) with respect to any formal enforcement action not specified under subsection (d) or (e) of section 23, vote to approve, disapprove, or modify the action;

“(5) review, in an advisory capacity, any lender oversight, portfolio risk management, or program integrity matters brought by the Director; and

“(6) take such other actions and perform such other functions as may be delegated to the Committee by the Administrator.

“(d) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall meet as necessary, but not less frequently than on a quarterly basis.

“(2) REPORTS.—The Committee shall submit to the Administrator a report detailing each meeting of the Committee, including if the Committee does or does not vote to approve a formal enforcement action of the Director of the Office of Credit Risk Management with respect to a lender.”.

(b) SUPERVISION DUTIES FOR 7(A) LENDERS.—Effective January 1, 2019, subsection (d) of section 47 (as added by subsection (a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) SUPERVISION DUTIES FOR 7(A) LENDERS.—

“(1) REVIEWS.—With respect to 7(a) lenders, an employee of the Office shall—

“(A) be present for and supervise any such review that is conducted by a contractor of the Office on the premise of the 7(a) lender; and

“(B) supervise any such review that is not conducted on the premise of the 7(a) lender.

“(2) REVIEW REPORT TIMELINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other requirements of the Office or the Administrator, the Administrator shall develop and implement a review report timeline which shall—

“(i) require the Administrator to—

“(I) deliver a written report of the review to the 7(a) lender not later than 60 business days after the date on which the review is concluded; or

“(II) if the Administrator expects to submit the report after the end of the 60-day period described in clause (i), notify the 7(a) lender of the expected date of submission of the report and the reason for the delay; and

“(ii) if a response by the 7(a) lender is requested in a report submitted under subparagraph (A), require the 7(a) lender to submit responses to the Administrator not later than 45 business days after the date on which the 7(a) lender receives the report.

“(B) EXTENSION.—The Administrator may extend the time frame described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II) with respect to a 7(a) lender as the Administrator determines necessary.”.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—

(1) OFFICE OF CREDIT RISK MANAGEMENT.—All functions of the Office of Credit Risk Management of the Small Business Administration, including the personnel, assets, and obligation of the Office of Credit Risk Management, as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be transferred to the Office of Credit Risk Management established under section 47 of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a).

(2) LENDER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.—All functions of the Lender Oversight Committee of the Small Business Administration, including the personnel, assets, and obligations of the Lender Oversight Committee, as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be transferred to the Lender Oversight Committee established under section 48 of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a).

(d) DEEMING OF NAME.—

(1) OFFICE OF CREDIT RISK MANAGEMENT.—Any reference in a law, regulation, guidance, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Office of Credit Risk Management of the Small Business Administration shall be deemed a reference to the Office of Credit Risk Management, established under section 47 of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a).

(2) LENDER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.—Any reference in a law, regulation, guidance, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Lender Oversight Committee of the Small Business Administration shall be deemed a reference to the Lender Oversight Committee, established under section 48 of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a).

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 3(r)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(r)(2)) is amended by striking “regulated SBA lender” each place it appears in heading and text and inserting “regulated lender”.

**SEC. 4. DEFINITION OF CREDIT ELSEWHERE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 3(h) (15 U.S.C. 632(h)) and inserting the following:

“(h) The term ‘credit elsewhere’ means—

“(1) for the purposes of this Act (except as used in section 7(b)), the availability of credit on reasonable terms and conditions to the individual loan applicant from non-Federal, non-State, or non-local government sources,

considering factors associated with conventional lending practices, including—

“(A) the business industry in which the loan applicant operates;

“(B) whether the loan applicant is an enterprise that has been in operation for a period of not more than 2 years;

“(C) the adequacy of the collateral available to secure the requested loan;

“(D) the loan term necessary to reasonably assure the ability of the loan applicant to repay the debt from the actual or projected cash flow of the business; and

“(E) any other factor relating to the particular credit application, as documented in detail by the lender, that cannot be overcome except through obtaining a Federal loan guarantee under prudent lending standards; and

“(2) for the purposes of section 7(b), the availability of credit on reasonable terms and conditions from non-Federal sources taking into consideration the prevailing rates and terms in the community in or near where the applicant business concern transacts business, or the applicant homeowner resides, for similar purposes and periods of time.”; and

(2) in section 7(a)(1)(A)(i) (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(1)(A)(i)), by inserting “The Administrator has the authority to direct, and conduct oversight for, the methods by which lenders determine whether a borrower is able to obtain credit elsewhere.” before “No financial assistance”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 18(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 647(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) As used in this Act, the term ‘agricultural enterprises’ means those small business concerns engaged in the production of food and fiber, ranching, and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural-related industries.”.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORITY FOR ADMINISTRATOR TO INCREASE AMOUNT FOR GENERAL BUSINESS LOANS.**

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (f); and

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

“(g) AUTHORITY TO INCREASE AMOUNT OF GENERAL BUSINESS LOANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) and with respect to fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, if the Administrator determines that the amount of commitments by the Administrator for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) for a fiscal year could exceed the limit on the total amount of commitments the Administrator may make for those loans under this Act, an appropriations Act, or any other provision of law, the Administrator may make commitments for those loans for that fiscal year in an aggregate amount equal to not more than 115 percent of that limit.

“(2) NOTICE REQUIRED BEFORE EXERCISING AUTHORITY.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which the Administrator intends to exercise the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall submit notice of intent to exercise the authority to—

“(A) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Small Business and the Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(3) LIMITATION.—The Administrator shall not exercise the authority under paragraph (1) more than once during any fiscal year.”.

**SEC. 6. ESTABLISHING A PROCESS FOR WAIVERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator exercises statutory or regulatory authority to waive a regulation or a requirement in the Standard Operating Procedures Manual or Policy Notice related to a program or function of the Office of Capital Access of the Administration, the waiver shall be in writing and be maintained in an indexed form.

(b) NO NEW WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as creating new authority for the Administrator to waive regulations of the Administration.

**SEC. 7. REPEAL OF SMALL BUSINESS LOAN LOSS REPORT.**

Subsection (b) of section 10 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 639(b)) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, although the economy is starting to recover, small businesses continue to face a rigid lending environment that challenges growth and job creation. With options limited, small businesses regularly turn to the SBA, the Small Business Administration, for assistance.

With nearly 70,000 loans made in fiscal year 2017, the 7(a) Loan Program is the SBA's largest capital access tool and is reserved for creditworthy small businesses that cannot access traditional or conventional bank lending.

□ 1500

In recent years, the program has experienced rapid growth, which spiked congressional interest and resulted in numerous hearings and meetings to evaluate the SBA's oversight of lenders.

After careful consideration, I, along with the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, determined legislation was needed to ensure the integrity of the program and to safeguard the American taxpayers' dollars. As a result, in January of this year, we introduced H.R. 4743, the Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018, this bill.

H.R. 4743 contains important oversight reforms that strengthen the SBA's Office of Credit Risk Management and the SBA's Lender Oversight Committee. H.R. 4743 also bolsters the credit elsewhere test which acts as a gatekeeper into this government guarantee program.

With the reforms outlined in this provision, the credit elsewhere test will

be clarified and refocused on a borrower's ability to access the program. The changes to the credit elsewhere test will ensure the program is being used by eligible and deserving small businesses.

Additionally, H.R. 4743 outlines a portfolio risk analysis that the SBA must perform. With any program that has a government role, healthy and vigorous oversight is required to protect the taxpayers. H.R. 4743 provides this for the 7(a) Loan Program and for the Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for all of her hard work and interest in this topic, and I also want to thank all of the members of the committee who have had a role in exploring this issue.

The bill has broad, bipartisan support—as many of our bills often do. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 4743, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4743, a bipartisan, bicameral bill that will improve oversight of the 7(a) Loan Program, the SBA's flagship lending product.

At the beginning of this Congress, our committee held a series of hearings to take the temperature of the 7(a) program. We actively investigated how it is being utilized, and we worked with stakeholders to address the deficiencies that were identified.

Both lenders and the agency have said oversight could be improved and transparency increased with legislative action. This bill is the product of that feedback and will make long overdue reforms to the program.

The legislation increases transparency and uniformity for both lenders and the agency by codifying the Office of Credit Risk Management and Lender Oversight Committee. It also requires the Office to internally submit a budget to ensure there is justification of the fees, salaries, and expenses used to carry out oversight functions.

We also heard that the credit elsewhere test—a bedrock of the program—was not clear and lacked a verification component. This bill better clarifies the credit elsewhere test and bolsters substantiation of how it is fulfilled.

Finally, we all remember 2015, when the program ran out of authority to lend before the end of the year. This created an artificial run on the lenders to get loans approved, unfairly harmed small businesses that needed credit, and ultimately required congressional intervention.

Today's bill incorporates provisions from legislation I introduced earlier this year, empowering the Administrator to request additional lending capacity from Congress to meet unexpected demands late in the fiscal year.

H.R. 4743 strikes a meaningful balance between strong oversight and protecting the interests of small businesses that need loans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. In my district, the Small Business Administration has made tremendous and direct impact with the 7(a) Loan Program by helping small businesses that are not able to find or obtain capital through traditional or conventional markets.

To acquire a 7(a) loan, participating lenders must determine that a small business cannot receive credit elsewhere. In practice, this is called the credit elsewhere test. The test became the focus of my subcommittee hearing in March of 2017, when the Committee reviewed the 7(a) Loan Program.

As conservatives, we must safeguard American taxpayer dollars. A government guarantee program needs strong oversight to make sure adequate safeguards are in place. That is why 7(a) oversight must begin with the credit elsewhere test.

This is exactly what H.R. 4743 proposes. It strengthens the credit elsewhere test and provides transparency to factors most commonly used by lenders as they move small businesses through the 7(a) loan process. Additionally, H.R. 4743 increases the oversight capabilities of the Office of Credit Risk Management and the Lender Oversight Committee. These reforms will support the program while protecting American taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for taking up this issue and working with all Members to ensure oversight is paramount, and I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, in crafting H.R. 4743, the chairman and I worked closely with our Senate counterparts, the SBA, and the lending industry. Everyone had a seat at the table, and through debate and compromise, we arrived at a legislative product we can all be proud of, and that, most importantly, will help deserving small businesses access loans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman CHABOT and Senators RISCH and CARDIN for their bipartisanship. And, finally, I would like to thank our staff for working diligently on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this

issue. I would also like to thank the staffs on both sides of the aisle, and I would also like to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, for his assistance in a bump that we ran into at the eleventh hour there.

He was a classmate of mine. We both came in in the historic class of 1994, and he will be leaving at the end of this term. He is going to be greatly missed, but, in any event, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, the 7(a) Loan Program is an important capital access resource for the Nation's small businesses. However, with any government guarantee program, strong oversight is mandatory to safeguard American taxpayer dollars. H.R. 4743 institutes strong and critical reforms to make sure oversight is front and center as this program is administered by the SBA.

H.R. 4743 ensures the program will only be utilized by small businesses that truly require its services, and I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan reforms instituted in H.R. 4743.

Finally, I want to again thank the gentlewoman from New York and the staffs and everyone else involved in this. I understand it might not be the norm everywhere these days, but, in our committee, it is business—and I should say—it is small business as usual. The gentlewoman was really a pleasure to work with on this and many other issues, so I thank the gentlewoman very much for her work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4743, 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.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 872, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 57

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act" (CFPB Bulletin 2013-02 (March 21, 2013), and printed in the Congressional Record on December 6, 2017, on pages S7888-S7889, along with a letter of opinion from the Government Accountability Office dated December 5, 2017, that the Bulletin is a rule under the Congressional Review Act), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which many of us know as perhaps the single, most powerful, unaccountable agency in the history of our Republic, a few years ago, issued guidance that essentially outlawed the practice of auto dealers in America being able to take wholesale finances from third parties and charge retail rates. They did this because the Bureau claimed that the practice potentially violated the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, known as ECOA.

Mr. Speaker, there were several different problems with this approach, not the least of which is at section 1029 of Dodd-Frank, which forbids the Bureau from regulating auto dealers. It is in the law, and so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle come to this very floor to jealously, religiously, and unrelentlessly, defend the Dodd-Frank Act.

I am anxious to hear their voices today, because to defend the Dodd-Frank Act, you must vote to overturn the Bureau's guidance because this was absolutely trampling upon the sacred ground of Dodd-Frank.

Now, I didn't support Dodd-Frank, but it is the law of the land, Mr. Speaker. And if there is anything, shouldn't lawgivers in this Chamber be committed to the rule of law, the laws that have been passed by the United States

Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States? So no less of an authority than Dodd-Frank says: Bureau, thou shalt not regulate auto dealers. But they attempted to do it. So that was sin number one.

Sin number two: they didn't engage in rulemaking. This was guidance. Now, guidance is supposed to tell a market participant: Okay, we understand what you are trying to do, and what you are trying to do is permissible. But, instead, the Bureau flipped it on its head and said: No, you are not allowed to do X, Y, and Z, which is essentially rulemaking, Mr. Speaker.

And so what the Bureau did was they violated the Administrative Procedure Act, which is there to assure that market participants receive due process; that they are allowed notice; that they are allowed to comment; that they are allowed to participate in the democratic process by which rules are promulgated.

So, again, what the Bureau did was, as opposed to engaging in formal rulemaking as demanded by the Administrative Procedure Act—by the way, which was essentially defined by the Clinton administration—but they violated that. They just threw it out.

□ 1515

The third problem here, Mr. Speaker, is the Bureau claimed under its former Director, Mr. Cordray, now gubernatorial candidate Mr. Cordray, that they were a data-driven bureau. Well, guess what? They couldn't come up with any data of this purported violation of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

They claimed that somehow there was unconscious discrimination on racial basis, known as disparate impact. But where was the data? Auto dealers, by law, cannot keep records on the racial characteristics of their customers.

So what did the very enterprising Bureau do, Mr. Speaker? They guessed. Now, they came up with a great academic name for it: Bayesian Improved Surname Geocoding system. Do you know what that means, Mr. Speaker? They guessed. They looked at somebody's last name. They looked at a ZIP Code. They scratched their heads.

Oh, that person must be of Asian heritage.

Oh, that person must be of European heritage.

Oh, that person must be of African heritage.

They made it up. They had no data; so they made it up.

Now, because of all this, in the previous Congress, Mr. Speaker, this body voted overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly—to overturn the guidance. The vote was 332-96. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act then. Fortunately, today the Senate has now acted; so this body has the opportunity to overturn these many wrongs.

And let me end with this wrong: consumers are being hurt. An analysis by The Wall Street Journal showed that

many creditworthy borrowers, because of what the Bureau has done, will have to pay up to \$586 more—\$586 more—for their auto loans because of what the Bureau has done. Because of that, under the Congressional Review Act, it is time for Congress to say: We said what we mean. We are going to protect consumers. We are going to overturn the Bureau's guidance, and we are going to do it today.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 57, a Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal a very important guidance on indirect auto finance lending that was issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau all the way back in 2013, in order to prevent discriminatory lending.

