



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 16, 2018

No. 119

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 16, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST 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 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RECOGNIZING HOWARD MARSHALL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mr. Howard Marshall, former Deputy Assistant Director at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Marshall recently concluded a 21-year career with the FBI, this after growing up in a household where his father, Brian, a resident of my district, was a special agent for 33 years. The Marshall family is visiting us in Washington, D.C., in the historic Capitol today.

During the early stages, Mr. Marshall worked in St. Louis, Memphis, as well as the FBI headquarters, where he worked on multiple task forces and supervised a public corruption squad.

In 2008, Mr. Marshall was promoted to FBI leadership as Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Dallas division, where he managed the white-collar crime and intelligence programs. After Dallas, he was promoted to the Inspection Division, where he led inspections of local field offices, as well as shooting incident review teams. Mr. Marshall was then appointed Special Agent in Charge in Louisville.

Recently, Mr. Marshall served as the Deputy Assistant Director of the Cyber Division, where he supported the mission to identify and defeat cyber threats targeting U.S. interests. Prior to the FBI, Mr. Marshall worked for the Prosecuting Attorney's Office in Little Rock, Arkansas.

We thank Mr. Marshall and his father, Brian, for their combined 54 years of public service to the American people and their service to the FBI, and all their fellow agents at the Bureau.

RECOGNITION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Northern California Power Agency, which is celebrating 50 years of service this year.

Back in 1968, a group of municipal electric utilities, including the city of Lodi in my district, joined together to form the NCPA. The NCPA continues to harness the power of clean energy today.

For 50 years, NCPA has utilized new technologies to provide clean, renew-

able energy for its consumer-owners. This includes the Lodi Energy Center, a fast-start, combined-cycle natural gas project.

The NCPA's commitments to innovation and clean power have made significant contributions to their California member communities, resulting in low electric rates and CO₂-free generation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the NCPA and its members on 50 years of service, achievement, and success.

PASS A FARM BILL

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, farmers and ranchers across Kansas faced drought conditions that crippled crops, dried ponds, and forced livestock owners to abandon pastures. In the years since, rain has fallen and conditions returned to normal, but drought conditions have once again struck Kansas, leaving many counties across my district dry and worried.

Ranchers in the Flint Hills of Kansas are finding themselves short of water and grass for their cattle, while farmers in central Kansas watch corn and soybean plants shrivel under the unrelenting heat. Some counties are nearly 15 inches behind normal rainfall totals, with many under extreme drought declaration.

All of this on top of low commodity prices and market uncertainty strains operating budgets and pushes farmer suicide rates to more than double that of the general population. That is right, Mr. Speaker, our farmer suicide rates are more than double that of the general population.

Unfortunately, the impacts do not stop at the farm gate. When production agriculture suffers, so do the communities our producers call home and the

□ 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.

H6197

companies that support the agriculture industry. The drought really does impact us all.

Earlier this month, I visited Connie and Joe Mushrush's Red Angus Ranch in Chase County, Kansas. They showed me their vacant pastures and dry ponds, and admitted this drought was one of the worst their family has ever endured. They are not alone, as I hear stories of farmers and ranchers all across the district struggling to find solutions and options for their crops and cattle.

While I cannot deliver the rain many of us pray for, I can help to bring a level of certainty and support to my farmers and ranchers through final passage of the 2018 farm bill. I have worked hard, alongside my Agriculture Committee colleagues, to write and pass legislation that continues crop insurance and conservation programs that help producers operate their farms and ranches more efficiently.

Farmers never want a handout, but in trying times like these, it is essential that we support those who put food on our table with a safety net that we can all count on. I will continue to do all I can to support my farmers and ranchers, and I ask that my colleagues say a prayer for rain and for the men and women who feed us all.

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF GUAM

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 74th anniversary of the liberation of Guam during World War II.

This morning, I just came from Arlington National Cemetery, where Ms. Irene Sgambelluri, a survivor of the occupation of Guam, joined me and Congressman SABLON in laying a memorial wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Sgambelluri is a dear friend of mine who happens to be in the audience today in the gallery. I was honored to host her here in our Nation's Capital for this solemn anniversary.

The Chamorro people of Guam endured 32 months of occupation and war-time atrocities, with thousands of our island's finest murdered, brutalized, and forced into concentration camps. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Sgambelluri's father was taken by the Japanese, and she was later forced into a concentration camp for the remainder of the war.

Today, I introduced the Occupation of Guam Remembrance Act in recognition of the atrocities endured by the Chamorro people of Guam during World War II. We must never, ever forget the sacrifices made by our island's manamko—the elders—during the war.

My Occupation of Guam Remembrance Act will ensure that all those victims and survivors who submitted for war claims will have their names inscribed on the memorial wall at the

Asan Bay Overlook in the War in the Pacific National Historic Park. The memorial wall is the only national monument dedicated to the sacrifices of Guam's Chamorro people during World War II, as well as the American servicemen and insular guardsmen who died defending the island during the war and those who liberated Guam in the summer of 1944.

Ms. Sgambelluri is just one of thousands who lived out that dark chapter in American history. I thank her for her friendship and for representing the thousands of war victims and survivors at this year's wreath laying ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery.

Guam's greatest generation, our manamko, or elders, who endured the war and survived have much to teach us. With the Occupation of Guam Remembrance Act, and the addition of all war claimants to the memorial wall, future generations will see the names of all those who sacrificed dearly for Guam and our future.

The victims and survivors of the occupation of Guam are in my prayers today, and I hope that all my colleagues here in Congress will join me in honoring the sacrifices of these very great Americans.

God bless Guam and God bless the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the rules do not allow for references to occupants of the gallery.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this people's House with wisdom and the courage to address the pressing difficulties of our time. As they continue the work of this assembly, guide them to grow in understanding in attaining solutions to our Nation's needs.

Continue to bless as well those charged with protecting and serving our country. They, too, need wisdom and insight into the pressure points of insecurity among our citizens. Lord, have mercy.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

KAVANAUGH THE RIGHT CHOICE

(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, The Post and Courier of Charleston, South Carolina, has provided a thoughtful editorial supporting the confirmation of Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

The editorial reinforces that "Brett Kavanaugh is a highly qualified 'originalist' who will help return the Supreme Court to its proper function in American society. The Senate should quickly confirm him."

"Judge Kavanaugh . . . fits President Donald Trump's promise to appoint judges known to adhere to the original language of the Constitution and its amendments, and to closely follow the law as laid down by Congress."

"As a Federal judge, Mr. Kavanaugh appears to have taken the . . . view that Congress is the preeminent policymaking body of the Federal government except where the Constitution gives policymaking powers to the executive; that Congress, the executive branch and the judiciary are all bound by the Constitution . . . and that judges and the President are further bound by the permissible decisions of Congress."

"It would be a welcome change to see the court allow the political branches of government to decide most political questions rather than the court."

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

SUPPORT FOR OUR NATIONAL PARKS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's national parks are a cherished part of our country's legacy, and it is critical

that they be preserved for generations to come.

Unfortunately, the National Park Service is facing an insurmountable backlog of deferred maintenance that is growing more urgent as decades-old agency structures reach the end of their anticipated lifespans. This is impacting some of our most beloved parks.

The Blue Ridge Parkway in North Carolina and Virginia is the country's second most visited National Park, supporting approximately 15,600 jobs and is a huge economic asset to nearby rural communities. Deferred maintenance has resulted in the unfortunate deterioration of its amenities and accessibility.

The National Park Service Legacy Act would establish a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund directly aimed at addressing the agency's backlog and fixing the issues facing the Blue Ridge Parkway. As a proud cosponsor of this innovative legislation, I encourage its vote and final passage in the House this Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

ELECTRONIC MESSAGE PRESERVATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1376) to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1376

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 "Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGES AND OTHER RECORDS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2912. Preservation of electronic messages and other records

"(a) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Archivist shall promulgate regulations governing Federal agency preservation of electronic messages that are determined to be records. Such regulations shall, at a minimum—

"(1) require the electronic capture, management, and preservation of such electronic records in accordance with the records disposition requirements of chapter 33;

"(2) require that such electronic records are readily accessible for retrieval through electronic searches; and

"(3) include timelines for Federal agency implementation of the regulations that ensure compliance as expeditiously as practicable.

"(b) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—The Archivist shall promulgate regulations that—

"(1) establish mandatory minimum functional requirements for electronic records management systems to ensure compliance with the requirements in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a); and

"(2) establish a process to ensure that the electronic records management system of each Federal agency meets the functional requirements established under paragraph (1).

"(c) COVERAGE OF OTHER ELECTRONIC RECORDS.—To the extent practicable, the regulations promulgated under subsections (a) and (b) shall also include requirements for the capture, management, and preservation of other electronic records.

"(d) COMPLIANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency shall comply with the regulations promulgated under subsections (a) and (b).

"(e) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Archivist shall periodically review and, as necessary, amend the regulations promulgated under subsections (a) and (b)."

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—

(1) PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall promulgate the regulations required under section 2912(a) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall promulgate the regulations required under section 2912(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(c) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) AGENCY REPORT TO ARCHIVIST.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Archivist a report on the agency's compliance with the regulations promulgated under section 2912 of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and shall make the report publicly available on the website of the agency.

(2) ARCHIVIST REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after receipt of all reports required by paragraph (1), the Archivist shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on Federal agency compliance with the regulations promulgated under section 2912(a) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and shall make the report publicly available on the website of the agency.

(3) FEDERAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "Federal agency" has the meaning given that term in section 2901 of title 44, United States Code.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2911 the following new item:

"2912. Preservation of electronic messages and other records."

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2901 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (14); and

(2) by striking paragraph (15) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(15) the term 'electronic messages' means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals; and

"(16) the term 'electronic records management system' means software designed to manage electronic records, including by—

"(A) categorizing and locating records;

"(B) ensuring that records are retained as long as necessary;

"(C) identifying records that are due for disposition; and

"(D) ensuring the storage, retrieval, and disposition of records."

SEC. 3. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

(a) ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2206 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) provisions for establishing standards necessary for the economical and efficient management of electronic Presidential records during the President's term of office, including—

"(A) records management controls necessary for the capture, management, and preservation of electronic messages;

"(B) records management controls necessary to ensure that electronic messages are readily accessible for retrieval through electronic searches; and

"(C) a process to ensure the electronic records management system to be used by the President for the purposes of complying with the requirements in subparagraphs (A) and (B)."

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The term 'electronic messages' has the meaning given that term under section 2901(15).

"(7) The term 'electronic records management system' has the meaning given that term under section 2901(16)."

(b) CERTIFICATION OF PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2210. Certification of the President's management of Presidential records

"(a) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—The Archivist shall annually certify whether the electronic records management controls established by the President meet requirements under sections 2203(a) and 2206(5).

"(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Archivist shall report annually to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on the status of the certification."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2210. Certification of the President’s management of Presidential records.”.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 2203(g) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) One year following the conclusion of a President’s term of office, or if a President serves consecutive terms one year following the conclusion of the last term, the Archivist shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on—

“(A) the volume and format of electronic Presidential records deposited into that President’s Presidential archival depository; and

“(B) whether the electronic records management controls of that President met the requirements under sections 2203(a) and 2206(5).”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1376, the Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017 will ensure the Federal Government continues to take the necessary steps to modernize its recordkeeping.

Despite the significant shift to electronic communications over the last two decades, many Federal agencies are just now moving away from a print-to-file method of electronic record preservation. Using paper to preserve electronic records is inefficient, difficult to manage, difficult to search, and risks loss of the records. Paper-based systems can also increase the cost to the taxpayer.

At the end of 2016, the Office of Management and Budget began requiring agencies to preserve records electronically if they were created electronically. This bill codifies that requirement. This bill ensures agencies will continue to electronically manage

their records, where possible, and closes gaps in current law.

H.R. 1376 also requires electronic Presidential records be held to the same archival standards as those of executive agencies.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his work on this important issue this Congress and in the previous Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017, and I want to thank Mr. GOWDY, our chairman, for getting this bill to the floor as he has today.

I introduced this bill with the goal of modernizing the Federal and Presidential Records Acts. This bill would require the Archivist of the United States to issue regulations mandating that all Federal agencies manage and preserve their email records electronically. This bill would help ensure that email records from Federal agencies and the White House are preserved.

According to an October 2017 report from the National Archives and Records Administration, approximately 46 percent of agencies continue to print and file paper copies of email messages. These records are more likely to get lost and are harder for agencies to retrieve during record searches under the Freedom of Information Act.

This bill would put into statute what agencies are already required to do under a directive issued by the Archivist and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

In 2016, the National Archives issued a document for agency records officers titled: “Why Agencies Need to Move Toward Electronic Recordkeeping.” The document identified a number of reasons, including long-term cost savings, information security, and more efficient and effective implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

This bill also would require the Archivist to establish standards for the preservation and management of email records that are Presidential records and to certify annually that the White House has records management controls in place that meet those standards.