Indirect auto lenders are lenders such as banks that work with car dealers to finance car loans for consumers. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that this is an inappropriate and misguided use of the Congressional Review Act that sets a dangerous precedent. While congressional Republicans so far have been very active in using the Congressional Review Act to tear down important regulations that protect Americans, today they are expanding their harmful efforts even further to now go after regulatory guidance issued by the Consumer Bureau years ago. This is a clear overreach that goes way beyond how the Congressional Review Act was intended to be used.

This resolution is one part of a widespread Republican effort to make it more difficult to hold financial institutions accountable. The Consumer Bureau's 2013 guidance on indirect auto lending was issued to provide clarity to indirect auto lenders and protect auto loan borrowers from discrimination. This is a market where discriminatory practices have well been documented. Since its establishment, the Consumer Bureau has levied more than \$140 million in fines and penalties against lenders for engaging in discriminatory auto lending practices.

Just this January, an investigation by the National Fair Housing Alliance found that, 62 percent of the time, highly qualified minority borrowers seeking purchase and financing options for a car receive more costly pricing options than less qualified White borrowers receive for the same vehicle. According to the same report, less qualified White borrowers were presented with more financing options 75 percent of the time.

The guidance issued by the Consumer Bureau simply clarified that indirect auto lenders would be held accountable for violations of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, or ECOA, if they took part in discriminatory practices in the pricing of auto loans. Under ECOA, it is illegal for a creditor or a lender to discriminate against a person because

of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, age, or receipt of income from any public assistance program.

So the issuance of this guidance, which also provided a number of steps to indirect auto lenders that they could use to ensure that they were in compliance with the law, was a commonsense action that has both protected borrowers from unfair practices and helped lenders stay on the right side of the law.

Proponents of this resolution say to the Consumer Bureau: Oh, you had no authority to regulate auto dealers. But that is not what is at issue here today. Let's be clear. The Consumer Bureau's guidance applies to indirect auto lenders, not automobile dealers.

This resolution would set back efforts to prevent discriminatory auto lending, make it harder for responsible businesses to follow the law, and harm consumers. It would not only repeal the Consumer Bureau's regulatory guidance on auto lending but could also prevent the Consumer Bureau from ever again issuing "substantially similar" guidance on the matter.

Furthermore, by setting this terrible precedent of repealing regulatory guidance, the majority is opening up a Pandora's box that could have deeply harmful consequences for the public and badly impede the important work of regulators, not just of the financial services industry but of all industries.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the resolution and urge Members to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), an outstanding advocate for all the working people of New York, a member of the Financial Services Committee, and the author of the House companion bill.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this important resolution, S.J. Res. 57.

I am the House sponsor of the companion legislation to this Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal ill-founded guidance issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau relating to the dealer-directed auto lending market. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman JEB HENSARLING for all of his amazing leadership on this very important issue. I also want to commend my Senate counterparts on this legislation: Senators JERRY MORAN and PAT TOOMEY.

Mr. Speaker, for so many of my constituents, access to transportation is key to their economic prosperity. And access to affordable credit is what helps them get behind the wheel to get their kids to school, get themselves to work, or to get sick loved ones to medical appointments. That is why the 2013 assault by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on the dealer-directed auto finance market is so damaging to the very people this rogue agency is claiming to help.

Indirect auto financing, also known as dealer-directed auto financing, are the loans offered to consumers in the dealerships where they are purchasing a vehicle. Dealer-directed financing is an important option for consumers and provides them and the dealerships they are purchasing the vehicle from with the flexibility to meet a consumer's needs based on their budget and credit score.

The CFPB, under the leadership of Richard Cordray, in their classic government-knows-best approach, decided in 2013, without consulting Congress or following the law, that they had a problem with this well-known form of auto financing. They launched an unconstitutional and illegal assault on honest car dealerships and the financial institutions they work with, falsely claiming discrimination and unfair lending practices.

The data to back up these egregious claims, through the Bureau's own admission, was deeply flawed and had an error rate as high as 41 percent. That was according to an independent audit. Let me be absolutely clear that any form of lending discrimination—whether based on race, religion, gender, orientation, or creed—is absolutely unacceptable and also totally illegal under various Federal and State laws, including the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, or ECOA.

What is also illegal and wrong is how the CFPB went about issuing this flawed mandate, labeling it as benign guidance, yet enforcing it as if it was a true Federal regulation, all in violation of the transparency and public comment requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act.

Through passage of today's joint resolution, we will permanently strike down this flawed CFPB mandate that attempted to virtually outlaw indirect auto lending in the United States. Today's fight over this important resolution may sound like a wonky policy debate, but to my constituents, permanently repealing this flawed CFPB ruling may make the difference between being denied or approved for an auto loan they desperately need.

This CFPB decree is estimated to raise the cost of auto lending by as much as \$600 per consumer. That is not crumbs. And through passage of S.J. Res. 57, we can also ensure that no future CFPB Director or administration can revive it without the express permission of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Director Mulvaney for working so hard to repair the serious damage done by his rogue predecessor at the CFPB. But at the end of the day, Congress must do its job by changing the law. This has been a bipartisan priority in the past, and I hope that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of S.J. Res. 57.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is about discrimination. This is not about false accusations. It is documented that these car

lenders have discriminated against people of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California. I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 57. This is a resolution to disapprove of the CFPB auto lending rules. I oppose this, Mr. Speaker, because I believe U.S. markets should be free from fraud and from schemes like the auto lending scheme to which we have been subjected as Americans. I oppose because I don't think Americans should be discriminated against; and then, when they are discriminated against, the guilty parties have no consequences. I think they need to be caught, punished, and the victims made whole.

The gentleman from Texas talked about the research that went into cross-matching ZIP Codes and surnames as if these technologies don't benefit all of us. We know down to the block where our voters are, who they are, what race they are, what gender they are, and who they are likely to vote for. So it is no great technological feat that these auto dealers could figure out who to discriminate against.

I oppose this because I, too, was one of those Black people who lived in one of those ZIP Codes, and I was discriminated against in my car loan. The CFPB thankfully pursued justice and got my money back, which I needed.

This resolution is everything wrong with the GOP agenda: rewarding fraudsters, hooksters, charlatans, and donors while ignoring the needs and the will of Americans.

We are seeing a buildup of subprime auto loans. Haven't we learned our lesson? Why would an entrepreneur go into inventing something or innovating something when they can just make their money with these predatory lending practices. Why invest in infrastructure and transportation when you can use opaque financial markets and dirty practices to turn people's desperation into misery-fueled profits.

They say history rhymes, Mr. Speaker. And it will be like the housing crisis but with cars. Voting for this resolution is a vote against good financial market practices, fairness, and against Americans.

□ 1530

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that the study that my friends on the other side of the aisle allude to from the NFHA wasn't even in existence when the Bureau promulgated their guidance, number one.

Number two, it is based on 2 people, 2 people out of 325 million. This is beyond junk science. It is a mockery, an absolute mockery of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act when we are here today to ensure that working Americans of all colors and races and creeds get credit.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the

chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his patience on this issue.

I want to start by thanking the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN, and, more specifically, also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his hard work on the House companion legislation to S.J. Res. 57.

Let me give my colleagues a brief history of the situation we are discussing today.

Dodd-Frank, specifically, barred the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from regulating all dealers. The Bureau did it anyway. In doing so, the CFPB didn't adhere to the Administrative Procedure Act, choosing instead to push this rule forward. They pushed it through based not on sound evidence or thoughtful methodology; rather, Bureau staff seem to have conducted the research backwards. They came up with the answer they wanted, and then they wrote the questions.

The simple truth of the matter is that the Bureau seized an opportunity to test congressional intent and expand its jurisdiction. Today, we are exercising not just our right, but our constitutional duty, to rescind the indirect auto guidance that is blatantly unprofessional and illegal.

And again, the CFPB—let me just reinforce this. CFPB does not have oversight of automobile transactions because Dodd-Frank specifically prohibited it, and they did it anyway.

My colleagues and I have stood on this floor time after time and warned of the dangers of this most powerful and completely unaccountable agency. Allowing the Bureau to move forward on such a rule would have been negligence on our part.

Unfortunately, this isn't the first time we have seen this play out, and it won't be the last. Across the financial regulatory spectrum, agencies have abused their authority, dodging congressional oversight by promulgating guidance that, in reality, acts as a rule. This has to end, Mr. Speaker.

I want to again extend my thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his constant efforts in holding this government accountable and commend the Senate for their action on this and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in advocating for a more responsible approach to guidance and rulemaking.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the chairman just said that junk science was used; however, Republicans put out a report called, "Disparate Impact' Claims Against Vehicle Financing Businesses." Here it is. And guess what. The Center for Responsible Lending said that was junk science.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and a tireless ad-

vocate dedicated to combating discrimination.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress today is going to be voting on whether or not to make it easier for dealers making car loans to offer better prices to borrowers based on the color of their skin. The majority wants you to vote, yeah, they can. We say they shouldn't. We say all Americans should be treated equally, and we think that the CFPB should be allowed to make sure that that is true.

You know, it is clear, minority buyers pay more. This has been found in any number of statistical ways. In a recent settlement with a large auto dealer, the Department of Justice and the CFPB found that 235,000 minority borrowers were paying higher rates. African-American, Asian, and Latino borrowers were paying between \$200 and \$300 more per loan compared to White borrowers.

Now, some of us believe in liberty and justice for all. Some of us believe in equal protection under the law. I believe that it is absolutely the wrong policy for us to second-guess the CFPB today, and I urge a "no" vote.

This is a fact that this disparate treatment in borrowing and rates and prices is even true when minority borrowers had the same or better credit than White borrowers. So the CFPB cracked down, and they issued guidance, which is what we would expect them to do. In fact, in total, they made sure that over—almost \$12 billion has gone back to consumers, a fact which I think, for my Republican friends, really upsets them.

But guidance was set to ensure that lenders were complying with the law, which makes discrimination in auto lending illegal. They also brought cases and recovered millions for borrowers: Ally Financial paid back \$80 million in recovery for victims of discrimination; American Honda Finance Corporation, \$24 million; Toyota Motor Credit Corporation, \$21.9 million; Fifth Third Bank, \$18 million.

Now, are we to believe that these institutions, run by some of the most sophisticated businesspeople and lawyers in America, are just handing out checks for nothing? They are paying settlements because why not? They have probably got more lawyers in one of these places than they do in the CFPB.

Now, the bottom line is these folks paid out because they needed to settle. They had exposure. This move today by the majority in the Financial Services Committee is to say: Go ahead. Don't worry about discrimination. We have got your back.

We are not going to stand here and let Americans get treated like second-class citizens, though.

The new system is working well, so, naturally, some folks want to change it. So, Republicans, I ask you guys to vote "no" on this thing. I want you to

join us in telling Americans that everybody should be treated equally.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was here during the debates that we had on Dodd-Frank and involved in much of the discussion. On the Democratic side and on the Republican side, there were a number of things we debated, but through all of that debate, there was a bipartisan belief that auto dealers and lenders were certainly not at the heart of the crisis and should not be the focus of new regulation.

With that in mind, as the chairman has noted, section 1029 of Dodd-Frank explicitly exempted auto dealers from CFPB supervision and regulation. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, why are we here today?

We are here because the auto dealers are the focus of a CFPB action that ends the consumers' ability to receive discounted car loans.

Why are consumers facing higher, not lower, costs when going to buy a car? The answer is regulatory overreach.

CFPB ignored the will of Congress, ignored the law as written. As *The Wall Street Journal* noted, Congress' explicit exemption "didn't stop former CFPB chief Richard Cordray, who used the back door of auto financing to regulate dealers."

And while Mr. Cordray may have been able to suspend this belief, we do not have the same luxury here. We are not here by choice, frankly. We must act to pass this resolution today.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the bipartisan call for enforcement of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and make this point: let's work together to tackle discrimination where it exists—where it exists—not where regulators ignore the law and employ algorithms to guess that it might exist.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law on the Judiciary Committee.

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

I would like to begin by reminding everyone that the Financial Protection Bureau, under the leadership of Director Cordray, returned \$12 billion to American consumers, including \$140 million in enforcement and consumer savings related to auto loans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S.J. Res. 57, a direct attack on people of color, vulnerable persons, and any other person of a protected class who is subject to financial discrimination by auto lenders.

This resolution is an unambiguous stamp of approval for Office of Manage-

ment and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney's agenda to shutter the CFPB by removing its ability to protect consumers and police discriminatory lending policies.

But aside from my deep, substantive concerns with this resolution, I am fundamentally opposed to this reckless and unprecedented use of the Congressional Review Act. The legislative history and plain reading of the statute make it clear that the CRA was designed to provide Congress with an opportunity to review new rules, not long-established agency guidance.

But because this archaic law was poorly designed—it actually requires agencies to physically submit thousands of rules every year in triplicate by courier—it is inevitable that some guidance will not be physically received by Congress for purposes of the CRA.

Today's resolution to disapprove guidance issued 5 years ago on procedural grounds makes it painfully obvious that the CRA has not only been horribly misused by Republicans, but it is irredeemably broken as well. In this Congress alone, Republicans have repealed more than a dozen critical protections for hardworking Americans with little notice or debate.

And how many jobs will this reckless agenda create, Mr. Speaker? None. We know this because President Trump's director of legislative affairs was asked whether these rollbacks would spur employment growth, and he conceded they would not.

So, if not to create jobs, stimulate the economy, or help working families, why vacate these commonsense rules? Corporate money, Mr. Speaker.

According to a report by Public Citizen, special interest groups spent more than \$1 billion in lobbying and campaign expenditures in opposition to the 14 rules already repealed by this Congress. And last month, OMB Director Mulvaney told a room full of bank lobbyists that campaign contributions were a determining factor for who he met with while serving as a Member of Congress, a disgraceful signal to corporations that this is a pay-to-play administration that is for sale.

That is why I have introduced the Sunset the CRA and Restore American Protections Act, or the SCRAP Act, to address this blatant abuse of process and to immediately restore the rules previously repealed by this Congress to the detriment of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), chairwoman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of a bill that, frankly, is long overdue. While former CFPB Director

Richard Cordray indicated in testimony before the House Committee on Financial Services that the Bureau's guidance was "nonbinding," the damage was already done.

The Bureau's attempt to regulate an industry that the Dodd-Frank Act specifically told them they could not regulate is the very reason our committee has worked tirelessly to bring accountability to an agency that has none. Sadly, this guidance has become symbolic for everything that is wrong with the CFPB.

So why are we here today? Why does this Congress care about guidance put out in 2013?