Under this bill, the Archivist must report 1 year after a President leaves office on whether the controls used by the President met the required standards. This legislation would provide accountability to encourage every President to have the controls in place that are necessary to preserve emails and other electronic records.

This bill has been passed by the House with bipartisan support several times before. I urge my colleagues to support the bill again today, and I hope that the Senate will act on the bill and send it to the President’s desk before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from North Carolina and I have laid

out very nicely exactly and eloquently what this bill is all about. It is very important that we modernize all of our systems in the Federal Government, and recordkeeping is so important.

We see it, particularly in our committee, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, because we are constantly trying to get records and requesting records and occasionally subpoenaing records. So this is a way, I believe, to make that whole process more effective, efficient, and transparent.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1376.

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.

GOOD ACCOUNTING OBLIGATION IN GOVERNMENT ACT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5415) to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5415

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 “Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act” or the “GAO-IG Act”.

SEC. 2. REPORTS ON OUTSTANDING GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE AND INSPECTOR GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) REQUIRED REPORTS.—In the annual budget justification submitted to Congress, as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the head of each agency shall include the following:

(1) A report listing each public recommendation of the Government Accountability Office that is designated by the Government Accountability Office as “open” or “closed, unimplemented” as of the date on which the annual budget justification is submitted.

(2) A report listing each public recommendation for corrective action from the Office of Inspector General of the agency for which no final action has been taken as of the date on which the annual budget justification is submitted.

(3) A report on the implementation status of each public recommendation described in paragraphs (1) and (2), which shall include the following:

(A) With respect to a public recommendation that is designated by the Government Accountability Office as “open” or “closed, unimplemented”—

(i) that the agency has decided not to implement, a detailed justification for the decision; or

(ii) that the agency has decided to adopt, a timeline for full implementation.

(B) With respect to a public recommendation for corrective action from the Office of Inspector General of the agency—

(i) for which the agency has taken action not recommended and considers closed, an explanation of the reason why the agency took different action with respect to each audit report to which the public recommendation for corrective action pertains; and

(ii) for which no final action has been taken, an explanation of the reasons why no final action was taken with respect to each audit report to which the public recommendation for corrective action pertains.

(C) With respect to an outstanding unimplemented public recommendation from the Office of Inspector General of the agency that the agency has decided to adopt, a timeline for implementation.

(4) An explanation for any discrepancy between—

(A) the most recent semiannual report submitted by the Inspector General of the agency and the report submitted under paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(B) any report submitted by the Government Accountability Office relating to public recommendations that are designated by the Government Accountability Office as “open” or “closed, unimplemented” and any report submitted under paragraph (1) and (2).

(b) **ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN AGENCIES.**—The head of a covered agency shall include in the annual budget justification described in subsection (a) a written response to each recommendation designated by the Comptroller in the annual priority recommendation letter sent to such head as high priority for attention by that head.

(c) **COPIES OF SUBMISSIONS.**—The head of each agency or covered agency, as applicable, shall provide a copy of the information submitted under subsections (a) and (b) to the Comptroller General and the Inspector General of the agency.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this bill may be construed to affect an authority provided to an Inspector General of an agency under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), including the authority of such Inspector General to identify each recommendation on which final action has not been taken.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGENCY.**—the term “agency” means—

(A) a designated Federal entity, as defined in section 8G(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(B) an establishment, as defined in section 12(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(2) **COVERED AGENCY.**—The term “covered agency” means the following:

(A) Each agency described in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(B) The Internal Revenue Service.

(C) The Securities and the Security and Exchange Commission.

(D) Any additional agency determined by the Comptroller General.

(3) **SEMIANNUAL REPORT.**—The term “semiannual report” means the semiannual report submitted to Congress by each Inspector General under section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5415, the GAO-IG Act.

The Government Accountability Office and inspectors general are two of the best sources for recommendations to improve the operations of the Federal Government. Their efforts help fight waste, fraud, and abuse; promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness within the executive branch; and save taxpayer dollars.

GAO and inspector general audits and investigations often end with corrective recommendations to the agency reviewed. As of May 2018, the GAO has issued more than 1,500 products with about 4,800 open recommendations.

Since 2014, IGs have issued over 8,900 reports, with approximately 40,300 total recommendations. During that same time period, IGs identified over \$99 billion in potential savings through their audits, investigations, and recommendations.

But all of these recommendations are only as valuable as the agency's commitment to implement them. I introduced the GAO-IG Act to ensure every agency evaluates and implements recommendations by GAO and the inspector general. The bill requires agencies to include the unresolved GAO and IG recommendations within their annual budget justification to Congress.

Agencies must also report on the implementation status of each recommendation and why they are not fully implemented. This creates a formal process in which agencies must take stock of their open and unimplemented recommendations each year. This increased transparency will encourage each agency to work with GAO and its inspector general to identify and implement high-priority open recommendations.

I would like to thank Representatives PALMER, DUNCAN, BISHOP, and FITZPATRICK for their cosponsorship of this legislation. I would also like to thank Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member CUMMINGS of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for their support. The bill passed out of the committee unanimously by voice vote earlier this year.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Mr. WALKER for introducing this well-thought-out bill and very important bill.

I support this bill, which would increase the transparency and accountability of Federal agencies. The bill would require agencies to include in their budget justifications to Congress a summary of the recommendations made by GAO or the agency's inspector general. Agencies would also be required to explain what steps they are taking to address these recommendations or, if they disagree with them, why they disagree.

GAO and inspectors general provide critical oversight of the executive branch. Knowing what agencies are doing or not doing to address GAO and IG recommendations will assist Congress in conducting its constitutional oversight role. This is, indeed, a commonsense measure that I strongly support. I just want to urge the House to pass this bill.

One of the things that has concerned many of us in the Congress is the issue of accountability. Accountability is so very, very important.

We all have a tremendous amount of respect for the inspectors general and for GAO. Over and over again, they make recommendations, and the question becomes: Whatever happens to those recommendations? Are they placed on a shelf and never to be seen again, or are they put into place? After all, the American people are spending a lot of money with regard to the research and the investigations conducted by the IG and the research conducted by the GAO.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are very supportive of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5415, 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.

EXTENDING VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4446) to amend the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act to extend the expiration date of the Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4446

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

SEC. 1. AMENDMENT.

The Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 114-224) is amended—

(1) in section 7(b), by striking “January 31, 2018” and inserting “January 31, 2019”; and

(2) in section 10, by striking “September 30, 2018” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4446, introduced by the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

H.R. 4446 would extend the Virgin Islands Centennial Commission by a period of 1 year.

Congress established the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the transfer of the Virgin Islands from Denmark to the United States. The Commission was delayed in convening. As a result, no events have been planned or carried out, and there is no final report available detailing the Commission's recommended activities.

This bill extends the life of the Commission by 1 year to give it more time to plan events celebrating this important moment in American history. The bill also delays the deadline for submitting the final report by 1 year.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on my bill, H.R. 4446, to extend the Virgin Islands Centennial Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member CUMMINGS, House leadership, and staff for their work to bring this bill to the House floor.

The Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act was signed into law in 2016 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Virgin Islands of the United States becoming an unincorporated territory of the United States and to facilitate discus-

sions and events on its relations with the territory.

Since its creation, the Commission has seen the appointments of Senators LISA MURKOWSKI, BILL NELSON, and MARCO RUBIO, Representatives TOM MACARTHUR and MIA LOVE, and Assistant Secretary for Insular Areas Douglas Domenech.

The Commission expires September 30, 2018, without the extension of such time.

The Commission has been formed to plan, develop, and carry out such activities as the Commission considers fitting and proper to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Virgin Islands of the United States becoming part of the United States. The Commission also will provide advice and assistance to the Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, as well as civic groups, to carry out activities to commemorate this milestone in the movement of the Virgin Islands in its relationship with the United States.

Passage of this bill would allow the Commission additional time to accomplish its mission to study specific issues related to the Virgin Islands of the United States by extending the final report termination deadlines by a year to January 31, 2019, and September 30, 2019, respectively.

In June, the Centennial Commission met and selected a chair and interim executive director. We are currently in the process of collaborating with the National Museum of African American History and Culture on public programs as well as hearings here and in the Virgin Islands. The Commission is also in the process of engaging stakeholders to become involved in developing future projects to meet its goals and objectives.

Last September, as we all know, the Virgin Islands faced catastrophic damage from two unprecedented back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes. The recovering American citizens residing on the islands would benefit greatly from continued congressional recognition, as well as the work of the Commission not only in commemorating our past, but, more importantly, talking about our future and our continued relationship with the country.

This Commission has received national and international support, and an extended lifespan of the Commission would allow it to better benefit from this support and further examine the often inadequate relationship between the territory and the rest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4446, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4446, 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.

WAYNE K. CURRY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4890) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, as the “Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4890

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

SECTION 1. WAYNE K. CURRY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, shall be known and designated as the “Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4890, a bill to name the post office at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, after Wayne K. Curry.

Mr. Curry was born in Brooklyn in 1951, but grew up in Cheverly, Maryland. After graduating from Western Maryland College, now McDaniel College, Curry began working for Prince George's County while earning his law degree at night. In 1944, Wayne Curry ran and was elected to the position of county executive.

Curry passed away from lung cancer on July 2, 2014, at the age of 63.

He was a dedicated public servant, and we honor him today by naming a post office after him in the county in which he served.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4890 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, as the Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) to tell us more about Mr. Curry.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Virgin Islands for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee for its consideration in support of H.R. 4890 as well as thank all the members of the Maryland delegation for their steadfast support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4890, which designates the post office at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, in Maryland's Fourth Congressional District the Wayne K. Curry Post Office in honor of our late county executive.

Wayne Keith Curry was born in Brooklyn, New York, and grew up in a racially segregated neighborhood in Cheverly, Maryland. His family was among the first non-White families to integrate the community in the early 1950s. He and his older brother were the first African American students to integrate Cheverly Tuxedo Elementary School and then Bladensburg High School.

Wayne began his career in public service in the administration of Prince George's County Executive Winfield Kelly, Jr., from 1975 to 1978. Through his vision, devotion, and tireless work ethic to make a better Prince George's County, he quickly rose through the ranks of county government.

He went on to serve in various roles, including community affairs assistant, administrative assistant to the county's chief administrative officer, and senior assistant to the executive.

Mr. Curry commuted nightly to Baltimore, eventually graduating with honors from the University of Maryland Law School, receiving his juris doctorate in 1980.

From 1980 until 1983, Wayne worked as counsel for a large real estate development company in Prince George's County, and later decided to start his own law practice in 1984. During this time, he served as general counsel for Dimensions Health Corporation, among other high-profile clients.

Although he was a partner at a lucrative law firm, public service had a strong grasp on his heart. He served as chairman of the United Way Campaign of Prince George's County, president of the Prince George's County Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the School Superintendent's Advisory Committee on Black Male Achievement, and chairman of the Prince George's County Substance Abuse Advisory Board.

When the opportunity presented itself, he ran for Prince George's Coun-

ty executive in 1994. Running as the underdog, he ultimately prevailed. He made history when he became the first African American to serve in the county's highest elected office.

He brought a renewed vitality to the office and focused his administration on the economic empowerment of his constituents.

The transformation of Prince George's County reflected Wayne Curry's own life from a sleepy southern hollow that was rural and all White to a large African American majority and increasingly cosmopolitan.

County Executive Curry presided over a period of unprecedented population growth, development, and modernization of Prince George's County and making it the national standard of African American success in local governance. Under Wayne's leadership, Prince George's County became the first county in our history where education and income levels rose as it transitioned from majority White to majority African American.

His business-friendly approach led Prince George's County through a severe financial crisis, the end of court-mandated busing, the construction of 26 new schools and a new stadium for the Washington Redskins.

He saw the county go from a deficit of \$108 million to enjoying a \$120 million surplus, protecting the county's AAA bond rating.

County Executive Wayne K. Curry passed away on July 2, 2014, at the age of 63 after losing his battle to lung cancer. He is survived by his wife, Sheila Curry; his son, Julian Curry; and daughter, Taylor Curry.

Wayne Curry never sought to make history, but simply to serve the community and the people and to better their lives. He was always about the future and getting it right.

Wayne K. Curry will live on through his historical impact on the people that I represent, and this bill will honor the vision, contribution, and legacy of the iconic Wayne K. Curry and will be a daily remainder in the heart of the county he cared so deeply about.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time.

I urge passage of H.R. 4890, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4890, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, as the "Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building." I thank my colleague from Maryland, Congressman ANTHONY BROWN, for his leadership in introducing this bill, which I am proud to co-sponsor.

Wayne Curry was an exceptional leader whose vision and commitment led to many of the groundbreaking developments that have helped make Prince George's County such a vibrant and dynamic county today. He was also a trailblazer committed to opening the doors of opportunity for African Americans in business and government.

Mr. Curry was a graduate of Western Maryland College and of the University of Maryland Law School in Baltimore. He worked for many years in commercial real estate and then eventually led the Prince George's Chamber of Commerce. Early in his career, he served as an aide to former County Executive Winfield M. Kelly.

Mr. Curry was elected the County Executive of Prince George's County in 1994—one of the first African Americans to be elected to lead a county in the nation—and was re-elected in 1998. As County Executive, he was a fierce advocate for Prince George's County and for its residents, and fought to increase funding for public schools, to ensure that economic development in the county benefited all residents, and to ensure that minority contractors had a fair chance to compete for government-funded contracts.

The Washington Post wrote that Mr. Curry was "A champion of black affluence" who "believed that economic power was the last milestone of the civil rights struggle."

We are blessed to have the memory and example of Wayne Curry to help lead us as we continue to fight to reach that last milestone and achieve the equality of economic opportunity that is essential to making the American dream a reality for minorities across this nation.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 4890 and again thank Congressman BROWN for his work on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4890.

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.

MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS POST OFFICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5238) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5238

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

SECTION 1. MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands

(Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5238, a bill to name the post office at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, after Major Robert Odell Owens.

Major Owens led a life of public service, beginning as a librarian at the Brooklyn Public Library. At around the same time, Owens became a member of the Brooklyn chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, where he worked to fight racism and discrimination in New York City.

From 1975 to 1982, Owens served as New York State senator. In 1982, Owens won election to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he went on to serve 24 years as a representative to the citizens of New York City.

In Congress, Owens fought passionately for many causes, including education policy. He was active in the Congressional Black Caucus Education Brain Trust, promoting reading, science, and math education.

This bill would honor Congressman Owens' service by naming a post office in Brooklyn in his name.

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

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 5238, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office.

This is particularly important to me, as Congressman Owens was my Congressman as a child growing up, and Saint Johns Place was the street on which my mother lived when she came from the Virgin Islands to live in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), and from that great place called Brooklyn, to tell us more about Congressman Owens.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the U.S. Virgin Islands and quasi-Brooklynite for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues' support for H.R. 5238, the Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office designation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a former colleague, a groundbreaking legislator, who is credited and lauded for being a forerunner of the progressive political movement in Brooklyn, New York, my predecessor, the Honorable Major Robert Odell Owens.

Congressman Owens served in this body from 1983 to 2007, and he served in both Brooklyn's 12th and 11th Congressional Districts of New York. Congressman Owens still brings to memory for many the fond recollections of his groundbreaking legislative accomplishments as a senior, longstanding member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Owens spent 8 years in the New York State Senate before he was elected to serve in Brooklyn, New York's 12th Congressional District, a seat previously held by the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, his predecessor.

Mr. Owens then went on to serve his community for over two decades. Through his committee work and work with the Congressional Black Caucus' Education Brain Trust, Major Owens became known as the Education Congressman, but he was also deemed with another moniker, the Rapping Rep, due to his ability to intertwine his political perspective into rhythmic poetry.

Mr. Owens will always be remembered for the legislative victories he achieved on the Hill, and his spectacular fight, particularly for the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, for which he is credited with its passage.

His accomplishments in Congress are vast, and many are stemmed from his lifelong passion for education, community development, and equality. Mr. Owens' passion for education began during his career in librarianship where he served as the community information librarian at the Brooklyn Public Library for a decade.

His friends and fellow activists in the Brooklyn community note that Mr. Owens was known to place collections from the Brooklyn Public Library in local stores, restaurants, laundromats, and more because his passion lay with in sharing knowledge and resources to those who may not have immediate access to it.

Mr. Owens was one of the founders of the New York Social Responsibilities Roundtable which was an organization that is now a part of the New York Library Association. Their mission is to create a central position for libraries and librarians in the battle for civil rights, social justice, peace, and ever-improved public access to education and information.

Congressman Owens' dynamic passions for public education, information sharing, equality, and civil rights became driving forces for him to run for Congress as a former head of the Congress of Racial Equality.

His legacy in Brooklyn led him to become a continued featured speaker at the White House Conference on Library

and Information Services, as well as a recipient of the American Library Association's highest honor: honorary membership.

Fittingly nicknamed the Librarian in Congress, Mr. Owens was dedicated to helping communities of color receive access to information resources through local public libraries.

Mr. Owens was a pillar within the United States Congress as an advocate for Americans with disabilities, social justice reform, library funding, education reform, as well as development in public schools and libraries to ensure that underserved communities did not lack access to information and education resources.

As a young public servant myself, I was inspired by Mr. Owens' work with the disabilities activists who often visited his office and eventually provided testimony before Mr. Owens' House Subcommittee on Select Education where he fought to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act, the ADA.

Today, Brooklynites benefit from public library resource initiatives because of his advocacy for funding. The ADA still stands as a law to prevent discrimination against Americans with disabilities, as it guarantees to create equal opportunity for the special needs community.

To this day, my colleagues and I work to protect this law at all costs, thanks to Congressman Owens' dedication to ensure that this law was enacted. I am so proud to be his successor.

H.R. 5238 would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, the Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office.

Congressman Owens will always be remembered in the district that he represented, and I am extremely pleased that the House will consider this bill in honor of his rich legacy and contributions to our great Chamber.

As I continue the distinct honor of representing the Ninth Congressional District of New York, I look forward to commemorating the life, memory, and integrity of our former House colleague, Congressman Major Robert Odell Owens, my trailblazing predecessor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge passage of H.R. 5238, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5238.

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.

STANLEY MICHELS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2692) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2692

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

SECTION 1. STANLEY MICHELS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2692, a bill to name the post office at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, after Stanley E. Michels.

Stanley Michels was a lawyer and politician from Washington Heights who was a New York councilman from 1978 to 2001. He was active in environmental protection and public health, having sponsored New York City's first law regulating smoking in public places.

Michels also sponsored one of the first city laws to prevent childhood lead poisoning, and he played a significant role in expanding the city's recycling program. Stanley Michels was a dedicated public servant.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of S. 2692, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York as the Stanley Michels Post Office Building.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr.

ESPAILLAT), to tell us more about Stanley E. Michels.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STACEY PLASKETT for yielding me time as well as Ranking Member ELLIAH CUMMINGS and TREY GOWDY for their support in bringing this bill to the floor.

I have a special acknowledgement and thank you to Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, who introduced the Senate version of my bill which is before us today. I rise in strong support of S. 2692, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in Manhattan as the Stanley Michels Post Office Building.

Stanley Michels was a great public servant. He was a loving family man and he was from my neighborhood of Washington Heights. He served on the New York City Council from 1978 to 2001, representing Council District 6, and always did so with distinction and with integrity.

As the chairman of the New York City Council's Committee on Environmental Protection from 1992 through 2001, Stanley was best known for his activism on environmental issues, particularly water quality, and also he was a strong advocate of tenants' rights.

He was a very strong supporter of New York City parks. They called him the King of the Parks in New York City and he injected millions of dollars into the park system across the City of New York, but, particularly, in northern Manhattan: Fort Tryon Park, Inwood Hill Park, Highbridge Park, Bennett Park, and Isham Park. All of these parks in the long, narrow neck of northern Manhattan received tremendous funding from Stanley Michels.

In many ways, Stanley was ahead of his time. In 1987, he was a prime sponsor of the Clean Indoor Air Act, which was New York City's first law regulating smoking in public places. He was also the visionary behind the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1982, legislation that is still relevant today in New York City and New York State.

He played a significant role in expanding the city's recycling program and in advocating for a memorandum of understanding among the city, the State, and upstate communities to protect the city's watershed in the Catskill Mountains.

After years of public service and a long fight against cancer, Stanley passed away in 2008, but his legacy will not be forgotten. It is my honor to see a post office named in his honor.

Stanley Michels and his family poured their hearts into making New York City a better place for all of us to live in. This included: his wife, Molly Michels; his sister, Ellen Grant; his son, Jeffrey; and his two daughters, Karen and Shari Michels—who is now a New York City civil court judge—and three grandchildren.

Stanley Michels left a tremendous legacy and he made a difference. Nam-

ing this post office after Stanley Michels is a fitting tribute to honor his memory and all of his contributions to New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have sponsored this bill, and I look forward to celebrating Stanley Michels' legacy next month.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I urge passage of S. 2692, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2692.

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.

CORPORAL JEFFERY ALLEN WILLIAMS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4407) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the "Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4407

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

SECTION 1. CORPORAL JEFFERY ALLEN WILLIAMS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4407, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

H.R. 4407 would name the post office on Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, in honor of the life and service of Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams.

Corporal Williams was born in 1985 and graduated from Wheaton Warrenville South High School in 2003. Shortly after graduating, Williams joined the Army and trained to become a medical specialist, dedicating his career and life to help his fellow soldiers.

Williams was deployed to Iraq in 2005, where he was assigned as a medic in then-Colonel H.R. McMaster's personal security detachment. Tragically, Corporal Williams was killed in action in Iraq in September 2005.

He is remembered by his troop as a dedicated, tough, and disciplined medic who always put others before himself. His decorations include the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Army Commendation Medal.

We thank Corporal Williams for his service and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor him. I look forward to hearing more about Corporal Williams from the sponsor of this bill, Mr. HULTGREN, in a few minutes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4407 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building.

Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams began his military career in 2003, completing his basic training at Fort Benning, Georgia, and qualifying as a 91W specialist and basic medical technician. He was deployed to Iraq in February 2005 and was tragically killed in action on September 5 of that year while serving as a medic for the regimental commander's personal security detachment.

Corporal Williams' awards include the Purple Heart, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Bronze Star, as well as the Combat Medic Badge.

Corporal Williams was well loved in his community and held a special regard for the post office, having spent many days in his youth becoming friends with the office staff.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to name the post office in Warrenville, Illinois, in memory of Corporal Williams and the ultimate sacrifice he made to his community and this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 4407, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. WALKER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in memory of Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams from my district in Warrenville, Illinois.

Jeff will be remembered by his fellow servicemen and women as a dedicated, tough, and disciplined medic who always put others before himself and was committed to his medical mission and fellow soldiers.

Upon graduation from Wheaton Warrenville South High School, Jeff began his military training in 2003 at Fort Benning, Georgia. He continued his training at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, graduating as a 91 Whiskey medical specialist and basic emergency medical technician. In January 2004, Jeff was assigned to Fort Carson, Colorado, with Medical Troop, Support Squadron of the Third Armored Cavalry Regiment.

Jeff deployed to Iraq in February 2005 with the ambulance platoon and was assigned as a medic for the regimental commander's personal security detachment. During his tour, Jeff recognized the dire need for qualified medics and decided to reenlist in order to further serve his fellow soldiers and his country.

When his service would eventually end, Jeff intended to continue his college education and become a physician's assistant after his return from Iraq. Tragically, while serving in Tal Afar, Iraq, Jeff was killed in action on September 5, 2005.

During his all too brief but distinguished military career, Jeff received various awards and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Army Commendation Medal, Iraqi Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and the Army Service Ribbon. Jeff was also awarded the Combat Medic Badge.

While Jeff is remembered by his Army colleagues as a dedicated and selfless soldier, he was that and much more to his family and friends at home. Those in the Warrenville community described Jeff as "the gregarious glue that connected our social networks together."

Jeff's sense of humor was magnetic, and his ability to connect with people and care about others was incredible. He befriended pretty much everyone in his class of 700 at Wheaton Warrenville South High School. Jeff had a special affection for new students and was their first friend, making a point to sit with them at lunch and including them in his group of friends.

Everyone who knew Jeff loved him, and there were few people in the Warrenville community who did not know Jeff.

Jeff and his younger brother were raised by their mother. As the older brother, Jeff took on many of the household responsibilities, which included running errands for his mother.

Jeff's frequent and favorite errand was running to the Warrenville Post Office for his mother. Over time, he came to know employees by name and they him, and he became friends with most of them. Jeff would go out of his way to brighten everyone's day there. He would often get lost in conversation, causing him to arrive home late. His mother came to realize that if Jeff wasn't home, he likely was at the post office, making friends and engaging with all who crossed his path.

Therefore, it is entirely appropriate, in honor of Jeff's service to our Nation, that I am introducing this legislation, H.R. 4407, to name the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams by supporting my legislation to name a post office facility in his hometown after this remarkable young man, so that his service and sacrifice and his impression on his community may be long remembered.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge passage of H.R. 4407, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4407.

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.