Let me read section 1029 from the Dodd-Frank Act: "the Bureau may not exercise any rulemaking, supervisory, enforcement or any other authority, including any authority to order assessments, over a motor vehicle dealer that is predominantly engaged in the sale and servicing of motor vehicles."

Unfortunately, we have seen, time and time again, an agency that is willing to issue regulation by enforcement. Since the 2013 guidance came out, the Bureau has issued over \$200 million in out-of-court settlements to auto lenders based on guidance that was flawed from the very start.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, our staff has issued multiple reports detailing the Bureau's baseless enforcement agenda. Because of their work, the CFPB can no longer hide behind, as one report noted, junk science.

I thank the chairman, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the gentlewoman to continue reading so that she can see, under the CFPB rule, that they have the ability to oversee the lending; and what she is talking about is the exemption of the automobile dealers, themselves, but not the lenders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the vice ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

□ 1545

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for her leadership on the floor on this issue.

I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 57 because it erases measures established a half-decade ago to prevent auto dealers from using discriminatory data tactics.

I also rise because it signals the majority's intention to contort the Congressional Review Act to allow it to be used on a dramatically increased scale in ways never intended.

Let me start with the policy.

When auto dealers provide financing through a third-party lender, they can increase the rate offered to the consumer and pocket the difference. Evidence suggests these dealer markups are frequently higher for minority borrowers than for similarly qualified White borrowers.

In 2013, the CFPB sought to address this problem. The agency produced guidance that clarified the fair lending requirements of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act applied to auto loans. The CFPB's action simply spelled out that dealer markups were indeed illegal if they led to discriminatory outcomes, intentional or otherwise.

It also listed some useful steps that auto dealers could take to ensure fair lending compliance. In recent years, the CFPB has fined auto dealers more than \$150 million for discriminating against minority borrowers.

A resolution of disapproval is not the way to change policy in this area. Instead, we should be going through regular order with public hearings, committee consideration, and amendments to achieve a bipartisan compromise, not just throwing out words like "junk science." We can settle that in regular order through a process.

In bringing this resolution to the floor, the majority is setting a dangerous new standard for the use of the Congressional Review Act, which only grants Congress the power to rescind regulations within a 60-legislative-day window. The CFPB guidance on auto lending was established in 2013, well outside the CRA's window.

Make no mistake: Using the CRA to repeal guidance from more than 5 years ago is an unprecedented expansion of the law's scope, and it will imperil thousands of Federal decisions going back decades. Let's not make it easier for minority car buyers to be exploited and discriminated against. Let's not open the door to an even more extreme and unprecedented use of the CRA.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against S.J. Res. 57.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the majority whip of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing S.J. Res. 57 to the floor today, a joint resolution to disapprove the 2013 Bureau guidance on auto finance. It has been well discussed today, why that is.

This is a very tailored, commonsense approach. It does not open up a precedent towards guidance being used for a CRA. It is a very narrow joint resolution. It is designed particularly with the GAO's ruling from last December, so I don't think that hyperbole is necessary.

We are here today to make sure that all of our constituents have access to affordable auto credit. Black, White, female, male, they need affordable auto credit. How do we get a job if we don't have an affordable car with which to go to work? So that is why we are here.

Secondly, we are here because our constituents demand that we demand accountability in our oversight function, we demand transparency. When you have a process that was not transparent and did not follow the Administrative Procedures Act and did not fol-

low the statute, we don't have accountability and we don't have transparency. Our constituents argue for that.

Many argue laws should be based on sound data; our rules should be carefully debated in public. That was not done in this instance. So we have this surreptitious, specious display of sophistry known as the indirect auto guidance from the Bureau.

So we are correcting that today, and the beneficiaries will be our constituents. The beneficiaries will be Article I power in this House as we oversee the executive.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor, and I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his leadership.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a Member who has shown true leadership in speaking out against this harmful resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 57, which provides for congressional disapproval of CFPB guidance on discrimination in the indirect auto lending industry.

As the only Ph.D. scientist in Congress, when I come to the floor, it is usually to debate science or important technical details of financial service regulations. But I am also the son of a civil rights lawyer, a scientist who stepped away from his career in science and became a civil rights lawyer. My father actually wrote much of the enforcement language behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The issue of minorities being systematically overcharged when purchasing automobiles is not a small issue, and, unfortunately, it is not going away.

This issue was first documented academically in the Chicago metropolitan region in the early 1990s when it was found that if you were a non-White person you were, on average, charged over \$500 more, in today's dollars, than a White person was.

In a recent study in the D.C. suburbs, it was found that non-Whites were charged an average of \$2,500 more than White people.

I understand this is a subject for some debate. I urge my colleagues to actually read the report that some are calling junk science here. It is a report that, frankly, as a scientist, may not have the statistics that I would like in terms of a large number of test cases, but the effect is so large that it cannot be a statistical fluctuation.

It was undertaken by the National Fair Housing Alliance, and it was done with a number of important scientific controls in its process.

This number by which non-Whites are being overcharged is not a small number. If you are overcharged by thousands of dollars on every one of the 5 to 10 cars that you buy during your lifetime, it is a big impediment to

building up household wealth for minorities or any family. Every dollar that goes out to pay an overpriced loan is \$1 that cannot be spent for retirement savings or for your child's college education.

A big part of this discrepancy is that non-Whites were far too often discriminated against not only in whether the loan application is approved but also in the rate charged for the loan.

Because of the financial arrangement between banks, when a non-White person is overcharged for a loan, the extra profits from that are split between the dealership and the bank. So I believe there is a responsibility for both parties to make sure that this financial incentive does not lead to the sort of discriminatory behavior that we unfortunately continue to see in this country.

During the debate over the Dodd-Frank bill, we decided to exempt car dealerships from direct oversight from the CFPB. I believe we did that because we felt, correctly, that car dealerships were the victims, rather than the cause, of the financial collapse. But we retained CFPB oversight over financial products, like the loans that are sold on financial markets.

This left an important line to be drawn because both banks and dealerships need guidance. While the banks, I believe, have a duty to make sure that the dealerships that are acting as, effectively, loan brokers on their behalf are not engaging in discriminatory behavior, they cannot be expected to put one of their agents in the room where every car deal is negotiated.

So guidance is needed. Into the breach strode the CFPB, which I believe was appropriate. This guidance is important to protecting American consumers.

In the past, critics of the CFPB guidance have argued that it relies on data that is inaccurate or misunderstood. I think that it relies on an incorrect understanding of the statistical uncertainties that are always present in any scientific measurement. The effect here is real, and it is large.

In the past, there have been bipartisan efforts to put some clarity on how the CFPB could offer this guidance, and this bill walks away from that bipartisan effort.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. The bill that the majority is bringing to the floor this week will preclude the reissuance of that necessary guidance instructive of how to comply with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974, which will remain in place.

Lenders will still be, rightly, required to comply with the law, but they will not have any guidance on how to do so, leading at least one analyst to call S.J. Res. 57 a "long-term negative for lenders," which, as a businessman, I agree with. S.J. Res. 57 is bad for both consumers and for lenders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose S.J. Res. 57 and preserve the opportunity to promulgate guidance intended to curtail discrimination.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's 2013 auto finance guidance.

The Dodd-Frank financial control law explicitly exempted auto dealers from the Bureau's supervision and regulation. However, this did not deter former Director of the Bureau Richard Cordray from trying to regulate this industry, circumventing the legislative intent of Congress through a backdoor guidance.

Not only did the Bureau lack the legal authority to issue such regulation, it also based its justification for the guidance on a flawed statistical methodology.

That methodology, which supposedly provided evidence of widespread discrimination of auto lenders against minorities, determined the probability of an individual's race and ethnicity merely based upon last names and ZIP Codes. According to a 2014 study, only 50 percent of Asians and 24 percent of African Americans were correctly identified by the Bureau's flawed methodology.

My friend and colleague from Illinois, a gentleman who self-identifies as a scientist, says that statistical uncertainties are always present. But the truth is that the Bureau's own records show that the Bureau designed a remuneration process that ensured that 235,000 consumers would receive remuneration checks, even though the Bureau knew that White consumers were not discriminated against on account of race. They would receive remuneration checks under that process.

Now, to me, Mr. Speaker, that is not statistical uncertainties that are always present; that is a totally flawed process. I think the American taxpayer would be totally offended to know that their tax dollars are going to people who were never harmed. That is not flawed statistical analysis that is always present; that is outright just a totally flawed process that rips off American taxpayers.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. If the lack of legal authority and deeply flawed methodology were not enough, the real-world consequences of the guidance could have been far worse if auto dealers didn't do everything they could to fight against the guidance. That is because auto

dealers help customers, especially those customers with less than pristine credit scores.

Let me give you an example from Kentucky. A female buyer, having gone through a recent divorce, had credit challenges. She was offered a 7.99 percent rate by a competing bank that put her payment at \$506 a month. But thanks to Ford Credit's Certified Pre-Owned Program, which is only available through a franchised Ford dealer, the same customer was able to receive a 2.9 percent rate, for a payment of \$441 a month. This scenario saved her almost \$70 a month and a whopping \$4,200 in interest charges over the life of the loan.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that in 2018 we are on the floor of Congress seeing the denial of some of my colleagues about discrimination in the auto lending business and defending the automobile lenders despite the fact there has been a study that shows that there has been discrimination.

The study should have included women, because they discriminate against women also. They think women are stupid and don't know how to negotiate a loan. Women have been taken advantage of too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets of the Financial Services Committee.

□ 1600

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly, strongly oppose this resolution, which will actually encourage discrimination against people of color who want to buy cars.

I know my Republican colleagues claim that this is about a rulemaking process, but let's be clear: This is not about process. This is about discrimination.

This issue is very simple. Financial institutions that make auto loans have an obligation not to discriminate against borrowers based on the color of their skin. This has been the law since Congress passed the Equal Credit Opportunity Act over 43 years ago.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found compelling evidence that, when financial institutions allow auto dealers to increase the interest rates on auto loans for specific borrowers that come into their dealership, minority borrowers were systematically charged a higher rate. In other words, this particular practice resulted in illegal lending discrimination.

So the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau did what it was supposed to do. It told financial institutions to stop this illegal and discriminatory practice or risk being sued by the Bureau for lending discrimination.

But the Consumer Bureau did not stop there. It also told the lenders exactly how they needed to change their practices to avoid being sued for lending discrimination.

This kind of transparency is a good thing. It allows the Consumer Bureau to root out discrimination in the auto lending market while also providing guidance and certainty to all the lenders that want to do the right thing.

Yet this guidance is exactly what the resolution before us today would repeal. Why? This would have the effect of encouraging discrimination against minority borrowers in the auto lending market and discouraging the Consumer Bureau from cracking down on this horrible practice.

I believe we need to stand strong against discrimination in all forms, including lending discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for their constituents, to vote for consumers, and to oppose this resolution.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a very hard-working member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 57, which will roll back a rule issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection related to indirect auto lending.

We know that in 2013 the Bureau issued guidance to financial institutions that would eliminate an auto dealer's ability to discount interest rates offered to consumers who finance vehicle purchases.

As many of us know, the CFPB has a longstanding history of imposing burdensome rules and regulations on a wide range of financial products. The CFPB has often issued rules without understanding of the full scope of the problem and without regard to the costs of compliance it imposes on an industry. This rule is no exception.

As clearly stated in section 1029 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the Bureau is explicitly prohibited from regulating auto dealers. This attempt by the Bureau to provide guidance to auto lending is a clear violation of the statute and is yet another example of how the Bureau continued to abuse its statutory power under then-Director Richard Cordray.

I am pleased to join my colleagues here today to ensure that the Bureau does not issue any substantially similar rules as it relates to indirect auto lending.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and other members of the House Financial Services Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure to help rein in the CFPB's regulatory overreach.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from New York (Ms. TENNEY), an outstanding member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for yielding, and a special thank you to my colleague from New York, LEE ZELDIN, for his support of S.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since the Consumer Financial Protection Board circumvented the formal rule-making process by unfairly denying consumers and small businesses the right to comment on guidance that will directly affect them.

By executing this wrongful end run around the proper rulemaking process, the CFPB created much uncertainty in the \$1.1 trillion auto lending market. In fact, in testimony before our committee, the former Director, Mr. Richard Cordray, admitted to me in testimony that he had to circumvent the rules to target auto lenders.

More than half of car buyers finance their purchases when acquiring an automobile. These consumers have the ability to obtain great auto rates through their dealer-assisted finance, otherwise known as indirect lending.

I have personally met many highly credible auto dealers in my district who are strongly committed to their communities and the consumers who they serve. In fact, one auto dealer that I met with specifically does not even take any form of picture ID when determining lending just to avoid any kind of scrutiny that would actually suggest that they were doing any kind of discrimination.

These auto dealers—and they are mostly small businesses—comply with fair lending policies and practices while meeting the needs of their consumers who desperately need to buy a car and often finance through their auto dealer.

However, this flawed, unstudied guidance, through the statistics we have heard from the other side, threatens to eliminate the flexibility these small businesses, these small auto dealers need to offer discounted interest rates to consumers who need to purchase a car on credit with a very limited budget, especially in my community.

Last Congress, multiple bipartisan letters and bills called for the CFPB to correct and reissue their guidance, which would bring clarity to the market, and study the impact this digression would have on lower income consumers. However, the CFPB refused to provide help on multiple occasions.

It is indeed ironic that the very agency which is supposed to protect consumers is, in fact, harming them with its flawed guidance rules. Congress created the Consumer Financial Protection Board to protect consumers, not hurt them.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to emphasize that these small

businesses should be protected by the Consumer Financial Protection Board, not targeted by them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues and everyone join us in supporting S.J. Res. 57 and finally rescind this flawed guidance by the CFPB.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sitting here appalled at what I am hearing from the opposite side of the aisle, the fact that they would use the Congressional Review Act to attack guidance and then have the audacity to say in the resolution that they can never, ever again in perpetuity ever have anything like this again.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee and chair of the Congressional Auto Caucus.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and giving me some time.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the phrase that “I am appalled” by what is taking place on the floor today. I will tell you, I join in those comments, and I really do believe that.

For a person whose family has been in the automobile business since 1953 and sold thousands and thousands of cars to people of any color, it doesn't matter the color of the person buying the car. Do we match them up with the transportation need that they were looking for, and were we able to arrange financing that was affordable to them? You cannot be in business for 65 years doing it the wrong way.

To impugn the integrity of the automobile people is absolutely beyond reproach. If you run out of facts, I guess the next thing you have to go to is discrimination. When we talk this way, it is so divisive, but that is the platform: Let's divide them, let's try to separate them—the color of the skin, the shape of their eye, their gender. Let's make sure that we can make every statement possible to show that there are bad people out there doing things to other folks and it is only by discrimination that these things get done.

I will tell you, I am greatly offended as a member of the automobile industry and as someone who has served thousands of people.