GEORGE SAKATO POST OFFICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 931) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 931

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE SAKATO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "George Sakato Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George Sakato Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the

gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 931, introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado, Senator CORY GARDNER. S. 931 would name the post office at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, in honor of Private George T. Sakato.

Born in Colton, California, Sakato joined the U.S. Army in 1944. Sakato served in the Army's 442nd Regimental Combat Team during World War II. On October 29, 1944, Sakato showed extraordinary heroism, charging a hill on the front line in France, winning control of the site and assuming control of his platoon after his platoon leader was killed in action.

In recognition of his heroism, Congress awarded him Nation's highest award for military valor, the Medal of Honor.

After returning home, Sakato continued 27 years of his life to work at the Stockyards Station Post Office.

Today and through this bill, we celebrate Private Sakato's life and service to his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill honoring his life and service, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of S. 931 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the George Sakato Post Office.

Born in California in 1921, George Sakato overcame discrimination to become an American hero. Classified as an "enemy alien" because of his Japanese heritage, Mr. Sakato was rejected by the Army Air Forces when he tried to enlist shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Sakato did not quit though, saying decades later, in 2009: "What do you mean 'enemy alien'? I am an American."

Mr. Sakato continued trying to enlist until he was finally accepted by the Army Ground Forces in 1944 and sent to fight in Europe, and we are glad that he did. There, he exemplified hard work and selflessness, serving with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, a unit of Japanese Americans that would become the most highly decorated com-

bat unit of its size and time serving in U.S. history.

Private Sakato would contribute to that legacy, earning the Army's second highest combat honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, after courageously leading his fellow soldiers to overtake the enemy in France after his platoon leader was killed.

In the year 2000, Private Sakato was awarded, as we heard, the Medal of Honor along with 21 other Asian American World War II veterans.

Private Sakato worked for the United States post office in Denver for more than two decades and passed away at the age of 94 in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 931 to commemorate Private Sakato's service and to honor the contributions he and so many other Japanese Americans have made to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 931.

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.

JACK H. BROWN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2979) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, as the "Jack H. Brown Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2979

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

SECTION 1. JACK H. BROWN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, shall be known and designated as the "Jack H. Brown Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Jack H. Brown Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from the Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2979, a bill to name the post office at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino in honor of Jack H. Brown.

Jack Brown was born in San Bernardino, California, in 1938. He served in the Navy's Pacific Fleet during the Vietnam era.

After returning home, Brown took a job at Stater Bros. Markets, a popular local grocery store. He would go on to found Stater Brothers Charities, along with the Boys and Girls Club in San Bernardino and Children's Fund of San Bernardino County.

Jack did a great deal for his community, and it is fitting that we would name now a post office in his hometown in his honor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 2979, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, as the Jack H. Brown Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) so that he may tell us more about the honorable veteran from San Bernardino, California, Jack Brown.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Many communities have larger-than-life figures, people who dedicate themselves to the service of others and change countless lives for the better, leaders who touch so many lives that their legacies outlive them. For my community in southern California's Inland Empire, that figure was Jack H. Brown.

Jack was the executive chairman of Stater Bros. Markets, one of the Inland Empire's largest employers. But he will be remembered for far more than his successes as a local community member than as a business leader.

Jack poured himself into our community using his time and resources to make the Inland Empire a better place, especially for children. He helped establish the Boys and Girls Club of San Bernardino to give the children of our community a safe place to learn, live, and grow.

He served as the founding chairman for the Children's Fund of San Bernardino County, a nonprofit organization that has provided assistance to more than 1.4 million children in our region since its inception in 1986.

But Jack's commitment to his community didn't stop there. Each time our region has been rocked by earthquakes, wildfires, floods, or acts of terror, like on December 2, 2015, we knew that Jack Brown would be there for the community and for the brave first responders who ensured that loss of life didn't continue to grow.

□ 1600

When we lost Jack Brown in late 2016, we lost a constant presence in our community. That is why I offered this bill to designate the U.S. Post Office at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino as the Jack H. Brown Post Office Building. While I can never truly repay Jack for all that he did for our community, I am hopeful that honoring his name in this way will restore that constant presence and remind the Inland Empire of the contributions of this truly great man.

Jack and I had a great relationship. Although he liked to tell me that I was his mayor in Redlands, Jack was sure to remind everyone that San Bernardino was his hometown. I am proud that this bill will memorialize his name at the center of the hometown that he loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I urge the passage of H.R. 2979, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2979.

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.

SPECIALIST TREVOR A. WIN'E POST OFFICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4946) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4946

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

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST TREVOR A. WIN'E POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, shall be known and designated as the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4946, a bill to name the post office at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, in honor of U.S. Army Specialist Trevor Win'E.

Trevor Win'E was born in 1981, in Orange, California. Specialist Win'E enlisted in the Army shortly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks to train as a petroleum supply specialist.

In 2003, he was set to deploy to South Korea but requested to, instead, deploy with his unit to Iraq, a request the Army granted. One year later, he was killed when his convoy encountered an IED attack in Tikrit, Iraq, causing fatal injuries.

Today, we honor Specialist Trevor Win'E's bravery and sacrifice for our Nation with a small but lasting symbol of our gratefulness and respect.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4946, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to tell us more about Trevor Anthony Win'E.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in support of H.R. 4946.

Freedom is not free. All gave some, and many made the ultimate sacrifice for our country and for our freedom. Army Specialist Trevor Anthony Win'E, one of my constituents, made the ultimate sacrifice. I am privileged today to introduce this bill to name the United States Post Office at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, after Army Specialist Trevor Anthony Win'E.

Trevor was born on September 24, 1981, the youngest of three children, to Rick and Deborah Win'E. He attended

Calvary Chapel High School in Santa Ana, my hometown, graduating in the year 2000. His family and close friends recall Trevor as a compassionate and devout young man, always willing to help, always willing to lend a hand.

Trevor was indeed a man of strong convictions who wanted to serve our country. Just months after the 9/11 attacks on our country, Trevor enlisted in the U.S. Army on May 1, 2002.

After basic training, he was trained as a petroleum supply specialist. He was assigned to the Army's 24th Quartermaster Supply Company at Fort Lewis, Washington, where he had a key role in multiple training operations. According to Lieutenant Colonel John Pratt, commander of the 24th Quartermaster Supply Company, Trevor was dedicated to his fellow soldiers.

In November 2003, Trevor's company was scheduled to deploy to Iraq, but Trevor was assigned to move to South Korea instead. He, of course, requested he deploy and serve alongside his fellow servicemembers in Iraq. Trevor was granted his request and continued to serve with his company, with his coworkers in Iraq.

In Tikrit, Iraq, Trevor was in the lead truck of a convoy, serving as a turret gunner. Unfortunately, the convoy was attacked by multiple improvised explosive devices and Trevor suffered severe injuries. The following day, on May 1, 2004, 2 years to the date of his enlistment, Trevor died. He was 22 years young.

Trevor was proud of his military service and wanted to serve in a capacity critical to the operations of a fighting force. He answered the call of duty after our Nation was attacked. Naming the post office after Trevor is a fitting tribute to his service and sacrifice to our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4946.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, actually, I have no further speakers. I want to thank the gentleman for his powerful words about a life well and honorably lived.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 4946, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4946.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WALKER. 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 motion will be postponed.

**SERGEANT DIETRICH SCHMIEMAN
POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5504) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, as the "Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5504

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

**SECTION 1. SERGEANT DIETRICH SCHMIEMAN
POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5504, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to name a post office in West Richland, Washington, in honor of Marine Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman.

Marine Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman grew up in Richland, Washington. After graduating high school in 2009, Schmieman enlisted in the Marine Corps, eventually attending the Special Operations School.

Sergeant Schmieman completed two overseas deployments. He received multiple honors during his service, including two Marine Corps Achievement Medals and a Navy Meritorious Unit Commendation. He also achieved his goal of serving as a critical skills operator in the 2nd Raider Battalion.

In July 2017, Sergeant Schmieman was tragically killed in a cargo plane crash over Mississippi. We thank him for his service to our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing more about this bill from Congress-

man NEWHOUSE in a few minutes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 5504, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, as the Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building.

A graduate of Columbia Basin College, Dietrich Schmieman joined the Marine Corps in 2009. Following a deployment to Okinawa, Japan, as a military parachutist and diver, Dietrich was promoted to sergeant and selected for Marine Corps Special Operations School.

You heard that he tragically lost his life in a cargo plane crash in July, but before that, he would complete a second overseas deployment and attain his goal of serving as a critical skills operator.

Sergeant Schmieman received 14 awards and decorations during his service and continues to be deeply missed by his Marine team, who plans to climb his beloved Mount Rainier in his honor this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 5504, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of legislation that will commemorate the life and service of a young man from central Washington who died serving his country just over a year ago, on July 10, 2017.

Marine Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman grew up in Richland, Washington, with his parents, Eric and Susan, and his two brothers, Aaron and Hans. He attended Christ the King Catholic School, Hanford High School, and Columbia Basin College, where he met friends who would remain close to him throughout his entire life.

In 2010, with a world of opportunity ahead of him, he chose to dedicate his life to service and enlist in the United States Marine Corps. It was his goal to serve within Special Operations Command.

Throughout his service, he received 14 awards and decorations, including several Achievement Medals, Good Conduct Medals, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. He had completed two overseas deployments, serving our Nation during Operation Enduring Freedom.

He achieved his goal, honorably serving as a critical skills operator in the U.S. Marine Corps 2nd Raider Battalion at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, when he was tragically killed in a KC-130 plane crash in Mississippi on July 10, 2017.

My legislation would designate the U.S. Postal Service facility at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, as the Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building.

Dietrich and his fellow servicemembers gave the ultimate sacrifice, and I hope to honor his memory, as well as the memory of the 15 other men and women killed in the crash, with this dedication to their service.

Dietrich's strong ties to his family, friends, and hometown continue to be evident. An avid skydiver, Dietrich's death inspired his parents, childhood friends, and fellow marines to complete a memorial skydive over central Washington. He had a tattoo symbolizing his love of the Pacific Northwest and requested that his ashes be spread on Mount Rainier, where his Marine brothers-in-arms will hike this August in his honor.

We recently observed the 1-year anniversary of the devastating plane crash, and I know that the designation of this post office will mean a lot to Dietrich's family and to our community, serving as a local memorial and a reminder of the sacrifice he and his fellow servicemembers gave to preserve the freedoms that are the cornerstone of our Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to name this building, which will be visited often by friends and family, after a courageous young man whose life and service deserve this honor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge the passage of H.R. 5504 in memory of Sergeant Schmieman, an American hero, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5504.

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.

□ 1615

**CREATING ADVANCED STREAM-
LINED ELECTRONIC SERVICES
FOR CONSTITUENTS ACT OF 2018**

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3076) to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act) to require agencies to accept electronic release forms, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3076

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 “Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act of 2018” or the “CASES Act”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) congressional offices provide crucial services to constituents by acting as a liaison between the constituents and the respective agencies;

(2) this includes assisting constituents by making inquiries and working toward resolutions on behalf of the constituent with the respective agencies; and

(3) this process should be simplified through the creation of electronic forms that may be submitted under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act), thus modernizing the process for constituents and improving access and efficiency of Government services and agencies in order to expedite the resolution of the problem for which constituents sought help.

SEC. 3. OMB GUIDANCE ON ELECTRONIC CONSENT FORMS.

(a) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance that does the following:

(1) Establishes—

(A) standards for each agency to develop an electronic identity proofing and authentication process for allowing an individual to provide a prior written electronic consent form for the disclosure of the individual's record under section 552a(b) of title 5, United States Code, or for individual access to a record under section 552a(d) of such title; or

(B) a method by which each agency can electronically identity proof and authenticate an individual submitting an electronic consent form through a central online portal.

(2) Creates a template for an electronic consent form that can be properly identity proofed and authenticated in accordance with paragraph (1).

(3) Requires each agency to accept the electronic consent form described in paragraph (2) that provides consent from any individual properly identity proofed and authenticated in accordance with paragraph (1) from the individual providing consent or an entity other than the individual, including a congressional office, on behalf of the individual for the purpose of authorizing the disclosure of the individual's record in accordance with section 552a(b) or 552a(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) Authorizes each agency to provide an online link to the consolidated online portal described under subsection (b)(1).

(b) **PORTAL; CONSENT IDENTIFIER; CONGRESSIONAL FUNCTION.**—

(1) **CONSOLIDATED ONLINE PORTAL.**—

(A) **OPERATION OF PORTAL.**—The Director (or a designee) shall operate (or designate the head of an agency to operate) a consolidated online portal that allows a member of the public to submit an electronic consent form in accordance with the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a) to any agency from a single website.

(B) **PRIVACY AND OTHER FEATURES.**—The portal shall include features to protect the privacy of individuals using the portal and may include any additional functions the Director finds will improve the implementation of this section.

(C) **USE OF EXISTING WEBSITE OR PORTAL.**—The Director may use any existing website or portal to satisfy the requirements of this subsection, including the portal established under section 552(m) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **CONSENT IDENTIFIER.**—The Director, or a designee, shall assign each consent form submitted through the portal described in paragraph (1) a consent identifier, which shall be provided to the agency and the individual or entity submitting the consent form. The agency shall track the consent form with the consent identifier.

(3) **CONGRESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, or a designee, shall ensure the operation of a function that allows a congressional office to provide a publicly available online link to the portal described in paragraph (1), which shall auto-populate information about such congressional office, including an indication of consent for such office to access a record in accordance with section 552a(b) of title 5, United States Code, in the consent form accessed through the portal.

(B) **NOTIFICATION OF CONSENT IDENTIFIER REQUIRED.**—The Director, or a designee, shall ensure the function sends the consent identifier to the congressional office when a consent form is submitted to an agency through the portal as accessed through the function.

(C) **AGENCY COMPLIANCE.**—Each agency shall comply with the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a) not later than 1 year after the date on which such guidance is issued.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGENCY; INDIVIDUAL; RECORD.**—The terms “agency”, “individual”, and “record” have the meanings given those terms in section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **CONSENT IDENTIFIER.**—The term “consent identifier” means a nonproprietary, unique identification number.

(3) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3076, the CASES for Constituents Act, introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

One of the most important services we can provide our constituents is help in navigating the complicated bureaucracy of Federal agencies. Whether it is a senior who needs help with a Social Security office or a veteran whose benefits are delayed, as Members of Congress, we can often help constituents reach a real person and get better results from Federal agencies.

However, in order for us to assist constituents while protecting their pri-

vacy rights, the Privacy Act requires constituents to complete and sign a consent form before agencies can provide a Member of Congress information about the case. The constituent prints the form or obtains it in person from a congressional office, signs it, and then mails, faxes, emails, or physically brings it back to the congressional office. The congressional office then must send the consent form to the agency from which the constituent needs help.

This process has unnecessary steps, leading to delays that frustrate our constituents, many of whom need help quickly.

H.R. 3076 helps to speed up the process by allowing constituents to submit Privacy Act consent forms electronically directly to the agency or a central portal. H.R. 3076 instructs the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance to Federal agencies to accept electronic consent. OMB's guidance will maintain a role for congressional caseworkers to advocate on behalf of constituents for a swift resolution.

A swift resolution is especially important for those constituents in the wake of natural disasters, since victims often need to reach out to multiple Federal entities for relief. At a time when many citizens need help from their government, allowing them to communicate more easily with the government is the very least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representatives GARRET GRAVES and JOE KENNEDY for introducing this bill to improve constituents' experiences when they are seeking help.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, the CASES for Constituents Act, introduced by Representatives GARRET GRAVES and JOE KENNEDY.

This bill, as you heard, would modernize the way Federal agencies process Privacy Act waivers and make it easier for Members of Congress to help constituents get assistance from Federal agents. We all know what this means. It helps to speed up the process of assisting your constituents, so it is a very valuable improvement.

A constituent has to provide an agency with written consent before a congressional office can obtain information from the agency on behalf of the constituent. Some agencies, as we have heard and know, have outdated policies and still require these consent forms to be mailed or faxed. Under the bill before us, the Office of Management and Budget would be required to establish standards for Federal agencies to accept electronic consent forms and for agencies to accept such forms.

The bill also would require the OMB to operate a consolidated online portal that would allow individuals to submit electronic consent forms and to track

the status of their form. The bill would also allow congressional offices to provide online links to the portal.

I appreciate very much the bipartisan way in which this bill was developed. I want to thank the majority for their cooperation in making a number of improvements to the bill; for example, the substitute amendment would require OMB to include features to protect the privacy of individuals who use the consolidated online portal required under the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for working with us on this, as well as many staff and members from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine for a minute if you had a medical emergency at your house and you had to mail a form to the ambulance service to have them come address the heart attack victim or other type of medical emergency that is occurring at your house? How irrational is that? Obviously, it doesn't make sense to do something like that, to mail for something that may be an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine, even in today's time, with the strict demands we have for customer service, if we actually had to truly mail order forms to different online companies to have them deliver something, to retail outlets to have them deliver something, a product to our house? There would be no tolerance for that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the government right now, the government today, our own United States Government which is here to serve our own Americans, only has a customer service rating of about 70 percent. In fact, it is less than 70 percent.

Well, that might have been a high watermark for my grades in school—maybe—Mr. Speaker, but that is absolutely an unacceptable level. This is our government. These are our taxpayers.

Why is it that private industry has been able to use technology to provide better customer service, to provide faster services? It is because they care about their customers and they care about their business and there is an incentive for them to do so. They don't have a monopoly, like the Federal Government does, for many of the services that it offers, but that does not excuse the Federal Government from providing better services.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to work very closely with Congressman JOE KENNEDY to help develop this legislation, and this is a solution to help bring the United States Government into the 21st century, or perhaps the

20th century. It simply does the same thing that private companies have figured out how to do for decades now, where we can access our banks online, we can access our insurance online, where we can go online to buy groceries and virtually any other good or service that we need. We can even file our own taxes with the Federal Government.

Yet the Privacy Act of 1974, as it is implemented today, requires, in order for us to provide services to our constituents, which may be an emergency situation, that they have to print out a form and mail it in, and that we then have to take and mail it to an agency. That is ridiculous in 2018, and it is unacceptable.

This bipartisan legislation addresses that. It allows for people to access their own government, access government services to address important things like, perhaps, accessing their VA benefits; like, perhaps, fixing a wrong the IRS has caused; like, perhaps, dislodging a permit or some other type of service the government is supposed to provide and has been sitting on, in some cases as we have dealt with, for years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you a quick story.

In 2016, in August of that year, in my hometown of Baton Rouge in south Louisiana, we experienced a 1,000-year flood. People were calling us by the hundreds per day, calling and saying: I need help. I need help with FEMA, SBA, and other government services.

We said: Yes, you bet. All you need to do is go to our website, print out this form, and then mail it to us.

Mr. Speaker, I can't say on the House floor some of the responses our office received whenever they were telling us about the 4 feet of water that their computers and printers and other equipment were under. It was a real aha moment.

How ridiculous is it that we sit here and act like we are 80 years ago as a government? We can do better.

This simply brings us to current technology, to allow constituents to reach out to our offices when we are addressing urgent issues, like passport issues for folks stuck in other countries, like Department of Defense issues where our own military men and women may be having problems in other countries, where our own citizens aren't getting the benefits that they paid for or they earned. It gives us the ability to quickly step in and address their issues, to intervene on their behalf and get these issues resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, especially, my friend JOE KENNEDY for working with us so closely on this bipartisan legislation, Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS, Congressman GENE GREEN, Congressmen WILL HURD and KEVIN MCCARTHY through the Innovation Initiative, Congressman MARK MEADOWS, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK, and many others who pro-

vided input to us, helped us perfect this legislation and get it here today. I want to thank the bipartisan cosponsors and folks who helped us on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, obviously this bill would work a very substantial improvement on our constituent services operations. I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 3076, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3076, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPC. STERLING WILLIAM WYATT POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4960) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the "Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4960

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

SECTION 1. SPC. STERLING WILLIAM WYATT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4960, a bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) to name the post office at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, in honor of Specialist Sterling William Wyatt.

Sterling Wyatt was born and raised in Columbia, Missouri. Even before he graduated high school, Wyatt had shown great service and achievement. He participated in the youth group and operated the sound equipment for his church. He made the rank of Eagle Scout. He earned a black belt in tae kwon do, and he received a certification as a nurse attendant.

After graduating high school in 2009, Wyatt continued his service, enlisting in the United States Army, where he was assigned to the 5th Battalion, 2nd Infantry Division, and was ultimately deployed to Afghanistan.

On July 11, 2012, when on patrol in Kandahar, Afghanistan, Wyatt's vehicle was attacked by an IED, and he was killed in action at age 21.

Specialist Wyatt made the ultimate sacrifice in his service of his nation. In recognition of his heroism, Specialist Wyatt was awarded the Medal of Valor, the Bronze Star, and the National Defense Service Medal, among others. We commend him for his service and honor him for his sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for introducing the bill and look forward to hearing more about the bill from her in the next few minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4960, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building.

Specialist Wyatt epitomized dedication and hard work, becoming an Eagle Scout, first degree black belt in tae kwon do, and a certified nurse attendant before his high school graduation.

He carried that spirit with him when he enlisted in the Army, joining the 20th Infantry Regiment. Specialist Wyatt deployed to Kandahar, Afghanistan, and gave his life on July 11, 2012, when his vehicle was hit by an IED. Just 21 years old, Specialist Wyatt was awarded the Medal of Valor and a Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to remember the ultimate sacrifice paid by Specialist Sterling William Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 4960, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Mis-

souri (Mrs. HARTZLER), the sponsor of this bill.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask support for H.R. 4960, which would name the downtown Columbia, Missouri, post office in memory of one of our Nation's heroes, Specialist Sterling William Wyatt, who proudly served in the United States Army.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member and so many of my colleagues for your support of this legislation.

Sterling was born and raised in Columbia, Missouri, located in the heart of Missouri's Fourth Congressional District.

Early on, Sterling showed his commitment to service by being an active participant in his youth group and in his church. Through his service and hard work, he was quite an accomplished young man. He earned the rank of Eagle Scout, a first degree black belt in tae kwon do, and a certification as a certified nurse attendant, all before graduating from high school in 2009.

□ 1630

Soon after, he decided to continue his lifestyle of service by joining the United States Army. He was assigned to the 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington.

Tragically, Specialist Wyatt was killed on July 11, 2012, while on patrol in Kandahar, Afghanistan. He was only 21 years old. His vehicle was attacked with an enemy improvised explosive device. His awards and decorations for his service are many, including, but not limited to, the Medal of Valor and Bronze Star.

Specialist Wyatt's dedication to serving his community and country were a testament to his faith and his family, especially his loving parents, Randy and Sherry Wyatt.

It is fitting that we bring this bill today for a vote before the United States House of Representatives, because just a few days ago we solemnly remembered the 6-year anniversary of his passing.

As representatives of the people who bravely serve our country, especially those who pay the ultimate sacrifice, we owe it to their lives and memories to never forget all that they have done for us.

Although Sterling was taken from us too soon, this bill will enshrine his memory in our community for posterity so everyone can know this brave soldier and be reminded that freedom is not free.

And maybe, when others learn about Sterling's story and sacrifice, they, too, will put service above self and answer the call to serve, which is the noblest and most honorable action anyone can take. Truly, greater love has no one than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends. Sterling did this for

his brothers and sisters in arms, for those who yearn to be free in a desperate land, and for all of us. We will forever be grateful.

And, with the renaming of this post office in Columbia, Missouri, the Specialist Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building, we will always remember and always be grateful.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation to honor Specialist Wyatt's memory.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge the passage of H.R. 4960 in honor of Specialist Wyatt, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4960.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WALKER. 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 motion will be postponed.

HARMON KILLEBREW POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3230) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, as the "Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3230

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

SECTION 1. HARMON KILLEBREW POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, shall be known and designated as the "Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3230, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), to name the post office at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, in honor of Harmon Killebrew.

Harmon Clayton Killebrew was born in Payette, Idaho, in 1936. He began his career playing major league baseball in 1954. He played over 22 seasons with multiple teams, and when he retired in 1975, he had the fifth most home runs in major league history.

Killebrew was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1984. In 1976, Killebrew cofounded the Danny Thompson Memorial, an annual golf tournament that raises money for cancer research.

Sadly, on March 17, 2011, at the age of 74, Killebrew passed away. He left an incredible legacy, one we continue to honor with this bill.

I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) for introducing this bill and look forward to hearing more from him about Killebrew in a few minutes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 3230, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, as the Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building.

A member of the Washington Senators, Minnesota Twins, and Kansas City Royals, Harmon Killebrew excelled in major league baseball for 22 years. During that time, he notched an impressive 2,086 hits, played in 13 All-Star games, and tallied nine seasons with over 100 RBIs.

In fact, I can remember as a kid rooting for the Orioles that we didn't want Harmon Killebrew coming up to the plate.

Harmon retired in 1975 in fifth place for career home runs. He was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Harmon Killebrew's accomplishments to the great American pastime.

I urge the passage of H.R. 3230, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3230, a bill that honors Idaho's greatest athlete and one of our great humanitarians.

H.R. 3230 names the post office in Payette, Idaho, after Harmon Killebrew, a Hall of Fame baseball player who later built an incredible legacy of charitable work.