If you think the dealers are that bad, please go to your hometown and look at the Little League fence and find out whose name is out there. Look at your high school programs and see who it is that is funding all these things. Go to any charity and see who is on the list of who takes care of people.

To sit here today and have to listen to that somehow this is discriminatory just adds to the fact that when you are out of facts, when you don't know what you are talking about and what you have never done—not one of your people have ever been on the floor and—not this floor. I am talking about the

automobile floor. You know an awful lot about laptops, but you know nothing about blacktop. You get on that floor, you get on that lot, and you work with people to make sure they can have affordable transportation—affordable transportation.

Rather than this person trying to arrange financing by himself or herself, we rely on a dealer, who has great, great heft within the financial community and to talk to lenders and say, “We have a great customer here who is looking to buy a car. We need you to work with us to get them in this transportation.” How in the world can you reduce this down to discrimination?

We are doing the same thing every day that you are doing. We are trying to make sure that we are making America great every day in every way. The best way to do that is to stop talking about discrimination and start talking about the Nation. We are coming together as a people in spite of what you say.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) to please not leave, because I want you to know that I am more offended as an African-American woman than you will ever be.

And this business about making America great again, it is your President that is dividing this country.

And don't talk to me about the fact that we don't understand. That is the attitude that has been given toward women time and time again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Chair wishes to remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I respect the Chair, but don't stop me in the middle when you didn't stop him in the middle. So I shall continue.

Don't you dare talk to me like that and think that somehow women don't understand what goes on on the floor of automobile dealers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is reminded to direct her remarks to the Chair.

The gentlewoman will continue in order.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. And I am saying that I will continue to do that. However, I don't appreciate that you did not interrupt him when he was making those outrageous remarks about him knowing more about discrimination than I know about discrimination. I resent that.

And I resent the remark about making America great again. He is down here making a speech for this dishonorable President of the United States of America.

Having said that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are times on the floor of this Congress that we hear some of the most outrageous comments in defense of some of the most outrageous practices.

This resolution is yet another harmful piece of legislation from the majority that should be rejected. Week after week, instead of working to benefit hardworking Americans and protect the public from abusive financial institutions, Republicans have advanced legislation to undermine and remove consumer and investor protections, threaten the stability of our economy and financial system, and benefit bad actors in the financial services industry. They are taking our system of financial regulation in precisely the wrong direction.

Today, as we have discussed, the majority is putting forth a Congressional Review Act resolution that would repeal important Consumer Financial Protection Bureau guidance to prevent discrimination by indirect auto lenders.

This resolution would set back efforts to prevent discriminatory auto lending, harm consumers, and make it harder for responsible businesses to follow the law. It is senseless and misguided.

□ 1615

The resolution would also set a dangerous precedent by repealing years-old regulatory guidance, which is not how the Congressional Review Act was intended to be used. Opening the door to inappropriate uses of the Congressional Review Act like this one threatens the important work of regulators, not just of the financial services industry, but of all industries.

So I call upon my colleagues across the aisle to work with the Democrats on policies that strengthen consumer protections, rather than the harmful rollbacks like the one before us today. I urge Members to oppose the resolution.

And I want my friends on the opposite side of the aisle to know that we don't easily get up and talk about discrimination against minorities and people of color. We don't like to have to do this. We wish that we had come to a time in the history of this country where it did not happen.

But I am appalled when the opposite side of the aisle stands up in strong defense of discrimination. If they were really interested in working with the Democrats they would say we have a better methodology of determining whether or not there is discrimination. We want to work with you. We want to do whatever is necessary to ensure that no one is discriminated against, yet I hear from Members like Mr. KELLY who come to the floor talking about we don't know what we are talking about, we don't understand it, we have never been on the floor of a dealership.

Oh, yes I have. My husband was in the car business. I know a lot about it.

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

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

It is rare, but I have found common ground with the ranking member; and the common ground is I have never heard such outrageous comments on the House floor as other Members of the other side of the aisle come and accuse us of defending discrimination?

Number one, almost half of her caucus supported S.J. Res. 57 to get rid of this in the last Congress.

And I hope every single car dealer in America is listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have come down here on the House floor to accuse them of racism. With what? The proof of a report that has a universe of two?

Again, it makes a mockery of the Equal Opportunity Credit Act.

And for those to come to the House floor and say they are appalled by discrimination? Well, where were they when the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection was accused of having a pervasive culture of retaliation and intimidation? They were found to engage in discrimination, but what did we hear from the other side of the aisle? We heard crickets. We heard crickets, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what is next? What are we going to hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle next? Are we going to hear that every pharmacist in America is a Fascist? Are we going to hear that every single doctor in America is engaged in spousal abuse? Where is the proof?

People are trying to sell cars and help them get into transportation.

And, oh, by the way, Mr. Speaker, almost every American now has one of these. Go to your smartphone and Google "auto finance." And guess what? At least on mine, it comes up State Farm, Lending Tree, Bank of America, Chase, RoadLoans. Nobody forces you to take the financing package of the dealer, even though often it is a better choice than other lenders.

It is so easy, Mr. Speaker, to come to the floor and say, My Lord, the charge is serious; therefore, you must be guilty until proven innocent.

This is an embarrassing day for the House, Mr. Speaker, absolutely embarrassing, and we ought to stand for the rule of law.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle so jealously guard the sanctity of Dodd-Frank, why haven't we heard their voice today? Why aren't they defending Dodd-Frank today? Because Dodd-Frank, itself, as coming down from Mount Sinai said, Thou shalt not regulate auto dealers.

And so now we are throwing Dodd-Frank overboard. We are calling auto dealers racists. It is, indeed, outrageous comments. And to come here to the House floor and so recklessly

make that accusation is an outrage, and it is why we need to ensure that S.J. Res. 57 is voted on affirmatively today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 175, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—234

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abraham       | Diaz-Balart     | Kelly (PA)   |
| Aderholt      | Donovan         | King (IA)    |
| Allen         | Duffy           | King (NY)    |
| Amash         | Duncan (SC)     | Kinzinger    |
| Amodei        | Duncan (TN)     | Knight       |
| Arrington     | Dunn            | Kustoff (TN) |
| Babin         | Emmer           | LaHood       |
| Bacon         | Estes (KS)      | LaMalfa      |
| Banks (IN)    | Faso            | Lamborn      |
| Barletta      | Ferguson        | Lance        |
| Barr          | Fitzpatrick     | Latta        |
| Barton        | Fleischmann     | Lesko        |
| Bergman       | Flores          | Lewis (MN)   |
| Biggs         | Fortenberry     | LoBiondo     |
| Bilirakis     | Foxo            | Long         |
| Bishop (MI)   | Frelinghuysen   | Loudermilk   |
| Bishop (UT)   | Gaetz           | Love         |
| Black         | Gallagher       | Lucas        |
| Blackburn     | Garrett         | Luetkemeyer  |
| Blum          | Gianforte       | MacArthur    |
| Bost          | Gibbs           | Marchant     |
| Brady (TX)    | Gohmert         | Marino       |
| Brat          | Gonzalez (TX)   | Marshall     |
| Brooks (AL)   | Goodlatte       | Massie       |
| Brooks (IN)   | Gosar           | Mast         |
| Buck          | Gowdy           | McCarthy     |
| Bucshon       | Granger         | McCaul       |
| Budd          | Graves (GA)     | McClintock   |
| Burgess       | Graves (LA)     | McHenry      |
| Byrne         | Graves (MO)     | McKinley     |
| Calvert       | Green, Gene     | McMorris     |
| Carter (GA)   | Griffith        | Rodgers      |
| Carter (TX)   | Grothman        | McSally      |
| Chabot        | Guthrie         | Meadows      |
| Cheney        | Handel          | Mitchell     |
| Coffman       | Harper          | Moolenaar    |
| Cole          | Harris          | Mooney (WV)  |
| Collins (GA)  | Hartzler        | Mullin       |
| Collins (NY)  | Hensarling      | Murphy (FL)  |
| Comer         | Herrera Beutler | Newhouse     |
| Comstock      | Hice, Jody B.   | Noem         |
| Conaway       | Higgins (LA)    | Norman       |
| Cook          | Hill            | Nunes        |
| Cooper        | Holding         | Olson        |
| Correa        | Hollingsworth   | Palazzo      |
| Costa         | Hudson          | Palmer       |
| Costello (PA) | Huizenga        | Paulsen      |
| Cramer        | Hultgren        | Pearce       |
| Crawford      | Hunter          | Perry        |
| Cuellar       | Hurd            | Peterson     |
| Culberson     | Issa            | Poliquin     |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Jenkins (KS)    | Posey        |
| Curtis        | Johnson (LA)    | Ratcliffe    |
| Davidson      | Johnson (OH)    | Reed         |
| Davis, Rodney | Johnson, Sam    | Reichert     |
| Denham        | Jordan          | Rice (SC)    |
| Dent          | Joyce (OH)      | Roby         |
| DeSantis      | Katko           | Roe (TN)     |
| DesJarlais    | Kelly (MS)      | Rogers (AL)  |

Rohrabacher  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster

Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner

Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NAYS—175

Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo

Garamendi  
Gomez  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross

O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buchanan

NOT VOTING—18

Adams  
Carson (IN)  
Cummings  
Gutiérrez  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson, E. B.

Jones  
Kuster (NH)  
Labrador  
Lipinski  
McCollum  
Messer

Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Renacci  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Scalise

□ 1648

Mses. BASS, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs.

BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. HANABUSA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas and FORTENBERRY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the tradition of the House Chaplain dates to the earliest days of the House of Representatives, beginning in 1789;

Whereas, the role of House Chaplain has been filled by 60 individuals of various religious denominations, serving Members of Congress of all faiths;

Whereas, Father Patrick Conroy has served honorably as House Chaplain since May 25, 2011, when he was appointed by then-Speaker John A. Boehner in consultation with Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi;

Whereas, Father Conroy had been reappointed and elected by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, most recently January 3, 2017;

Whereas, on April 16, 2018, the Nation's first Jesuit—and only the second Catholic—Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives submitted his resignation before the full House;

Whereas, the Chaplain had only eight months remaining in his term of service to the House;

Whereas, this resignation was requested by the office of Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the House of Representatives;

Whereas, the Speaker's office said ". . . the decision (to remove the Chaplain) was his (Speaker Ryan's);"

Whereas, on May 3, 2018, Father Conroy submitted a letter retracting and rescinding his resignation, which was accepted by Speaker Ryan;

Whereas, despite the Speaker's statement accepting this retraction letter, a number of Members of Congress remain concerned about what motivated the original request for Father Conroy to resign and the lack of adequate notification or explanation given to Members;

Whereas, the rights of Members of the House of Representatives were undermined when the leader of one party made a unilateral decision to ask for the resignation of the Chaplain;

Whereas, this resignation and the circumstances behind it has compromised the integrity and the dignity of the House of Representatives by politicizing the office of the House Chaplain;

Resolved, that there is hereby established a select committee to investigate the circumstances around the resignation of the House Chaplain;

the circumstances around the resignation of the House Chaplain;

The select committee shall be comprised of six members, of which three shall be appointed by the chair of the Committee on Ethics and three by the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics;

The select committee shall investigate the motivations and actions that led to the resignation of the Chaplain, including the decisions to remove the Chaplain and the process by which Members of Congress were notified of the resignation;

The select committee shall provide a report to the House by July 13, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from New York to offer the resolution just noticed.

Does the gentleman offer the resolution?

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 878

Whereas, the tradition of the House Chaplain dates to the earliest days of the House of Representatives, beginning in 1789;

Whereas, the role of House Chaplain has been filled by 60 individuals of various religious denominations, serving Members of Congress of all faiths;

Whereas, Father Patrick Conroy has served honorably as House Chaplain since May 25, 2011, when he was appointed by then-Speaker John A. Boehner in consultation with Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi;

Whereas, Father Conroy had been reappointed and elected by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, most recently January 3, 2017;

Whereas, on April 16, 2018, the nation's first Jesuit—and only the second Catholic—Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives submitted his resignation before the full House;

Whereas, the Chaplain had only eight months remaining in his term of service to the House;

Whereas, this resignation was requested by the office of Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the House of Representatives;

Whereas, the Speaker's office said ". . . the decision (to remove the Chaplain) was his (Speaker Ryan's);"

Whereas, on May 3, 2018, Father Conroy submitted a letter retracting and rescinding his resignation, which was accepted by Speaker Ryan;

Whereas, despite the Speaker's statement accepting this retraction letter, a number of Members of Congress remain concerned about what motivated the original request for Father Conroy to resign and the lack of adequate notification or explanation given to Members;

Whereas, the rights of Members of the House of Representatives were undermined when the leader of one party made a unilateral decision to ask for the resignation of the Chaplain;

Whereas, this resignation and the circumstances behind it has compromised the integrity and the dignity of the House of Representatives by politicizing the office of the House Chaplain;

Resolved, that there is hereby established a select committee to investigate the circumstances around the resignation of the House Chaplain;

The select committee shall be comprised of six members, of which three shall be appointed by the chair of the Committee on

Ethics, and three by the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics;

The select committee shall investigate the motivations and actions that led to the resignation of the Chaplain, including the decisions to remove the Chaplain and the process by which Members of Congress were notified of the resignation;