Idahoans take great pride in Harmon Killebrew's success, and rightfully so. Killebrew's career began in 1954 when Herman Welker, the U.S. Senator from Idaho, tipped off the owner of the Washington Senators, Clark Griffith, about the 17-year-old slugger.

Griffith sent a scout, who almost didn't get to see Killebrew play. After a night of rain, groundkeepers burned gasoline to make the field playable. Killebrew did his part by hitting a ball 435 feet into a Payette beet field.

Immediately signed as a \$12,000 bonus baby, Killebrew debuted a few weeks later. During his 22-year career with the Washington Senators, Minnesota Twins, and Kansas City Royals, he hit 573 home runs, more than all but four major league players at the time of his retirement.

He was the American league's most valuable player in 1969, hitting 49 home runs and driving in 140 runs. He played in 13 All-Star games and was inducted into the Hall of Fame in 1984.

Killebrew built his strength lifting 10-gallon milk cans on Idaho dairies and leveraged his work ethic into legendary status. For fans across America, Killebrew was beloved for remaining the down-to-Earth farm kid who signed a major league contract before turning 18.

Twins teammate, Rich Reese, called him "one of the classiest people I've ever met in my life. . . . he treated people with respect, even with the stature that he had."

Asked what he liked to do for fun, Killebrew once said, "Well, I like to wash dishes, I guess." In the off season, he worked feeding cows, selling men's clothing, and reading gas meters.

After retirement from baseball, he sold insurance, ran a car dealership, and worked as a broadcaster.

In 1976, Killebrew helped found the Danny Thompson Memorial Golf Tournament in Sun Valley, Idaho, now called the Killebrew-Thompson Memorial. The event benefits cancer research.

The Harmon Killebrew Foundation, founded in 1998, with his wife, Nita, has built more than a dozen Miracle League fields designed for kids with disabilities, including one named for him in Payette. The baseball and football fields at Payette High School are also named for Killebrew.

Killebrew died of cancer in 2011 at age 74 after entering into hospice care, a treatment he had advocated for for years. At his memorial service, his wife read a tribute from a fan: "Harmon is an extraordinary, beautiful, loving, compassionate human being, who also happens to be a legendary baseball player."

In the days after his death, his high school team, the Payette Pirates, made an improbable run for a State championship. Entering the district tournament with a losing record, the Pirates won four straight to reach the State title game. The team wore HK patches on their sleeves. "Harmon's

been with us the entire time," said one player. The Pirates finally lost to a 25-1 Fruitland team, taking home the second-place trophy.

"He is still touching people," said Nita Killebrew, who worked with my office on the bill and lives in Meridian. Killebrew's legacy of generosity lives on, and it is appropriate to honor his legacy with the legislation we are considering today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3230. Through this bill, we will recognize one of Idaho's greatest stars, and we will advance the legacy of one of America's most charitable athletes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge the passage of H.R. 3230 to name the post office in Payette, Idaho, for Harmon Killebrew, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3230.

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.

VETERANS PROVIDING HEALTHCARE TRANSITION IM- PROVEMENT ACT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 899) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 899

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 "Veterans Providing Healthcare Transition Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. DISABLED VETERAN LEAVE FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS IN VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6329(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the term 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 2105, and includes—

"(A) an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

"(B) notwithstanding subsection (a) of section 7421 of title 38, an individual occupying a position listed in subsection (b) of such section;"

(b) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to a position listed in section 7421(b) of title 38, United States Code, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any individual appointed to such a position on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 899, the Veterans Providing Healthcare Transition Improvement Act introduced by the junior Senator from Hawaii.

S. 899 is the Senate version of H.R. 2648 introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS). In 2015, Congress enacted the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act. The Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act provides 104 hours of paid sick leave to newly employed veterans with a service-connected disability rating of 30 percent or more.

The sick leave is used to attend medical treatment related to the service-connected disability and must be used within 12 months of beginning employment. The law, however, did not explicitly apply to veterans hired into certain medical occupations at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

When the VA has applied the provisions of the act to these occupations, this bill would ensure new veterans hired in these positions continue to receive paid sick leave to treat their service-connected disability.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for sponsoring the House version of this bill and for his dedication to caring for our Nation's veterans. I would also like to thank Chairman DAVID ROE and his staff at the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs for working with us to bring this bill to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 2648, the "Veterans Transition Improvement Act," and its Senate companion, S. 899. There are provisions in the legislation that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor con-

sideration of this legislation, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bills, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bills which fall within its jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2648 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.

Hon. DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 2648, the Veterans Transition Improvement Act with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an additional referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Based on our previous consultation, we intend to request S. 899—the Senate companion to H.R. 2648—be scheduled for floor consideration.

To expedite floor consideration, I ask that you forego further consideration of H.R. 2648. This in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Veterans' Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on H.R. 2648, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of S. 899, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

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

I want to thank Representatives STIVERS and TAKANO for their sponsorship of this much needed bipartisan bill, which would expand, as you heard, coverage of Representative STEPHEN LYNCH's Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act to newly hired healthcare veterans at the Veterans Health Administration.

Approximately one-third of VA's new hires are veterans. It is no surprise that veterans who leave military service want to continue to serve this country and the American people. We are grateful that these brave men and women, many of whom are wounded themselves, choose to devote their civilian careers to taking care of their fellow wounded warriors.

The bill would provide newly hired doctors, nurses, physician assistants, dentists, optometrists, and chiropractors at the VHA who have service-con-

nected disabilities with 104 hours of sick leave during their first year of employment to take care of their medical conditions.

This is a very good bill that I urge my colleagues to support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), the champion of this bill and the sponsor of its House companion.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 899, the Veterans Providing Healthcare Transition Improvement Act.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), for helping me, being the lead Democrat on this. This is bipartisan and bicameral legislation. Senator HIRONO is the sponsor in the Senate. We are the sponsors in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is great to have a veteran in the chair today. Mr. Speaker, as a brigadier general in the Ohio Army National Guard, I know firsthand the incredible sacrifices that our veterans have made in the service of our country. We owe it to them to provide them time when they come home to deal with the things they need to work on, their medical and other conditions.

In 2015, the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act was signed into law, which was great. It gave sick leave to people that are newly hired Federal employees, rather than waiting on that leave to accrue, if they had a disability rating, a service-connected disability rating of 30 percent or more. Unfortunately, that bill did not extend those benefits to title 38 employees.

□ 1645

Those are VA employees, like physicians, physician assistants, registered nurses, chiropractors, podiatrists, optometrists, and dentists. They are healthcare providers themselves. It is no small number of employees. In fact, as we sit here, there are over 14,000 vacancies in title 38 jobs. That means up to 14,000 people can benefit from this bill.

Again, it is bipartisan. It is a simple change that allows these title 38 veteran employees to get leave to deal with their wounded warrior conditions rather than waiting for that leave to accrue over time. It is a bipartisan bill. I thank Mr. TAKANO for that.

A lot of veteran organizations have supported it: the National Association of VA Physicians and Dentists, the Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs, the American Legion, the VFW, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, Association of the United States Navy, American Federation of Government Employees, National Federation of Federal Employees, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, AMVETS, and the Federal Managers Association.

I thank the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Maryland, and the chairman from South Carolina for their hard work on this. I also want to thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) for their expertise as they worked through this bill. I thank the sponsors of the Senate legislation, and I thank Representative TAKANO for joining me in this important effort.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), one of the sponsors of this very, very important bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 899, the Veterans Providing Healthcare Transition Improvement Act, which extends paid sick leave benefits for veteran employees with service-connected disabilities in their first year of work at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

As the lead Democrat on this bill, I thank my colleague Representative STEVE STIVERS from Ohio for his bipartisan leadership on this issue. And let me hasten to add, I do enjoy the work that we do together as founders and co-chairs of the bipartisan Congressional Maker Caucus, bringing to the attention of the Congress advanced manufacturing technologies.

But back to the issue at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Senator MAZIE HIRONO for taking the lead on this important issue in the Senate.

Veterans who choose to provide their medical skills and expertise to serve other veterans at the Department of Veterans Affairs should not have to take a leave of absence to receive the care that they need. By improving the Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act to extend benefits to wounded warriors working at the VA, we will help veterans who need to take time off to get their own medical care.

This will also help in hiring and recruiting what are known as title 38 employees at the VA. This group of employees includes physicians, physician assistants, registered nurses, chiropractors, podiatrists, optometrists, and dentists.

According to 2018 data from the Veterans Health Administration, there are over 14,000 title 38 vacancies nationwide. We must make it a priority to fill these vacancies to ensure that the VA is well staffed and capable of providing veterans with the services that they need. Extending benefits to title 38 employees at the VA can help with the recruitment and hiring of veterans who want to continue helping other veterans.

Veterans working at the VA already make incredible sacrifices to help their fellow veterans. Their paychecks

should not be one of them. This is why I urge my colleagues to stand with our veterans and support this legislation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 899, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 899, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROUTE 66 CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 66) to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prepare a plan on the preservation needs of Route 66, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 66

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 "Route 66 Centennial Commission Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Route 66 was the Nation's first all-paved highway under the U.S. Highway System connecting the Midwest to California and has played a major role in the history of the United States.

(2) Route 66 was the symbol of opportunity to hundreds of thousands of people seeking escape from the Dust Bowl in the 1930s, serving as a "road to opportunity" in the West and providing employment during the Great Depression, as thousands were put to work on road crews to pave the road.

(3) Route 66 was invaluable in transporting troops, equipment, and supplies across the country to the West, where the government established multiple industries and armed force bases during World War II. Upon the conclusion of the war in 1945, Route 66 was a key route taken by thousands of troops as they returned home.

(4) Route 66 symbolized the Nation's positive outlook during the postwar economic recovery in the 1950s and 1960s, serving as an icon of

free-spirited independence and linking people across the United States. During this period, the tourist industry along Route 66 grew tremendously, giving rise to countless tourist courts, motels, service stations, garages, and diners.

(5) Since June 27, 1985, when Route 66 was decommissioned as a Federal highway, the popularity and mythical stature of Route 66 has grown domestically and internationally, as the road has experienced a rebirth of interest and support.

(6) The year 2026 will be the centennial anniversary of Route 66, and a commission should be established to study and recommend to Congress activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate that anniversary in a manner that appropriately honors America's Mother Road.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the Route 66 Centennial Commission (referred to in this Act as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The Commission shall have the following duties:

(1) To study activities that may be carried out by the Federal Government to determine whether the activities are fitting and proper to honor Route 66 on the occasion of its centennial anniversary, including any of the activities described under section 8(b)(2)(B).

(2) To recommend to Congress the activities the Commission considers most fitting and proper to honor Route 66 on such occasion, to be carried out by the Department of Transportation and any other entity or entities within the Federal Government that the Commission considers most appropriate to carry out such activities.

(3) To plan and host, in cooperation with such partners, a conference on the U.S. Numbered Highway System, and assist in the activities of such a conference.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—*The Commission shall be composed of 19 members appointed as follows:*

(1) Three members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President.

(2) Two members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Secretary of Transportation.

(3) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Illinois.

(4) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Missouri.

(5) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Kansas.

(6) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Oklahoma.

(7) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Texas.

(8) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of New Mexico.

(9) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Arizona.

(10) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of California.

(11) Three members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation

of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(12) Three members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) QUALIFIED CITIZEN.—A qualified citizen described in this subsection is a private citizen of the United States with—

(1) a demonstrated dedication to educating others about the importance of historical figures and events; and

(2) substantial knowledge and appreciation of Route 66.

(c) TIME OF APPOINTMENT.—Each initial appointment of a member of the Commission shall be made before the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.—If a member of the Commission was appointed to the Commission as a Member of Congress, and ceases to be a Member of Congress, that member may continue to serve on the Commission for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date that member ceases to be a Member of Congress.

(e) TERMS.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(f) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) BASIC PAY.—Members shall serve on the Commission without pay.

(h) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(i) QUORUM.—Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(j) CHAIR.—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall designate one member of the Commission as Chair.

(k) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

SEC. 6. DIRECTOR AND STAFF.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of a Director and such additional personnel as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—

(1) DIRECTOR.—The Director of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) STAFF.—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take by this Act.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information nec-

essary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission may submit to Congress such interim reports as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report incorporating specific recommendations for the commemoration of the centennial of Route 66 and related events.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall include recommendations for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among the public and private authorities and organizations recommended for participation by the Commission; and

(B) may recommend activities such as—

(i) the production, publication, and distribution of books, pamphlets, films, electronic publications, and other educational materials focusing on the history and impact of Route 66 on the United States and the world;

(ii) bibliographical and documentary projects, publications, and electronic resources;

(iii) conferences, convocations, lectures, seminars, and other programs;

(iv) the development of programs by and for libraries, museums, parks, and historic sites, including national traveling exhibitions;

(v) ceremonies and celebrations commemorating specific events;

(vi) the production, distribution, and performance of artistic works, and of programs and activities, focusing on the national and international significance of Route 66; and

(vii) the issuance of commemorative coins, medals, certificates of recognition, and postage stamps.

(c) FINAL REPORT.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a final report not later than 90 days before the termination of the Commission provided in section 10.

SEC. 9. PLAN ON PRESERVATION NEEDS OF ROUTE 66.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Governors referred to in section 5(a), shall prepare a plan on the preservation needs of Route 66.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the President a report containing the plan prepared under subsection (a).

SEC. 10. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate not later than June 30, 2027.

SEC. 11. CLARIFICATION REGARDING FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements may be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or made available for the Department of Transportation, except for amounts authorized from the Highway Trust Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Il-

linois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 66, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 66, the Route 66 Centennial Commission Act.

I thank my colleague, Representative GRACE NAPOLITANO, for sponsoring this legislation with me, and I also thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFazio for helping shepherd this bill to the floor, along with Highways and Transit Subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRAVES.

I am proud to have Route 66 run through the middle of my district, and I believe it is important that we celebrate the history of Route 66.

In 1926, Route 66 became our Nation's first all-paved highway under the U.S. highway system, connecting Chicago, Illinois, to Santa Monica, California. Early on, the road was used by hundreds of thousands of Americans seeking to escape the Dust Bowl and provided critical employment opportunities for road crews paving the road during the Great Depression.

During World War II, the highway transported troops, equipment, and supplies to military bases across our country and was used after the war by thousands of troops returning home to their families.

By the 1950s, Route 66 began to see a rise in tourism and became the true symbol of American freedom and independence that we all know today.

In April of last year, I went on an extended tour of Illinois' stretch of the highway with my colleague Representative DARIN LAHOOD and also many State and local leaders. I had the opportunity to see the economic impact that the Mother Road brings to Illinois. It supports many jobs and key economic activity in small towns, and it helps to generate important revenue to support those small rural communities.

For example, travelers along Route 66 in Illinois can see a giant pink elephant statue and other larger-than-life sculptures at the Pink Elephant Antique Mall in Livingston, Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, my family and I were coming back to my hometown of Taylorville yesterday, and we stopped and had a great lunch at the Twistee Treat, which is attached to the Pink Elephant Antique Mall. So

if you ever want to go there, they have great burgers. I happened to have a pork tenderloin sandwich that I probably shouldn't have eaten, but it was really, really good, and topped it off, of course, with Twistee Treat's famous ice cream.

You can also, if you are traveling Route 66, stop and see a movie at the Wildey Theater in Edwardsville, Illinois. That originally opened in 1909. Or stop for an all-day breakfast at Jungle Jim's Cafe, a quintessential roadside diner in Springfield, Illinois.

Those are just a few of the thousands of local businesses along Route 66 whose livelihoods depend upon the historic highway.

You don't even have to be in a car to ride along Route 66. The Illinois Route 66 Trail is a system of off-road paths for bikes, hikers, or anyone else looking to see the Mother Road in a different way.

The centennial of this great highway will be an international celebration, and the State of Illinois will be ready to welcome travelers from around the world who want to experience the history and magic of this scenic byway.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will create a 19-member commission to recommend activities to honor the 100th anniversary of the Mother Road in the year 2026.

It also directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to develop a plan to ensure the first all-paved U.S. highway connecting the Midwest to my colleague's, Mrs. NAPOLITANO's, district in California will be preserved for many years to come. In doing this, the Secretary of Transportation will work with the Governors of the eight States that this historic highway passes through to develop a comprehensive preservation plan.

H.R. 66 is endorsed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation; the Route 66 Road Ahead Partnership; the National Historic Route 66 Federation; Auto Club Enterprises, also known as AAA; and the Route 66 Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD their letters of support of the bill.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,

July 16, 2018.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We appreciate this opportunity to present the National Trust for Historic Preservation's perspective on H.R. 66, the Route 66 Centennial Commission Act, which is scheduled for House floor consideration today. The National Trust enthusiastically endorses this legislation and looks forward to its enactment this year.

INTERESTS OF THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a privately-funded charitable, educational, and nonprofit organization chartered by Congress in 1949 to "facilitate public participation in historic preservation" and to further the purposes of federal historic preservation laws. The intent of Congress was for the National Trust "to mobilize and coordinate public interest, participation, and resources in the preservation and interpretation of sites and buildings." With

headquarters in Washington, D.C., nine field offices, 27 historic sites, more than one million members and supporters, and a national network of partners in states, territories, and the District of Columbia, the National Trust works to save America's historic places and advocates for historic preservation as a fundamental value in programs and policies at all levels of government.

H.R. 66, ROUTE 66 CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

We appreciate Representative Rodney Davis' leadership on this legislation to create a Route 66 Centennial Commission that recognizes and honors Route 66 on its centennial anniversary. Historic Route 66 stretches approximately 2,400 miles from Chicago, IL to Los Angeles, CA, passing through eight states and more than 300 communities. This vital transportation corridor between the Midwest and southern California has endured as a symbol of freedom and mobility while epitomizing a new optimism that pervaded the nation's economic recovery following World War II.

Route 66 was found by the National Park Service (NPS) to be nationally significant in its 1995 Route 66 Special Resource Study, which determined that Route 66 met the eligibility requirements for a National Historic Trail. Numerous buildings along Route 66 are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and a 2012 Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) establishing the road's national significance was recently approved by the Keeper of the National Register. Route 66 has been designated a National Scenic Byway in four states, including one segment that has been designated an All-American Road—the highest designation offered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Route 66 is internationally recognized as representing America's love of the automobile and open road. As a Dustbowl migration route, a World War II strategic military route, and a vacation travel route, it has been celebrated in music, literature, television, movies, and popular lore. The National Trust has been supportive of Route 66 preservation efforts for many years, including it in our signature National Treasures program, participating in symposiums, providing strategic assistance, and including Route 66 on the 2018 list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.

When Congress passed the Route 66 Corridor Preservation Program in 1999, a program administered by the National Park Service (NPS), Route 66 was described as a symbol of the American people's heritage of travel and their legacy of seeking a better life. We applaud Representative Rodney Davis and the over 40 cosponsors of H.R. 66 for their commitment to recognizing the national significance of Route 66.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present the National Trust's perspectives on this legislation, and we look forward to working with Congress to ensure H.R. 66 is enacted into law this year.

Sincerely,

PAM BOWMAN,
Director of Public Lands Policy.

THE RT. 66 ROAD AHEAD PARTNERSHIP,
March 7, 2018.

CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: The Rt. 66 Road Ahead Partnership supports H.R. 66, which will establish a Rt. 66 100th Anniversary Commission at the Federal level. This legislation will help ensure activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate this milestone are planned and carried out in a way that appropriately honors America's Mother Road.

2026 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Numbered Highway System and Route 66. The road was our na-

tion's first all-paved highway connecting the Midwest, starting in Illinois, and ending in California. Since the early decades of the 20th Century, Route 66 has reflected and been an integral part of American history.

Hundreds of thousands of people used Route 66 to escape the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, and many found employment along its path. The road also transported troops, equipment, and other military supplies across the country during WWII, and was used by thousands of troops as they returned home. In the 1950s and 1960s, Route 66 saw the rise of American tourism and became home to countless tourist attractions, motels, diners, and other businesses along its path. Today, Route 66 remains an iconic symbol of American freedom and of the U.S. as a mobile society.

H.R. 66 will create a commission to recommend activities for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Route 66. The bill also requires USDOT to develop a plan on the preservation needs of the road, and directs USDOT to host a conference on the U.S. Numbered Highway System.

The Rt. 66 Road Ahead Partnership believes in the preservation, promotion, and development of Route 66, and is committed to helping ensure the road's 100th Anniversary is planned and celebrated in a manner that recognizes its historic significance. For this reason, we strongly support H.R. 66.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. THOMAS,
Chairman.

NATIONAL HISTORIC
ROUTE 66 FEDERATION,
Lake Arrowhead, CA, February 10, 2018.

THE ROUTE 66 ROAD AHEAD PARTNERSHIP: This is to let you know, the National Historic Route 66 Federation supports H.R. 66, which will establish a Route 66 100th Anniversary Commission at the Federal level. This legislation will help ensure activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate this milestone are planned and carried out in a way that appropriately honors America's Mother Road.

2026 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Numbered Highway System and Route 66. The road was our nation's first all-paved highway connecting the Midwest, starting in Illinois, and ending in California. Since the early decades of the 20th Century, Route 66 has reflected and been an integral part of American history.

Hundreds of thousands of people used Route 66 to escape the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, and many found employment along its corridor. The road also transported troops, equipment, and other military supplies across the country during the Second World War, and was traveled by thousands of troops as they returned home.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Route 66 saw the rise of American tourism and became home to countless tourist attractions, motels, diners and other businesses along its path. Today, Route 66 remains an iconic symbol of American freedom and of the U.S. as a mobile society.

H.R. 66 will create a commission to recommend activities for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Route 66. The bill also requires USDOT to develop a plan on the preservation needs of the road, and directs USDOT to host a conference on the U.S. Numbered Highway System.

For 24 years, The National Historic Route 66 Federation has been dedicated to the preservation and promotion of Route 66, and is committed to helping ensure the road's 100th Anniversary is planned and celebrated in a

manner that recognizes its historic significance. For this reason, we strongly support H.R. 66.

Sincerely,

DAVID KNUDSON,
Executive Director.

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,

Los Angeles, CA, January 17, 2017.

Subject: H.R. 66—Route 66 Centennial Commission Act.

HON. RODNEY DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

THE HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: Auto Club Enterprises (AAA) applauds your leadership for introducing H.R. 66, which would form a commission tasked with celebrating Route 66's centennial and direct that a preservation plan for the Route be prepared.

Auto Club Enterprises represents the interests of our AAA members and motorists in five of the eight states represented in this proposal (California, New Mexico, Texas, Missouri and southern Illinois). Furthermore, the largest motor club within ACE, the Automobile Club of Southern California (ACSC), played a central role in the survey and signposting of the original highway that became Route 66: the National Old Trails Road, created in 1914-1915. ACSC published the first maps of the route and its signs guided travelers for the first decade of the road's existence [both illustrations attached].

We are keenly aware of the strong historical connection between Route 66 and major trends in our nation's history and travel and the history of the Southwest.

Route 66 was one of our nation's first all-paved highways connecting the Midwest to California, and has played a major role in the history of the United States. It offered opportunity to hundreds of thousands of people seeking escape from the Dust Bowl in the 1930s, and its construction created jobs for thousands during the Great Depression.

Route 66 represented America's great optimism and enthusiasm during the postwar economic recovery. In this era, the tourism industry along Route 66 grew tremendously; giving rise to countless tourist courts, motels, service stations, garages, and diners.

Because of its resonance within American history and culture, Route 66 has been the subject of memorable productions in all media, from popular music to television to movies.

For all these reasons—its historical and cultural significance and its connection with our own history, Auto Club Enterprises supports the passage of H.R. 66.

We look forward to working with you and other stakeholders in support of passing H.R. 66 and to our continued partnership after its passage to successfully implement its provisions.

Sincerely,

HAMID BAHADORI,
Manager, Transportation Policy
and Programs.

THE ROUTE 66 ALLIANCE,
Tulsa, OK, February 8, 2018.

Re H.R. 66.

THE ROUTE 66 ROAD AHEAD PARTNERSHIP: On behalf of the Route 66 Alliance, I am pleased to provide this letter of support for H.R. 66, which will establish a Route 66 100th Anniversary Commission at the Federal level. This legislation will help ensure activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate this milestone are planned and carried out in a manner that appropriately honors America's Mother Road.

2026 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Numbered Highway

System and Route 66. The road was our nation's first all-paved highway connecting the Midwest, beginning in Illinois, and ending in California. Since the early decades of the 20th Century, Route 66 has reflected and been an integral part of American history. And Tulsa celebrates this legacy since the Father of Route 66, Cyrus Avery, led the effort to have Route 66 pass through Oklahoma, specifically Tulsa, where East meets West!

Hundreds of thousands of people used Route 66 to escape the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, and many found employment along its path. The road also transported troops, equipment, and other military supplies across the country during the Second World War, and was used by thousands of troops as they returned home. In the 1950s and 1960s, Route 66 saw the rise of American tourism and became home to countless tourist attractions, motels, diners, and other businesses along its path. Today, Route 66 remains an iconic symbol of American freedom and of the U.S. as a mobile society.