The select committee shall provide a report to the House by July 13, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCarthy moves to lay the resolution on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, is this motion privileged?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has offered a motion to table the question of privilege.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am asking on the underlying resolution before you, is it a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announced that the resolution qualified as privileged.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, could the House consider this motion immediately? The gentleman from New York requests: Can the House consider this motion immediately?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will first consider the pending motion to table.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the Chair rule as to whether or not the House could consider this motion immediately?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will first consider the motion to table. If the motion fails, then the House could pursue other dispositions of the resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, one more further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the vote to table that you are speaking of will prevent this measure from coming to the floor today immediately. Is that not true?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will now consider the motion to table.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 182, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—223

|               |                 |                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Abraham       | Gohmert         | Noem              |
| Aderholt      | Goodlatte       | Norman            |
| Allen         | Gosar           | Nunes             |
| Amodei        | Gowdy           | Olson             |
| Arrington     | Granger         | Palazzo           |
| Babin         | Graves (GA)     | Palmer            |
| Bacon         | Graves (LA)     | Paulsen           |
| Banks (IN)    | Graves (MO)     | Pearce            |
| Barletta      | Griffith        | Perry             |
| Barr          | Grothman        | Poliquin          |
| Barton        | Posey           | Royce             |
| Bergman       | Guthrie         | Ratcliffe         |
| Biggs         | Handel          | Reed              |
| Bilirakis     | Harper          | Reichert          |
| Bishop (MI)   | Harris          | Rice (SC)         |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hartzer         | Roby              |
| Black         | Hensarling      | Roe (TN)          |
| Blackburn     | Herrera Beutler | Rogers (AL)       |
| Blum          | Hice, Jody B.   | Rohrabacher       |
| Bost          | Higgins (LA)    | Rooney, Francis   |
| Brady (TX)    | Hill            | Rooney, Thomas J. |
| Brooks (AL)   | Holding         | Ros-Lehtinen      |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hollingsworth   | Roskam            |
| Buchanan      | Hudson          | Ross              |
| Buck          | Huizenga        | Rothfus           |
| Bucshon       | Hultgren        | Rouzer            |
| Budd          | Hunter          | Royce (CA)        |
| Burgess       | Hurd            | Russell           |
| Byrne         | Issa            | Rutherford        |
| Calvert       | Jenkins (KS)    | Sanford           |
| Carter (GA)   | Johnson (LA)    | Schweikert        |
| Carter (TX)   | Johnson (OH)    | Scott, Austin     |
| Chabot        | Johnson, Sam    | Sensenbrenner     |
| Cheney        | Jordan          | Sessions          |
| Coffman       | Joyce (OH)      | Shimkus           |
| Cole          | Katko           | Shuster           |
| Collins (GA)  | Kelly (MS)      | Simpson           |
| Collins (NY)  | Kelly (PA)      | Smith (MO)        |
| Comer         | King (IA)       | Smith (NE)        |
| Comstock      | King (NY)       | Smith (NJ)        |
| Conaway       | Kinzinger       | Smith (TX)        |
| Cook          | Kinzinger       | Smucker           |
| Costello (PA) | Knight          | Stefanik          |
| Cramer        | Kustoff (TN)    | Stewart           |
| Crawford      | LaHood          | Stivers           |
| Culberson     | LaMalfa         | Taylor            |
| Curbelo (FL)  | Lamborn         | Tenney            |
| Curtis        | Lance           | Thompson (PA)     |
| Davidson      | Latta           | Thornberry        |
| Davis, Rodney | Lesko           | Tipton            |
| Denham        | Lewis (MN)      | Trott             |
| Dent          | LoBiondo        | Turner            |
| DeSantis      | Long            | Upton             |
| DesJarlais    | Loudermilk      | Valadao           |
| Diaz-Balart   | Love            | Wagner            |
| Donovan       | Lucas           | Walberg           |
| Duffy         | Luetkemeyer     | Walden            |
| Duncan (SC)   | MacArthur       | Walker            |
| Duncan (TN)   | Marchant        | Walorski          |
| Dunn          | Marino          | Walters, Mimi     |
| Emmer         | Marshall        | Weber (TX)        |
| Estes (KS)    | Massie          | Webster (FL)      |
| Faso          | Mast            | Wenstrup          |
| Ferguson      | McCarthy        | Westerman         |
| Fitzpatrick   | McCaul          | Williams          |
| Fleischmann   | McClintock      | Wilson (SC)       |
| Flores        | McHenry         | Wittman           |
| Fortenberry   | McKinley        | Womack            |
| Fox           | McMorris        | Woodall           |
| Frelinghuysen | McRodgers       | Yoder             |
| Gaetz         | McSally         | Yoho              |
| Gallagher     | Meadows         | Young (AK)        |
| Garrett       | Mitchell        | Young (IA)        |
| Gianforte     | Moolenaar       | Zeldin            |
| Gibbs         | Mooney (WV)     |                   |
|               | Mullin          |                   |
|               | Newhouse        |                   |

NAYS—182

|          |                   |               |
|----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Aguilar  | Bishop (GA)       | Brownley (CA) |
| Amash    | Blumenauer        | Bustos        |
| Barragán | Bonamici          | Butterfield   |
| Bass     | Boyle, Brendan F. | Capuano       |
| Beatty   | Brady (PA)        | Carbajal      |
| Bera     | Brown (MD)        | Cárdenas      |
| Beyer    |                   | Cartwright    |

|                   |                |                |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Castro (FL)       | Huffman        | Perlmutter     |
| Castro (TX)       | Jackson Lee    | Peters         |
| Chu, Judy         | Jayapal        | Peterson       |
| Ciulline          | Jeffries       | Pingree        |
| Clark (MA)        | Johnson (GA)   | Pocan          |
| Clarke (NY)       | Kaptur         | Polis          |
| Clay              | Keating        | Price (NC)     |
| Cleaver           | Kelly (IL)     | Quigley        |
| Clyburn           | Kennedy        | Raskin         |
| Cohen             | Khanna         | Rice (NY)      |
| Connolly          | Kihuen         | Richmond       |
| Cooper            | Kildee         | Roybal-Allard  |
| Correa            | Kilmer         | Ruiz           |
| Costa             | Kind           | Ruppersberger  |
| Courtney          | Krishnamoorthi | Rush           |
| Crist             | Lamb           | Ryan (OH)      |
| Crowley           | Langevin       | Sánchez        |
| Cueellar          | Larsen (WA)    | Sarbanes       |
| Davis (CA)        | Larson (CT)    | Schakowsky     |
| Davis, Danny      | Lawrence       | Schiff         |
| DeFazio           | Lawson (FL)    | Schneider      |
| DeGette           | Lee            | Schrader       |
| Delaney           | Levin          | Scott (VA)     |
| DeLauro           | Lewis (GA)     | Serrano        |
| DelBene           | Lieu, Ted      | Sewell (AL)    |
| Demings           | Loeb sack      | Shea-Porter    |
| DeSaulnier        | Lofgren        | Sherman        |
| Deutch            | Lowenthal      | Sinema         |
| Dingell           | Lowe y         | Sires          |
| Doggett           | Lujan Grisham, | Smith (WA)     |
| Doyle, Michael F. | M.             | Soto           |
| Ellison           | Luján, Ben Ray | Speier         |
| Engel             | Lynch          | Suo zzi        |
| Eshoo             | Maloney,       | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Espail lat        | Carolyn B.     | Takano         |
| Esty (CT)         | Maloney, Sean  | Thompson (CA)  |
| Evans             | Matsui         | Thompson (MS)  |
| Foster            | McEachin       | Titus          |
| Frankel (FL)      | McGovern       | Tonko          |
| Fudge             | McNerney       | Torres         |
| Gabbard           | Meeks          | Tsongas        |
| Gallego           | Meng           | Vargas         |
| Garamendi         | Moore          | Veasey         |
| Gomez             | Moulton        | Vela           |
| Gonzalez (TX)     | Murphy (FL)    | Velázquez      |
| Gottheimer        | Nadler         | Visclosky      |
| Green, Al         | Neal           | Walz           |
| Green, Gene       | Nolan          | Wasserman      |
| Grijalva          | Norcross       | Schultz        |
| Hanabusa          | O'Halleran     | Waters, Maxine |
| Hastings          | O'Rourke       | Watson Coleman |
| Heck              | Pallone        | Welch          |
| Higgins (NY)      | Panetta        | Wilson (FL)    |
| Himes             | Pascrell       | Yarmuth        |
| Hoyer             | Payne          |                |
|                   | Pelosi         |                |

NOT VOTING—23

|                 |             |              |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Adams           | Jones       | Poe (TX)     |
| Blunt Rochester | Kuster (NH) | Renacci      |
| Brat            | Labrador    | Rogers (KY)  |
| Carson (IN)     | Lipinski    | Rokita       |
| Cummings        | McCollum    | Rosen        |
| Gutiérrez       | Messer      | Scalise      |
| Jenkins (WV)    | Napolitano  | Scott, David |
| Johnson, E. B.  | Pittenger   |              |

□ 1714

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 171 and "yea" on rollcall No. 172.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2018 I was in my district for my primary election and missed rollcall votes 169, 170, 171, and 172. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Nay" on rollcall 169, "Nay" on rollcall 170, "Nay" on rollcall 171, and "Nay" on rollcall 172.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 1587 AND H.R. 4199

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of both H.R. 1587 and H.R. 4199, bills originally introduced by Representative Slaughter of New York, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut? There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3053, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-665) on the resolution (H. Res. 879) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CELEBRATING THE BAPTISMS OF DR. FRANK GASKILL, OLIVIA GASKILL, AND MADDOX GASKILL

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the baptism of Dr. Frank Gaskill and his two children, Olivia and Maddox, of Charlotte, North Carolina, this past weekend. On May 6, at the Myers Park United Methodist Church, I was able to celebrate a member joining the church of faith.

Dr. Gaskill is a psychologist and author, who has dedicated his life to helping children with Asperger's. After earning his bachelor of arts, master's, and Ph.D. in psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, he went on to develop a practice that has been recognized as one of the most creative, innovative, and best run practices in the United States.

I look forward to the positive impact Dr. Gaskill will continue to have, and I am overjoyed by his commitment to his faith.

Dr. Gaskill, as you begin this new part of your life, look to Psalm 37:3, which reminds us: "Trust in the Lord and do good; dwell in the land and cultivate faithfulness."

RECOGNIZING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of America's teachers.

In classrooms across the country, teachers are doing an excellent job in educating our children and preparing them for their future success. Teachers are much more than educators. They are leaders, and they are role models.

Mr. Speaker, this week is Teacher Appreciation Week, and I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring our teachers not just today, but every day.

On a personal note, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring three teachers in my life:

My father, the late Congressman Donald Payne, Sr., was a high school teacher who used his time in Congress to fight for K-12 education at home and abroad;

My sister, Wanda Payne, just retired last year from teaching kindergarten and pre-K and special needs children for 31 years; and

My sister, Nicole Payne, who is director of alternative education for the Paterson School District in New Jersey.

My father and sisters, like teachers across this country, help young people grow into strong, capable adults. For that, let's honor them.

ENACTING TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a creative solution to enacting term limits without amending the Constitution, H.R. 5539, the Thomas Jefferson Public Service Act of 2018.

Under this proposal, after six terms in the House or two in the Senate, Members of Congress will only receive \$1 a year in compensation for their service, effectively implementing real term limits. Again, no constitutional amendment necessary.

Critics may say this will create a Congress full of rich people, but, in fact, people using this argument are exactly the career politicians we need to weed out. If a person were to ignore the effective 12-year term limit, regardless of how much money they might have, the culture of term limits would be set in and they would be widely opposed, criticized, and should be thrown out.

Eighty-six percent of our customers, the voters, want term limits. As a businessperson, I am just figuring out how to get them what they want. That is what we do in the real world: satisfy customers.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CARRIE PARSONS

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Carrie Parsons. Carrie always made sure to live

her life by her favorite saying: "live, laugh, and love."

She enjoyed playing intramural softball and working at the staffing firm, Ajilon. Carrie recently got engaged in Hawaii to the love of her life, and they were excited to start their life together.

She went to the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1 with four of her friends for a girls trip. Carrie always loved dancing and singing to her favorite country songs, and she made sure to ensure everyone was having a good time. Her friends remember her as being a "one in a million friend" who was young, vibrant, and full of life.

I would like to extend my condolences to Carrie Parsons' family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, May is Mental Health Awareness Month, and I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the need for increased mental health awareness and resources in our communities. I would like to recognize an organization in my district, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that does just that.

The Bucks County Crisis Intervention Team, founded in 2008, brings together law enforcement, mental health professionals, and local officials to reinforce the treatment of mental illness as a disorder and not as a crime.

I am appreciative of the law enforcement officers who, last month, became certified as members of the Bucks County Crisis Intervention Team, the 18th class to do so.

I would also like to thank mental health advocate Sharon Curran, whose involvement with this program and work with the Lenape Valley Foundation makes Bucks County a safer and a more accommodating community.

Mr. Speaker, working together with this group, we look forward to expanded access to quality mental healthcare for anyone in our community who is in need.

HONORING "SUPER" COOPER BUSCH

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent from the 22nd District of New York, Cooper Busch, better known as Super Cooper.

Cooper Busch of Chenango Bridge, a spunky, fearless, and loving 4-year-old, an incredible fighter, born with Down syndrome, Cooper was diagnosed in November of 2016 with acute myeloid leukemia.

On Sunday, May 6, sadly, sweet Cooper passed away. Cooper is survived by his parents, Tara and Steve; his brother, Cole; and his sister, Hope.

In Cooper's last month, he received a surprise total bedroom makeover, he threw out the first pitch for the Rumble Ponies, and he dropped the puck for the Binghamton Devils.

Volunteers organized fundraisers, sent in meals for the Busch family, and sold Super Cooper t-shirts. A local artist even wrote and illustrated a special book called, "Super Cooper Saves the Day."

Our condolences are with the entire Busch family during this very difficult time. Cooper's enduring spirit and bravery are an inspiration to all of us. Super Cooper's smile, lovable personality, and his zeal to live each day to the fullest, no matter how challenging, no matter how much time we may be allotted on this very dear Earth, will be his eternal legacy to all of us.

May Super Cooper rest in peace.

#### LEGISLATION AS A REFLECTION OF MORALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to take up any of the topics that are already in order here, which is most every topic delivered in a decent fashion.

But I have some things to talk about here tonight that are a bit celebratory, things that I am pretty happy about. I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, the narrative of a significant accomplishment that I think, in the end, will save the lives of perhaps millions of innocent unborn babies in this country.

The history of *Roe v. Wade* goes back to January 22, 1973, when the United States Supreme Court came down with a decision. Coupled were two cases the same day, *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, and those two cases that were delivered launched abortion on demand in America. It was a stunning set of decisions, the scope of which, the magnitude of which, could not have been comprehended at that time.

I remember then, when they came down. We had no children yet at that point. Marilyn and I were married, but at that age in life and not having any experience with the impact of such a decision—America didn't have that experience—the way we analyzed that thing, didn't understand how severe this would be.

Yet, once the decision came down, there is something that I have learned, Mr. Speaker, and that is that people say: You can't legislate morality.

I have always thought that was a pretty weak statement and not very defensible, but you hear it quite often: You can't legislate morality. You can't legislate morality.

Well, legislation is a reflection of morality. For example, we have laws against murder and rape and assault and battery and armed robbery, and the list goes on and on of the things that are prohibited. They are the reflections of the morality of a nation.

The lack of such legislation would indicate only one of two things: either it is the lack of morality, or it is a nation that doesn't need laws to frame it because the morality of the nation is so enshrined in the culture that there doesn't need to be laws.

For example, one of those examples would be that, for centuries, marriage was between a man and a woman. We didn't need laws that said so because everybody knew that marriage defined a union between a man and a woman—in my case, joined together in holy matrimony.

So as the legislation came forward—and I was in the Iowa Senate at the time—I remember some of that debate and discussion, and it was: Why do we need to pass this law to defend marriage, the Defense of Marriage Act?

I helped write part of that language, Mr. Speaker, and I had a little bit of a hard time explaining why it was important that we move it, more or less, an insurance policy so that we could protect marriage in Iowa against the movement that had just begun not very much earlier than that by litigation out in Hawaii. And then the conflation between civil unions and marriage.

But the reflection of the values of marriage were in our culture so deeply that senator after senator stood on the floor and said: Why do we need to do this? This is a redundant exercise. It is a waste of our time. Everybody knows that marriage is between a man and a woman.

And we passed the Defense of Marriage Act. There were only about three or four who voted against it. We wondered why they did that. They were out there in the fringes, so we thought, at the time. That was about 1998.

□ 1730

By 2009—and that would only be 11 years later—the Iowa Supreme Court came down with the decision *Varnum v. Brien*, which imposed same-sex marriage on Iowa, the transformation of a culture that needed a law to protect marriage, if we were to protect it. But once, for thousands of years—I will say at least for thousands of years—marriage was between a man and a woman, and it changed.

When something became permissive, then the permissiveness of it changed the morality of the situation. That is not a very good description, Mr. Speaker, of what happened with the abortion circumstances in America. We understood then that life begins at the moment of conception. But when *Roe v. Wade* came down with the decision that prohibited the States from regulating abortion and prohibiting abortion, then it became permissible and permissive,

and it became pervasive at the same time.

Some of our peak incidents of abortion, from 1973 until the latter part of that decade, got up to 1.6 million abortions a year. And, today, after 45 years of *Roe v. Wade*, this Nation has seen 60 million—some say 61 million—babies aborted. Babies who would be growing up in our society today: going to school; playing ball; studying; going to church; loving their brothers and sisters, their mothers, their fathers, their grandparents, their aunts, their uncles. They are gone: 60 million little babies gone.

And not only 60 million—there is no way to actually describe 60 million babies as only—but, in addition, there are another roughly 60 million who were not born because their mothers were aborted. A population between 100 and 120 million Americans are missing today because of *Roe v. Wade's* decision—*Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*—an unsoundly and unjustly decision that came down from the United States Supreme Court.

One of the problems we have in this country is we have three branches of government. A lot of government teachers and constitutional teachers instruct that it is three coequal branches of government, but that is not what our Founding Fathers expected. They defined it, instead, that the judicial branch of government would be the weakest of the three branches of government.

Yet our society, our culture, our civilization gives such reverence to the United States Supreme Court that they can't even get their minds around the idea of: What do you do if the Court comes down with an atrocious, outrageous, erroneous, nonconstitutional decision that visits 60 million deaths of innocent babies on our country and another 60 million babies who are not born because of a result of it? A missing 100 to 120 million babies—a decision of the Supreme Court.

And what do we do?

We accept the decision as if the decisions of the Supreme Court are utterly sacrosanct, and the only way they can ever change is if the circumstances of that Court should change in such a way that the appointments and the confirmations to the Court could transform and reverse the erroneous decisions in the past.

Now, there are circumstances where the Supreme Court has reversed their own decision. We had the *Dred Scott* decision that actually wasn't reversed. That was a decision on slavery. Some say that that was an erroneous, poorly found decision.

I think I side with Abraham Lincoln that it was constitutional at its time. It probably was a decision that conformed to the Constitution, however morally wrong it was.

Then along came the 13th, the 14th, and the 15th Amendments that rectified the situation that was put upon us by *Dred Scott*. And, by the way,

600,000 lives lost in the Civil War, putting an end to slavery and resolving the Union.

Was the Union going to be something that one could separate from, or once you are part of the Union are you always part of the Union?

And, as this turned out, 600,000 Americans were killed in the Civil War, putting an end to slavery—600,000. It sounds like a lot until you compare it to 60 million babies aborted, Mr. Speaker.

This is the worst atrocity ever—accumulated effect of it—the worst atrocity ever committed on American soil, and it was sanctified by the Supreme Court in an unsoundly founded decision.

Now, the thing that obstructs us from getting pro-life legislation passed is a few people who profess that they are pro-life—a pro-life organization. They say: Well, we have to respect the Supreme Court decision that it is sacrosanct.

The Supreme Court laid out the parameters of viability not only in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, but also in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992: this viability concept, which is that if a baby can't survive outside of the womb, it is really not a life. Well, we know better than that because we can hear their hearts beat, we can watch them move around inside of the womb, we can watch them squirm, we can watch them suck their thumb, and we can watch them move their lips like they are trying to talk.

We bond with these babies now through ultrasound. The ultrasound is just about as good as Skype with our children and grandchildren who are out here breathing this free air. Those are the circumstances that have changed. We know that it is life.

The Supreme Court's decision wasn't soundly found. They weren't looking at an ultrasound then, back 45 years ago. We didn't know whether we had twins, or singles, or triplets, or quadruplets then because we didn't have enough ability to even listen to the heartbeat precisely enough. Today, we can, Mr. Speaker.

Today, we are listening to heartbeats, and, today, we are watching babies squirm, and move, and suck their thumb, and move their mouth like they are trying to talk, and get their exercise inside of the womb. Now we know. We can't deny. It is not a blob of tissue, it is not some kind of an intruder. This is a unique DNA, innocent, unborn human life.

We brought legislation here to this Congress called the Heartbeat legislation, H.R. 490. In this legislation, it says that before an abortionist sets about committing an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat with transabdominal ultrasound, which picks up a heartbeat between 7 and 8 weeks from fertilization or conception. He must first check for a heartbeat. If a heartbeat is detected, the baby is protected.

This rings not only in our hearts, but it rings true in our conscience. We

know that where there is a heartbeat, there is life. And we know that if you go in and surgically, or by any other method, snuff out that heartbeat, you are snuffing out life, the most innocent among us.

Father Jonathan Morris, a priest from New York whom we see on FOX News in the morning, one day was commenting. He was commenting about how the ladies and the mothers in the church, when their babies start to cry too loud, they get up and hustle them out of the church, and he said: Why would you do that?

Those are the only innocent voices in that church. Well, the most innocent are in the womb, and the most innocent have been victimized by this idea of convenience, or women's rights, or that it is not somebody else's business to tell someone else what to do with their body.

Well, it isn't about their body, Mr. Speaker. It is about that unique being, with that unique combination of DNA. That is how precious this is. We never know the potential of a baby, an innocent unborn baby.

There was a story in the news a couple of days ago. Now, there are those who would predict that inside the womb you can identify Down syndrome, you can identify other afflictions; and those other afflictions, they might argue, make that baby less than perfect. But those babies, when they are loved, are perfect for those who love them.

We can't decide with a level of certainty, regardless, when they are in the womb. If there is a heartbeat there, that is an innocent life that is deserving of protection. If we would not end that life of that baby outside of the womb, we would not, and should not, end it inside the womb. So if a heartbeat is detected, the baby is protected.

H.R. 490 has 171 cosponsors here in the House of Representatives. It has come further and faster than any significant piece of pro-life legislation, I believe, since 1973 in *Roe v. Wade* in the first place.

We need to get this bill to the floor of this House and send it over and put it on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk. There is hardly any room left on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk these days. That number must be up to 500 or so bills sitting on his desk. But we can put Heartbeat there on top of MITCH MCCONNELL's desk.

When you do that, that is the highest priority. Whatever it is on top of the desk is the highest priority. And we can say to MITCH: Bring this thing out to the floor of the Senate and send Heartbeat up to the President's desk.

If you can't do that, send the President to the States where the Democrats who will vote "no" on it are running for office. Remind them that America is now a pro-life nation, and this pro-life nation wants to pass pro-life legislation.

If they can't do it with the Senators who are seated over there now, they

can do it with the Senators who can be seated over there next January. I believe that the conscience of America will be reflected if we send that over and put the bill on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk.

Here is the polling that we have also. There are some people who worry about public opinion. They should know their conscience and act off of their conscience. But off of public opinion, it works this way: the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. We have a Barna poll that was conducted, actually, February of last year.

It says that 86 percent of Republicans support the Heartbeat bill without exceptions, 61 percent of Independents support it without exceptions, and 55 percent of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill without exceptions. That is an astonishing thing to see that we have a majority of Democrats. I would call that a landslide if I won by 55 percent or more. This is a poll of a landslide among Democrats where we do have a Democrat or two or three who will vote for this bill. But, for the most part, that has been polarized here also.

We used to have at least 60 different pro-life Democrats who would come in and vote on pro-life legislation. Now I count maybe three. I hope that number is more. I regret that the parties have gotten this polarized, but some of this stuff happened when they had to walk the plank to vote for ObamaCare, and the people who replaced them were conservative Republicans. That is one of the reasons why we have so many cosponsors here on the Republican side—171 cosponsors here—and 162 national organizations or leaders have signed on.

I notice that Reverend Franklin Graham sent out a tweet in support of Heartbeat legislation here a couple of weeks ago. I am a great admirer and respector of Reverend Graham, and I believe that his moral barometer matches that of any moral.

The support for this bill has come along well.

I will circle back to the resistance that we have that we need to overcome yet, Mr. Speaker.

While we reached a plateau on the Heartbeat bill, it became apparent to me that having one line in the water—however good that line is in the water here in the House of Representatives behind H.R. 490—it was also important to get some other lines in the water. The one thing that I could do was to take the Heartbeat bill and offer it up to the Iowa Legislature.

I had a conversation with State Senator Brad Zaun. He had a shot and would have made a good Congressman, but he is chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Iowa Senate today. I had that conversation with him and had a conversation with Senator Jason Schultz. They took the Heartbeat legislation and brought that into the Iowa Senate.

The draft of that legislation was adapted to a bit of a degree to conform

to the State legislature. They worked that bill around through their caucus a little bit. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee there, Senator Brad Zaun, said: I am bringing this bill through committee. He was keeping me up to speed with what was going on.

That was an intense hearing before the committee. I am just going to speak on what I hear back channel—not that I was in the room. There were some people who wanted to stage a protest against the Heartbeat bill. So the chairman of the Judiciary Committee looked at them before he gaveled in the committee and said: If anybody has come here to protest, raise your hand, and I will throw you out now. I liked his approach. There was no need to throw anybody out because they actually behaved.

So there was a quiet, but an intense, hearing and markup before the Iowa Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Republicans all voted for the Heartbeat bill. Then here it sits on the calendar of the floor of the Iowa Senate.

Now the next big milestone needed to be reached, and that is that the majority leader, Bill Dix, brought the topic up before the caucus. That is closed door, so I am only speculating on what I picked up also back channel, Mr. Speaker. But he said to the 29 Republicans seated there in the caucus: Is there anybody here who doesn't want to vote for this Heartbeat bill? No one raised their hand, so the decision was made: We will bring it to the floor.

Well, it had been assigned to the chair of the subcommittee for the bill, who was Amy Sinclair. Amy Sinclair put together the subcommittee effort and prepared herself for an intense debate. It was expected to be an intense debate. I pointed out to her that my first debate on the floor of the Iowa Senate took me 7½ hours before I got my bill passed.

□ 1745

It was official English, by the way. It was a long, hard slog, to quote Rumsfeld.

Hers was entirely different. I thought there would be 6, 7, 8, 10 hours of debate. She brought the bill up, made eloquent opening remarks, rebutted a few of the remarks that were made on the other side, and 24 minutes later, the vote went up on the board, 30-20.

An independent voted also—and his name is David Johnson—for the heartbeat bill in the Iowa Senate, along with all 29 Republican senators, 30-20 on 24 minutes of debate.

And it rocketed over to the house of representatives, and, once again, I had the misconception of thinking to myself, this is going to be easy, but, like a lot of things in life, it isn't that easy.

So, as we began to see how the bill was going to move, if it moved at all, in the Iowa House, what I learned was that they didn't think they could move it, they didn't think they had the votes. The first whip check card that we worked on there—we needed 51

votes. There were 100 in the Iowa House. Of the 51 votes we needed, we only had 35. So a bunch of us went to work.

By the way, one of the people at the top of my list to thank here in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tonight, Mr. Speaker, is the Iowa representative of National Right to Life—who is not supporting this bill at the national level, and they need to lead, follow, or get out of the way. But their Iowa representative, his name is Scott Valencia, and he is of Iowa Right to Life. He was magnificent in the work that he did and the strategy that unfolded and in the network that he had put together with the pro-life community within Iowa.

I could always count on Scott being at the center, the nexus, of the communications on who was thinking what, who was saying what, and helping to inform us in the spreadsheet we put together to whip the votes.

Also on that list would be, from The Family Leader, Bob Vander Plaats, whom I have campaigned a lot with. We worked together to vote three supreme court justices off the Iowa bench. He and his team at The Family Leader, including Chuck Hurley, a longtime friend, and Danny Carroll, a former representative, were stellar in their efforts in focusing on how we would pull the votes together in the Iowa House.

There were 32 organizations in the Iowa pro-life coalition. Those are the organizations that I referenced, Scott Valencia, that put his finger on that pulse, but many of these people are people I worked with for years, that go back 20 or more years on this issue, and I am so proud of the work they did.

Our former majority leader here in the United States House of Representatives, Tom DeLay, made the trip up to Iowa to testify in favor of the heartbeat bill before a hearing in the Iowa House of Representatives, along with Dr. Kathy Altman, who was a witness for us here in Congress as well, Mr. Speaker.

So I am very, very grateful to all of these folks and many more, but the jobs that they did helped move this thing in the right direction. The hearing was intense, and there was strong testimony on both sides, but the voice for the unborn, the voice for the most innocent prevailed in that hearing. And it gave more confidence to some of the people that were reluctant to vote in favor of the bill on that night.

One of those people, I suspect—and I suspect only—would be Dave Heaton, who I count as a good friend. I have always enjoyed him and had a certain affection for the affable gentleman who has so many prime ribs down there in his restaurant in southeast Iowa, but when he voted "yes" coming out of committee, he said, "Yes for now," and I thought maybe that was the end of it. But it turned out that we needed 51 votes. We wouldn't have had them if it hadn't been for the vote of Dave

Heaton as he retires. God bless Dave. I appreciate his vote.

I appreciate the vote and the work of so many there in the house, including Speaker Upmeyer, who is a second-generation speaker of the house of representatives, who has earned her place there and has become a very stable and a master strategist on how to move legislation through the legislature, along with Majority Leader Chris Hagenow, who was fully behind the heartbeat bill from the beginning and, I think, kept a low profile publicly but did a lot behind the scenes.

Then another individual whose character I know well, and that is the Speaker Pro Tem Matt Windschitl, who has been part of this strategy all along, a very, very steady hand, a very, very clear strategist, somebody you want to ride the river with. He does come from over there in the river bottom, not very far from me.

I appreciate the strategy and the work that each of these individuals did, but this doesn't stop at this point either, Mr. Speaker.

The chairman of the Human Resources Committee, Joel Fry, did master work on it, as well as the floor manager in the Iowa House, Shannon Lundgren. Shannon, I believe, is in her first term, and I haven't gotten to know her personally, but here is the narrative that I get from the way she managed that debate in the house. It was a lot longer in the house. It went on for hours, 5 to 7 hours, something like that, perhaps more. The bill passed around 11:30 that night.

Shannon, when she had brought the bill up there, this was the critique that came to me, is that she started out slow, and you might start to wonder if she was going to be able to hold her own through that very, very grueling trial that had been assigned to her that she was, I think, eager and proud to take on, and she should be proud, because she got stronger as the night wore on.

So did a number of the other members of the Iowa House. They stepped up to defend their positions and to advocate their narratives. One of them would be Steve Holt. He and also Sandy Salmon, who had introduced her own bill, her own pro-life legislation, they were strong and many others were strong in the way they handled their debate.

I didn't put together a complete, analyzed list here, Mr. Speaker, because, for one thing, I just didn't have the time, but I recognize the risk in naming names. There definitely are people that I have left out. There will be others that I will try to thread in here, but there will always be people that are left out.

Some of them in the middle of this, though, were Jack Whitver, who is the leader in the Iowa Senate. I mentioned Amy Sinclair, the chair of the subcommittee and the floor manager in the senate. Senator Brad Zaun, whom I have talked with a lot and grown to admire, and I appreciate his drive. He

doesn't hesitate, he doesn't equivocate, he knows what he believes, and he strategizes and acts upon it. And Senator Jason Schultz, whom I first brought up this topic with.

I want to thank every representative and every senator who spoke and who voted for the heartbeat bill in the Iowa legislature. It was a phenomenal accomplishment.

Last year, they passed a 20-week, called sometimes the pain-capable bill. Many thought that would be the end of the effort on pro-life for a while, and they came back this year and passed heartbeat legislation.

Not only was it the work, not only was it the debate, not only was it the negotiations and the votes that were counted and the effort on the whip team from those elected members who worked inside the house of representatives and the senate, but also the outside groups, the 32 outside organizations and then some, that came together. It was a phenomenal, phenomenal effort that brought this together.

I wanted to say also a couple of words about how difficult this was for some of the most pro-life people that we had. I am not one who believes in exceptions. I don't believe that a baby that is a product of a rape should be executed for the crime of their father. Neither do I believe that that should be the case for a baby who is a product of incest, which might be the crime of the father and it might be the crime of the father and the mother. Those babies are innocent, and they should have every right to life of every other baby conceived at any other time under any other circumstances.

But it came to that place where there were either going to be exceptions or there was going to be no bill passed. I think there would have been a way we might have been able to resolve that, but by the time it came to that place on the calendar, that place on the clock, that place on the legislative clock, a decision had to be made: Are we going to bring a bill to the floor of the Iowa House with exceptions, or are we going to have no bill whatsoever? That was the decision. That was the crux of the matter.

Coming to that place of decision, the right decision is: Let's save all the lives we can. Let's take all we can and get as much done as we can. If we could come back with heartbeat after the 20-week bill last year, maybe next year we can come back to eliminate the exceptions or perhaps even do personhood, which is the goal of the pro-life community. It should be that case worldwide.

So I know it was a very difficult decision for some. I happen to know that Skyler Wheeler may be the most pro-life member of the Iowa House of Representatives, and it was a very difficult decision for him, but with Skyler Wheeler, we got to 51. We have a bill that then was sent on its way to the Governor's desk.

Before I mention the Governor any further, I want to also mention some of the other help that we had. This promise on heartbeat legislation is rooted back to a request made by Phyllis Schlafly just days before she passed away that I would draft and introduce heartbeat legislation here in Congress. I followed through on that commitment.

She was, in a time of her life, a living, breathing icon, the clearest political thinker of our time, a pure constitutionalist, a strong, faithful Christian woman who left her mark and her imprint across this Nation in many, many ways. I have powerful respect for Phyllis Schlafly, for her life, for her contribution, for her judgment, and for the promise that I made on the day of her funeral.

I made that promise sitting in discussion and consultation with Janet Porter of Faith to Action, who has been the driving force on this, the launching force on this from the beginning. And Janet Porter now may be the most driven pro-life activist in America, and she has accomplished a lot to get this started. She teamed up with Tom DeLay, our former majority leader here. He made his fame as the whip, maybe the best whip that we have ever seen here in the House of Representatives. Both of them worked pro bono on this to move the votes and get cosponsors signed up here in Congress, which gave a lot of credibility to the heartbeat bill on its way to the Iowa legislature.

In addition, one of the push-backs that we got in the Iowa House was, "We don't want to spend taxpayers' money defending this legislation." It is something that they believe that—I mean, some of the folks would say: We will lose in court. So if you know you are going to lose, you can't spend taxpayers' money, knowing you are going to lose.

My response back to that was: We know we are going to lose at the lower court level. Anybody that argues that that is a reason not to move pro-life legislation, because we will lose at the district court level, we will lose at the circuit level, that is a given, because we have a strong precedent established by the United States Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. Of course the lower courts, respecting the Supreme Court, are not going to try to overturn a Supreme Court decision. We have to accept the idea that this will be litigated, it will go through the lower courts, and as it goes into the lower courts, we will lose at each turn until we get to the United States Supreme Court.

To give an example of how this worked in the past, on the ban on partial-birth abortion, which came to us about the end of the 1990s, as I recall, on the initial case, the ban on partial-birth abortion, that gruesome and ghastly procedure that is so, so awful, to describe it here on the floor of Con-

gress is more than I will do here tonight, Mr. Speaker, but Congress banned that procedure.

Having banned that procedure, it was litigated by—guess what—Planned Parenthood, the advocacy group for abortion itself, and the Supreme Court struck down our ban on partial-birth abortion. Of course, they have to use a rationale, so their rationale was that the act of a partial-birth abortion wasn't precisely enough defined, that it was vague, and if it was vague, then how would the abortionist know if he is committing a crime or not. I said: "You are killing a baby. That ought to be enough."

Instead, the Supreme Court ruled to strike down our ban on partial-birth abortion, but they wanted a more precise description of it. And they argued that Congress had not established that a partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

□ 1800

So I arrived in this Congress shortly after that decision. We went to work on this. The chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice at that time, where I am the chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice today, was STEVE CHABOT of Cincinnati, a strong pro-life advocate, and we held hearing after hearing in the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee.

By the way, the chairman of the full committee at that time was sitting here just a few minutes ago, Mr. JIM SENSENBRENNER.

So we established, through congressional hearings, and wrote a new ban on partial-birth abortion that precisely defined the act of a partial-birth abortion that we would prohibit by statute and congressional findings, after hearings, that it is never necessary to commit this heinous act in order to save the life of the mother.

With those congressional findings coupled with the precise definition, we passed the legislation and sent it out again, and it was litigated again by, let's see, Planned Parenthood—or that was Carhart. LeRoy Carhart was the abortionist out of Omaha who was the lead on that case, *Gonzales v. Carhart*, as I recall.

But in any case, that precise definition that we drafted and the congressional findings that it is never medically necessary to save the life of the mother were enough to get the same Court to reverse themselves and accept the conclusions that Congress had drawn because we had conformed to their request.

So there is a case where the Court came down on the side of striking down our ban on partial-birth abortion, and then we brought it back through the courts again and it was tried in three circuits simultaneously, and in every circuit we lost. But then the cases were packaged together and they went before the United States Supreme Court, and then we won on the side of life.

The Court reversed itself, but we lost at every lower court level. We only had a chance to succeed at the Supreme Court. And that is going to be the case with this legislation, as well, because it directly challenges *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

So it has to get to the Supreme Court. We are going to lose until we get there. When we get there, especially if we arrive in the Supreme Court with a new appointment to the Supreme Court, we are looking at, more likely now, under today's circumstances, the potential of a 5-4 Court, a Court that would be coming down on the side of the Constitution and the strict constructionism that protects life.

We are obligated to protect life under the 14th Amendment. So if Congress can define life, we define it as, if a heartbeat is detected, that is life, the baby is protected.

And the cost of defending this case isn't going to fall on the backs of Iowa taxpayers, Madam Speaker. Instead, we have two organizations that have volunteered to step up, *pro bono*, to defend this case before the courts, and those two organizations are—this is the message from Matt Staver of Liberty Counsel—Liberty University, many will know it as—and that has produced a pretty good chief of staff in my operation, Sarah Stevens.

Matt Staver has agreed to defend this, *pro bono*. That is Latin for "on the house." And also Martin Cannon of St. Thomas More Society will have agreed that they will also defend it *pro bono*. So we will see how this comes together, but it doesn't put the taxpayers of Iowa at risk.

So it makes it not only the right decision for life, the right decision for law, the right decision for our Constitution and, in particular, our 14th Amendment, it makes it the right decision for the taxpayers.

When we look at the society we live in today, the last time we had unemployment numbers down as low as we are seeing now, I remember them bringing a bill into the State legislature that would require all of the health insurance policies in Iowa to cover contraceptives. One of the arguments they made was we can't be having women missing work because they are pregnant, having babies. We need the labor force too much.

Well, that didn't fit to my analysis at the time, which is why I remember it. Instead, we need babies that will go to work in 18 or 20 years, and we need to sustain ourselves and our society.

I tell young people constantly, good people need to have a lot of babies and raise them right. That fixes everything that can be fixed. If good people raise their babies right and have a lot of babies, there will be enough people here to do the work we need to do; and we will create the jobs for others, and we will see people picking up and carrying their share of the load, pulling the har-

ness instead of riding in the wagon. That is what saves this society.

But, in any case, here we are, Madam Speaker, with a bill that passed out of the Iowa House that night, on about Wednesday night of last week, at 11:30 at night—might have been Tuesday night, 11:30 at night. May 2 was, let's see. About 11:30 that night.

And the dedication of our Iowa senators was such that they said: Well, let's just take this up right away. Why don't you carry that across the rotunda and we will take it up on the floor of the Iowa Senate.

And they did. And after a fairly short debate, they passed it in the Iowa Senate.

Again, there were so many missing, but 29 to—let's see. I remember the lower number of it. But it passed easily out of the Iowa Senate, and it was messaged to the Governor that night, which would have been, I believe, May 2.

So by the time we got around to Friday, I found myself in South Carolina, at the invitation of the Governor of South Carolina, to talk about sanctuary cities, and we ended up doing a press conference also on Heartbeat, interesting conversation.

I think we enjoyed a friendship, and I expect that South Carolina actually had a Heartbeat bill in front of them that was—it would have been very hard for it to survive reaching the sine die part of their session because they were about done.

The same with the sanctuary city bill. We tried to do what we could with that, but anything that didn't pass down there I think comes up again next year, and they have got an extra boost to get that done.

I really appreciate the leadership provided by Governor Henry McMaster on the sanctuary cities and on Heartbeat, and we will make sure that we are supportive down there, as we have been in Iowa.

Also, Governor Ricketts of Nebraska has said: Send me a Heartbeat bill; I'll sign it.

I know that there are people in the Nebraska Unicameral that are preparing to bring Heartbeat in next year in Nebraska, and I know that it is also part of the Governor's debate in the race in Florida. So there are other States that are looking as well.

This could be something that spreads out across the countryside in State after State after State, Madam Speaker, but it would not have had this kind of momentum had it not been for Governor Reynolds, who had a bill signing ceremony on Friday afternoon at 3 in her formal office in the capitol and filled the office up with lots of young kids and good, steady, stalwart legislators who deserve a lot of credit and to take a bow for this.

I looked at the pictures of that bill signing ceremony, and it occurred to me that they probably saved as many lives just during the debate for Heartbeat as were represented by the children in Governor Reynolds' office.

I thank Governor Reynolds for signing the bill and putting it into law.

She had put out a statement a week or a little more earlier that said that she is proud to be part of the most pro-life administration in Iowa history. Well, she can now, with confidence and, hopefully, at least, an inner pride let us know that she has signed the bill, and it makes Governor Kim Reynolds the most pro-life Governor in the history of the State of Iowa.

This accomplishment came about because of the work done by people I have mentioned here and many, many more who worked on this, who prayed for this, who relentlessly pushed in the right direction to bring about a bill that could go to the Governor's desk.

Governor Reynolds had such a magnificent bill signing ceremony that sent such a strong message to the rest of the country; and that message to the rest of the country would be this, Madam Speaker: that Iowa, this purple State, this State that voted for Barack Obama twice—we also went for Donald Trump, I might add. But Iowa actually launched Barack Obama's campaign for the Presidency. He slipped in there from Illinois and got a big bounce in the first-in-the-Nation caucus, and off he went to the Presidency and to his reelection as well, with strong support out of Iowa. But he won Iowa each time.

So prior to President Trump winning in the 2016 election, the time before that that went Republican was George Bush's 2004 reelection. We worked that hard, and he won Iowa by only 10,000 votes.

The other time, the next time prior that Iowa had gone for a Republican President was Ronald Reagan's reelection in 1984. So that is how rare those Iowa victories are.

We are a purple State, but Iowa Republicans have put up excellent leadership, and excellent leadership has emerged from a coalesced Republican Party that has been very strong and has hammered out the planks in the platform over and over again. They ring with utter clarity to me when I read that platform these days, Madam Speaker.

So I put out this challenge to the States and the rest of the country: If purple State Iowa can pass Heartbeat and have the strongest pro-life legislation in the United States of America—of the 50 States, Iowa has the strongest pro-life legislation passed into law, signed by Governor Reynolds—then the challenge that is laid out there for the rest of the States is see what you can do. Take a look at Iowa's legislation. Move the cleanest you can. No exceptions is best because that baby's life begins at the moment of fertilization, and we need to protect innocent life from that point on.

But we can define the beginning of life medically by requiring an ultrasound, and that ultrasound, if it picks up a heartbeat, if a heartbeat is detected, the baby is protected. That

phrase rings in the conscience of Americans nationwide. That is why 86 percent of Republicans support Heartbeat, H.R. 490. That is why 61 percent of Independents, and that is why 55 percent of Democrats do.

And, by the way, that 55 percent of Democrats is why no Republican will lose their seat for voting for Heartbeat, because Democrats won't dare attack you for that. If they do so, they are going against their own base, their own people, who are 55 percent pro-life, even though I can only count about three over here among the Democrats who will be cosponsors of this legislation and, I think, that can define themselves as pro-life.

So I thank all of these individuals who have worked so hard to put this whole strategy together, and I spent some time speaking to the issue, Madam Speaker, because I want the people to understand that things don't come easy and good ideas don't just float to the top and sail off to be passed. It takes real work and real organization to get things accomplished, and determination and conviction and people who believe.

I look back at Dr. John Willke, who was the founder, the original founder of National Right to Life, and that is the oldest and the largest pro-life organization in the country. He said this: "When I founded the pro-life movement, it wasn't to regulate how abortions would be done. It was to bring the abortion killing to an end. We have waited too long, and that wait has cost us too much." That is Dr. John C. Willke, cofounder and former president of National Right to Life.

Now, in their mission statement, I am not sure if I have it here in my text, Madam Speaker, but I will get it as close as I need to from memory if I don't have it.

National Right to Life's mission statement says that they are dedicated to protecting human life from the beginning of life till natural death. The beginning of life raised a question with me, so I went through their website to find out how they define the beginning of life.

They define it on their website, National Right to Life, as from the moment of fertilization. Life begins at the moment of fertilization, according to National Right to Life, and ends at natural death.

I agree with that. I think their mission statement is correct. I think we need to defend life from the moment of fertilization until natural death, and I think National Right to Life should do the same thing.

But they believe that we should not challenge the Supreme Court. They believe that we have to accept *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, and we have to accept the idea of viability that was framed within the *Casey* decision. That is why they have supported the 20-week bill, to get up there close to the edge of viability, this idea that a 24-week baby

can survive outside the womb, a 23-week baby can survive outside the womb, a 22½-week baby can survive outside the womb.

□ 1815

So under the supposition that we work our way back to actually a 21-week baby can survive outside the womb—and I saw data that said a 20½-week also. So the 20-week is marked down there to try to stretch the definition of viability just about as far as they could bring themselves to do so, but they fear challenging the Supreme Court.

They are accepting of the Supreme Court decisions, those decisions from 45 years ago, 60 million abortions ago, and they are stuck in the idea that we can't challenge the Supreme Court.

Well, how could you not challenge the Supreme Court of the United States? This is the United States Congress. Some teach it has three coequal branches of government. I said earlier it is not three. There is a superior branch of government. There is a branch of government that is the weakest of the three, defined by our Founding Fathers, to be the judicial branch of government.

And we have a decision that is called *Marbury v. Madison* that came in in the first years of the 19th century, where the Supreme Court asserted their authority to define the Constitution and tell us all what it means, and we have acquiesced to that, decision after decision, for over 200 years.

And how can it be that a Supreme Court of lifetime appointees that conceivably could all be stacked under the terms of one President and live for decades after that and stay on the Court after that that could invoke all kinds of havoc on God-given liberties, and we would have no way to appeal a decision of the Supreme Court? We just have to accept those decisions as if they are the final authority? They are God to us?

I say we respect them. I think we respect their jurisprudence. I think we carefully observe what they do. And I think that most of the decisions they make are soundly founded, but some of them are completely wrong.

And they have reversed themselves in their own history, which is utter proof that they are completely wrong.

I would point out that the clearest one is the *Kelo* decision. They haven't reversed it yet, but Justice Scalia said he expected it would be reversed at some time.

But this was the confiscation of property. The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees property rights. It says: "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the *Kelo* decision, in about 2005, struck those words "for public use" from the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

Now, how can we tolerate a decision like that and accept it because it

comes from the Supreme Court? And does it live forever that way?

Does the *Obergefell* decision, that legal, rational thought out of nowhere, they impose same-sex marriage on every union in America? How is it that a decision made by either the Iowa Supreme Court or the U.S. Supreme Court has taken away the rights of my sons to be married as husbands and wives? Why does the Supreme Court get to visit with that edict?

Because we respect them, we accept those decisions, we don't question them, because the culture is what the culture is.

Well, the culture has got to change, and we have got to change our way of looking at this issue of abortion. We cannot sit around and twiddle our thumbs or wait until the Supreme Court is configured differently.

But we can do this: we can anticipate it will be configured differently. We can call upon the Supreme Court to reverse their previous decisions. This idea of *stare decisis*, the concept that once decided, a subsequent court has to accept the decision made by their predecessors, this Congress can't do that. Well, we can. We don't. We say: No Congress can bind a subsequent Congress. No Congress can say: You shall appropriate X dollars going into the future and have that be irreversible.

All decisions made by our predecessors in previous Congresses and signed by any previous President can be reversed by the United States Congress if it is our will to do that. We don't accept as sacrosanct a decision made by a previous Congress, and neither should we accept a decision as sacrosanct made by a previous Supreme Court. They should all be open to question.

Yes, we should respect their judgment, their jurisprudence, but we can't allow ourselves to be bound by those decisions, even if we have to go all the way back to challenge *Marbury* at some point.

But we won't have to do that, Madam Speaker, because I believe the next appointment to the Supreme Court brings a strict constructionist, an originalist, to the Court, as promised by President Trump.

He followed through with Neil Gorsuch. I believe he will follow through with a second appointment to the Court, if given that opportunity.

We need to move Heartbeat legislation over to the desk of MITCH MCCONNELL so we can begin to apply how we are going to get it off his desk and get it to the floor of the Senate and passed and over to President Trump's desk, where he will sign the Heartbeat legislation and where the very pro-life Vice President MIKE PENCE will be standing next to him when that day happens.

All of this needs to unfold here, Madam Speaker, and the obstruction really comes from the number one pro-life organization, the largest and the oldest: National Right to Life.

So I will put up only one poster here, Madam Speaker, and this is it. National Right to Life says, and this is off

of their site, they do not oppose the Heartbeat bill.

By my utilization of the English language, I don't know the difference between "do not oppose" and "do not support."

But what we need is support, not this intransigence that is going on, especially when the leadership in this House has essentially given the National Right to Life and two other organizations that, by the way, support the Heartbeat bill, a de facto veto that no pro-life legislation comes to the floor of the House of Representatives unless it is supported by the top three organizations in the country.

Supported by. Does not support. Why? Heartbeat matches their mission statement more closely than anything that they have supported before. And it is drafted with the anticipation that we would get it before the next appointment to the Supreme Court, not this one. And they fear that somehow we are going to lose some ground if we go to the Court before the Court is ready. And I say I fear for every year we fail to get the Heartbeat bill to the Supreme Court, we have on our conscience a million abortions in America taking place; a million little babies not born; a million little pairs of shoes that aren't going to be sitting there by that little bed, by that little crib; a million little children, as innocent as could be, who will never have the chance to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to play, to fall in love, have children of their own, and raise their children with our American values in their hearts, our faith taught to them, their souls saved and demonstrated here as they lift our country up and the world up with the beliefs and the convictions that were passed to us from God through our Founding Fathers.

And we equivocate on something like this? And National Right to Life stands there, essentially in the way? Whether they do not oppose or whether they do not support, until that changes, this bill does not come to the floor, unless the Speaker changes his mind, the majority leader changes his mind, and the majority whip changes his mind.

So I call upon National Right to Life to take a look at Iowa. It may be news to them, Madam Speaker, that Heartbeat passed Iowa. It will be litigated. It will be on its way towards the Supreme Court, and maybe to the Supreme Court, but there is no acknowledgement that this has happened on the part of National Right to Life. It is as if it didn't happen for them, because they can't bring themselves to break out of the mold that they have been stuck in for years. This is a 45-year hidebound mold, and if it doesn't change, it is 1 million abortions a year, every year, until it does change.

This strategy, over the last 45 years, has cost the lives of 60 million babies. Now, I am not asserting that it could have been solved and reversed in the first year or 2, or 5, or even 10. But along the way, we have to make the

case that the Supreme Court, if they don't change, cannot be allowed to be the final word on the lives of another 60 million babies.

So, Madam Speaker, congratulations to the State of Iowa, the Iowa General Assembly, the Iowa Senate, the Iowa House of Representatives, the Iowa Governor, the leadership in the House and in the Senate, all of those who teamed up and joined hands and worked relentlessly and persistently to bring this Heartbeat bill through, and the signature of Governor Reynolds. God bless them all for the job that they did. May we match their effort and their success here in the United States Congress.

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

#### PROPOSED RESCISSIONS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-117)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 1012 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 683), I herewith report 38 rescissions of budget authority, totaling \$15.4 billion.

The proposed rescissions affect programs of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Energy, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, State, Transportation, and the Treasury, as well as of the Corporation for National and Community Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Railroad Retirement Board, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the United States Agency for International Development.

The details of these rescissions are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2018.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4744. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the

approved retirement of Vice Admiral Jan E. Tighe, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4745. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2018 Annual Report to Congress on Chemical and Biological Warfare Defense, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1523(a); Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1703; (107 Stat. 1854); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4746. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Federal Mortgage Disclosure Requirements Under the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2017-0018] (RIN: 3170-AA71) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4747. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4748. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4749. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-13, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4750. A letter from the Chief, Administrative Law Division, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4751. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2018 through 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 103-62, Sec. 3(a) (as amended by Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2); (124 Stat. 3866); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4752. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, transmitting the 2017 management report and statement of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4753. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0068] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 879. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes. (Rept. 115-665). Referred to the House Calendar.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 5697. A bill to support wildlife conservation, improve anti-trafficking enforcement, provide dedicated funding for wildlife conservation at no expense to taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 5698. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 5699. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidance on pain management and the prevention of opioid use disorder for hospitals receiving payment under part A of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 5700. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to designate a national dialing short code for users of mobile voice service to reach public safety personnel in critical, but non-emergency, circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MULLIN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 5701. A bill to establish an aviation maintenance workforce development pilot program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 5702. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a strategy implementing recommendations relating to the Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 5703. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Army of certain property located in Cheatham County, Tennessee; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5704. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to pro-

vide additional funding under the Community Development Block Grant program for units of general local government to digitize and make available online information regarding violations of housing construction, building, and safety codes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 5705. A bill to require each post office of the United States Postal Service to display the official portrait of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 5706. A bill to establish the Pearl Harbor National Memorial in the State of Hawaii and the Honouliuli National Historic Site in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 5707. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to improve the treatment of members of the Armed Forces for post-traumatic stress disorder relating to military sexual trauma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5708. A bill to convey a parcel of land in Quincy, Illinois, to the American Legion Post #37, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FASO, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5710. A bill to develop and implement national standards for the use of solitary confinement in correctional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 5711. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to allow National Health Service Corps members to provide obligated service as behavioral and mental health professionals at schools, other community-based setting, or patient homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5712. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to compel manufacturers to correct inaccurate classification data reported to the Medicaid rebate program,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 5713. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify the effective date of the promotion of commissioned officers of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard, to improve processes for Federal recognition of the promotions of such officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution supporting a bold and sustained expansion of Federal investments in affordable rental homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VELA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRIST, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BASS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 876. A resolution supporting the goal of increasing public school teacher pay and public education funding; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of

New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CORREA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MENG, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIREs, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H. Res. 877. A resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Commerce to provide certain documents in the Secretary's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the decision to include a question on citizenship in the 2020 decennial census of population; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 878. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOST, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. EMMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H. Res. 880. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of America's teachers to building and enhancing the Nation's civic, cultural, and economic well-being; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MESSER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H. Res. 881. A resolution recognizing May 3, 2018, as the 30th anniversary of the National Day of Prayer established under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for setting aside the first Thursday in May as the date on which the National Day of Prayer is celebrated", approved May 5, 1988, which was signed by President Ronald Reagan on May 5, 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. Res. 882. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives during Teacher Appreciation Week regarding the importance of education, particularly civics

education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 5698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 5700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3.

"The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce . . ."

Aviation maintenance is a vital component of our nation's aviation system. Without a healthy workforce of aviation technicians and mechanics, the interstate commerce conducted through our national airspace would be endangered. This legislation aims to promote greater study and promotion of this field as a career option for men and women weighing various career options.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 5703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 5705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"clause 7 of section 8 of article I of the United States Constitution."

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 5706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article IV; Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 5711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 5712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 5713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 154: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 168: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 237: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 754: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 785: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 820: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. DESANTIS.  
 H.R. 846: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 850: Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 930: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 936: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H.R. 959: Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 980: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 1038: Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 1114: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 1130: Mr. BARR.  
 H.R. 1156: Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 1204: Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 1212: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BARR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 1243: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 1261: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
 H.R. 1298: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1318: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 1322: Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 1447: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 1516: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H.R. 1550: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
 H.R. 1555: Mr. DAVIDSON.  
 H.R. 1606: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1680: Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
 H.R. 1697: Ms. SANCHEZ.  
 H.R. 1783: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 1828: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 1957: Mr. AGUILAR.  
 H.R. 2077: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 2119: Mr. MCEACHIN.  
 H.R. 2151: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 2234: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 2290: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HURD, and Mr. RUSSELL.  
 H.R. 2315: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 2327: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 2358: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHRADER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.  
 H.R. 2401: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 2553: Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 2556: Mr. EMMER.  
 H.R. 2591: Ms. CHENEY.  
 H.R. 2598: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 2856: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
 H.R. 2885: Ms. SINEMA.  
 H.R. 2938: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 2943: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 3195: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 3330: Mr. WESTERMAN.  
 H.R. 3378: Ms. SINEMA.  
 H.R. 3440: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 3456: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 3528: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 3593: Mr. BUCSHON.  
 H.R. 3605: Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 3617: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H.R. 3635: Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 3666: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
 H.R. 3692: Mr. SOTO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 3988: Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 4006: Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 4039: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 4082: Mr. MCEACHIN and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 4122: Ms. ROSEN.  
 H.R. 4223: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 4253: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
 H.R. 4284: Mr. SCALISE.  
 H.R. 4311: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 4444: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LANCE.  
 H.R. 4451: Mr. LAMB and Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 4468: Mr. FASO.  
 H.R. 4525: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
 H.R. 4585: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 4699: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
 H.R. 4720: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 4732: Mr. GARRETT.  
 H.R. 4754: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 4770: Mr. POLIQUIN and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H.R. 4957: Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 4962: Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 5031: Mr. DEUTCH and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.  
 H.R. 5041: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 5045: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 5105: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 5129: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 5132: Mr. NUNES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. LONG, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COSTA, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VELA, and Mr. HUIZENGA.  
 H.R. 5141: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BARR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H.R. 5201: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 5220: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 5248: Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 5272: Mr. RENACCI.  
 H.R. 5281: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 5291: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 5314: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 5358: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
 H.R. 5359: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H.R. 5374: Mr. HECK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN,

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MEEKS.  
 H.R. 5397: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 5422: Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 5433: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 5547: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
 H.R. 5551: Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 5561: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 5593: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 5599: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 5603: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 5606: Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 5644: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
 H.R. 5647: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 5681: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 5685: Mr. SCALISE.  
 H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
 H. Res. 30: Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H. Res. 31: Mr. POLIS.  
 H. Res. 69: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H. Res. 199: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H. Res. 220: Mr. NORMAN.  
 H. Res. 257: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Res. 274: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H. Res. 401: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H. Res. 529: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H. Res. 763: Mr. HURD.  
 H. Res. 774: Mr. LAMB.  
 H. Res. 785: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 835: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. FASO.  
 H. Res. 859: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
 H. Res. 869: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H. Res. 870: Mr. NORMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 153 of 2018, urging the United States House of Representatives to Pass H.R. 4663 — the “Know Your Vets Act”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

100. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 151 of 2018, urging the United States Senate to Pass S. 994 — the “Protecting Religiously Affiliated Institutions Act of 2017”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.