H.R. 66 will create a commission to recommend activities for the commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of Route 66. The bill also requires USDOT to develop a plan on the preservation needs of the road, and directs USDOT to host a conference on the U.S. Numbered Highway System.

The Route 66 Alliance is dedicated to the preservation and promotion of Route 66, and is committed to helping ensure the road's 100th Anniversary is planned and celebrated in a manner that recognizes its historic significance. For this reason, we strongly support H.R. 66.

Best regards,

KEN BUSBY,
Executive Director & CEO.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, throughout its history, Route 66 has become more than just a way to get from point A to point B. It has evolved into a symbol of American independence and prosperity. I am proud to help continue the legacy of Route 66, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 66.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 66, the Route 66 Centennial Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman RODNEY DAVIS, for introducing this legislation with me; and I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Ranking Member NORTON for their support in moving this bill along through the committee.

Route 66, as was pointed out, runs east to west through my district as Foothill Boulevard and Huntington Drive in the cities of La Verne, San Dimas, Azusa, Duarte, and Monrovia. Our local restaurants, shops, and businesses, like so many others dotting the interstate from the heartland to the West Coast, provide rest breaks for travelers, allowing them to sample the local flavors of our communities that are proud to be connected by the iconic road. Other cities are doing this as well.

The city of Duarte celebrates every year in September with a parade of

classic cars, equestrian groups, and marching bands. Along the highway, there are signs still there from long ago showing Route 66 lives there.

The theme of the Los Angeles County Fair this year, which is a very popular fair, is Route 66, with memorabilia and Route 66 movie-themed nights.

States and local governments across the country are reinvesting in Route 66 as an icon of American history and culture. The Federal Government should be involved in this effort as well.

H.R. 66 creates a national commission to recommend activities to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Route 66 in 2026.

The bill will also direct the Department of Transportation, as was pointed out, to develop a plan on the preservation needs of this iconic Route 66. The Department is required to consult with eight States through which Route 66 travels, which include California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, and Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, Route 66 is a significant part of America's past, but it also continues to provide transportation, economic, and community benefits to our society today. We must continue to improve this historic road so that many more generations can, in the words of Chuck Berry, get their kicks on Route 66.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support Route 66, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and also my colleague Mr. LAHOOD, for going on the Route 66 tour and passing legislation through the Natural Resources Committee when he was a member of that committee to ensure that this Mother Road gets the recognition that it deserves when it turns 100 years old.

I will tell you, you talk about economic impacts, this road has a tremendous impact in rural America and central Illinois. When I pulled into the Pink Elephant Antique Mall yesterday, it was tough to find a parking spot on a Sunday in Livingston, Illinois, when that town has 850 people who reside there. This is a big deal.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. My communities, as of now, are very excited about this bill and the celebration of the 100th birthday.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 66, 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.

INNOVATIVE STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3906) to establish centers of excellence for innovative stormwater control infrastructure, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3906

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 “Innovative Stormwater Infrastructure Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING TASK FORCE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a stormwater infrastructure funding task force composed of representatives of Federal, State, and local governments and private (including nonprofit) entities to conduct a study on, and develop recommendations to improve, the availability of public and private sources of funding for the construction, rehabilitation, and operation and maintenance of stormwater infrastructure to meet the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) *CONSIDERATIONS.*—In carrying out subsection (a), the task force shall—

(1) identify existing Federal, State, and local public sources and private sources of funding for stormwater infrastructure; and

(2) consider—

(A) how funding for stormwater infrastructure from such sources has been made available, and utilized, in each State to address stormwater infrastructure needs identified pursuant to section 516(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1375(b)(1));

(B) how the source of funding affects the affordability of the infrastructure (as determined based on the considerations used to assess the financial capability of municipalities under the integrated planning guidelines described in the Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency on June 5, 2012, and dated May, 2012), including consideration of the costs associated with financing the infrastructure; and

(C) whether such sources of funding are sufficient to support capital expenditures and long-term operation and maintenance costs necessary to meet the stormwater infrastructure needs of municipalities.

(c) *REPORT.*—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study conducted, and the recommendations developed, under subsection (a).

(d) *STATE DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous on H.R. 3906, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, BILL SHUSTER; the ranking member, Congressman DEFAZIO; and my good friend the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for their work in progressing this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, with the additional development that is occurring in this country, with the additional water and stormwater systems that are being built, heavy rains end up transiting or transferring pollutants, heavy metals, trash, bacteria, and many other things into our water system.

Mr. Speaker, I represent south Louisiana. The watershed that I represent drains from Montana to two Canadian provinces to New York. It is one of the largest watersheds in the world. Of course, all of that stormwater runoff ends up coming down right through my home State and contributes to one of the largest dead zones in the Nation—in fact, the largest dead zone in the Nation—which is not very compatible with us having some of the top commercial and recreational fishing and one of the largest or most productive estuaries in the United States.

So I want to thank Mr. HECK for introducing this legislation, for working with Congressman KATKO in putting this together in a bipartisan manner.

What this legislation does is it recognizes that stormwater runoff does actually transfer, or does contribute to pollutants, in our waterways, and it recognizes that this is a problem. But it also recognizes that it is a problem that needs to be solved by local, by State, and by Federal agencies, by Federal officials.

So this legislation creates a new task force to look at innovative financing, to look at new funding streams, to look at how we can do a better job integrating the various funding streams to actually achieve this objective that we all share on a bipartisan basis to help reduce the amount of pollutants and trash and other things that get into our waterways. This is an important step forward.

Mr. Speaker, in a previous life, I managed a large infrastructure program where we built tens of billions of dollars of infrastructure. One of the first things I realized is how important it was for us to look at all the funding streams that are available, and the

possible funding streams that are available, pulling those together to make sure that they are being used in a complementary manner, not managed in silos, and certainly not managed in a contradictory or in a conflicting manner.

The gentleman’s legislation helps to address that. It helps look at the revenue streams that are available today, whether they are Federal, whether they are State, whether they are local funds, or perhaps even private or not-for-profit, looking at the different regulatory structures that are out there, looking at opportunities for us to achieve this bipartisan goal of reducing pollutants, of helping reduce trash, of helping reduce the dead zone and other adverse outcomes as a result of stormwater runoff from heavy rains.

Again, I want to point out that this is bipartisan legislation, that this passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee unanimously, that my good friend from California Mrs. NAPOLITANO worked with us on changes in the committee. I thank, again, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and Mr. KATKO for working together on something that is an important issue, for coming up with a bipartisan solution, and looking forward to ensuring that this passes the House and passes the Senate as well to where we can get it to the President’s desk.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, because I rise in support of H.R. 3906, the Innovative Stormwater Infrastructure Act of 2018.

This bipartisan bill, as was pointed out, was introduced by our colleague from Washington, Congressman HECK, aimed at addressing one of the ongoing concerns facing our communities, an unfunded mandate—very unfunded: how to address and pay for controlling ongoing sources of stormwater that empty into our local water bodies.

According to EPA, runoff from urbanized areas is a leading source of water quality impairments on local water bodies. In urban and suburban areas, buildings and pavement cover much of the land and prevent rain and snowmelt from soaking into the ground. Instead, these developed areas rely on storm drains to carry large amounts of water runoff from roofs and paved areas to nearby waterways, and with it, as was pointed out again, high levels of pollution, such as oil, dirt, chemicals, and lawn fertilizers released directly into local streams and rivers.

Congress needs to do more to help communities come into compliance with the goals of the Clean Water Act, the unfunded mandate. We need to encourage the development of new technologies and practices for addressing stormwater runoff. We need to encourage the implementation of cost-effective, low-impact development and nature-based infrastructure alternatives.

Finally, we need to provide additional Federal assistance to communities to help address their local water quality challenges. Many of the communities are small and could not afford them. It will bankrupt them if they have to follow the letter of the law.

Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 3906, as introduced, would have addressed some of these challenges, the bill was modified by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This modification removed the authorization of a new EPA stormwater grant program and replaced it with a new study on how existing sources of Federal, State, local, and private funds are being used to address local stormwater challenges.

As amended, H.R. 3906 would direct the EPA administration to partner with Federal, State, and local agencies and stakeholders in the creation of a new stormwater infrastructure funding task force. This new task force will look at funding and affordability issues related to the construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance of the stormwater infrastructure necessary to meet the goals of the Clean Water Act.

The task force will be required to inventory the available public and private sources of funding for stormwater infrastructure and to assess how the use of these sources of funding might affect the affordability of the infrastructure to a municipality, which sometimes is floundering.

While there may be several financing options available to communities to address local stormwater challenges, the actual cost of these options to a community may vary greatly.

For example, it is far cheaper for a community to obtain a Federal grant for water infrastructure than a loan, but it may also be more affordable for a community to borrow from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund than to borrow the same amount from the private market. So the question is not simply about whether funding is available to the community, but is that funding also affordable to the community.

I expect that the results of the task force will show how the Federal Government needs to be an active player in financing affordable stormwater infrastructure. Perhaps this information will guide future Congresses to take a greater role in financing our water infrastructure challenges.

Mr. Speaker, while I am disappointed that this legislation does not provide additional Federal resources so desperately needed to address our local water infrastructure challenges, the bill is a very good first step in further refining the scope of the stormwater challenges facing our Nation.

I am pleased to support the bill, and I heartily urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, pretty simply put, this bill is about addressing the single largest source of water pollution in America, which is stormwater runoff.

It is a nationwide issue from D.C., to Los Angeles, to Milwaukee, to Louisiana. But it is also one that is acutely felt in my home State of Washington, because there, it really does rain a lot. When that rain falls, the rain runs off the roofs. The rain runs down the streets. The rain runs into the storm drainage system. Along the way, it picks up all sorts of nasty, toxic stuff that has been alluded to earlier, stuff like fertilizers, metals, oils, and pesticides. That stuff, all that bad stuff, runs into our lakes and our rivers and, ultimately, in my region of the country, into Puget Sound, which is the largest estuary, by water volume, in the United States.

It has been estimated by scientists that stormwater accounts for up to 80 percent of all water pollution. Gone are the days of the easy-fix solutions of point-source pollution, where we could just pass a law saying: You can't do that anymore. Figure it out.

This is a lot more difficult. It is a lot more decentralized. It is a lot more pervasive. Frankly, it is no less harmful.

And it hurts not just our environment. Let's be clear, this hurts our businesses as well, especially those that depend on clean water.

In our State, we have a robust shellfish industry that employs thousands of people. Stormwater can kill a salmon in a matter of hours. We actually have time-lapse films from underwater showing this, and it is not very much time that has elapsed. This isn't something where they ingest the metal, and then months or years later they die. You can literally watch them die as the stormwater hits the water.

And they are fundamental. Salmon are fundamental to the economy and the culture of the Pacific Northwest and especially to the Native people, who have depended on them since time immemorial.

Salmon support, in fact, in our region of the country, a \$30 billion a year economy.

Salmon are also the prey of choice of our beloved southern resident orcas, which we are precariously close to losing altogether. Frankly, we can't save the orcas if we don't save the salmon, and we can't save the salmon if we don't save Puget Sound, and we can't save Puget Sound if we don't deal with stormwater runoff.

Every region has its own story. The gentleman from Louisiana told his most eloquently, and I thank him, about how stormwater is punishing our waterways and, along with it, our way of life and our economy.

That is why State and local governments are implementing green

stormwater infrastructure, like rain gardens and permeable pavement, and are building new gray stormwater infrastructure to reduce combined sewer outflows. But that is not enough. It is not enough by a long shot.

□ 1715

State and local governments are stretched thin, and that is why we need the Federal Government to step up and do its partnership role in this.

Back in my State, we estimate that the stormwater problem could be solved with \$19 billion in investment between now and 2036; and, frankly, almost all of that is in the Puget Sound region, 98 percent.

That is a lot of money and that is why H.R. 3906 is an important first step to help the experts and the stakeholders come together and come up with innovative ways not to be duplicative and to think outside the box.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by thanking Chairman SHUSTER; Ranking Member DeFAZIO; along with Subcommittee Chairman GRAVES; Ranking Member NAPOLITANO; my colleague and my friend from New York, Congressman KATKO; and their staffs for their work on this bill. I appreciate their help to bring greater attention to the problem of stormwater runoff.

But let's be clear: We have to do more; we have to do a lot more. I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to increase the Federal Government's partnership role in tackling this urgent threat, which, again, is the number one cause of water pollution in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, just one last word, I think this is a very important bill. We have been dealing with the stormwater issue for at least 7 years in my area, and because it is an unfunded mandate, the cities are crying out for help. I think the two cases set forth by my colleagues point out the need for Federal help.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Congressman HECK recently brought up the shellfish industry. Just this week, the Louisiana Oyster Task Force is coming to town. We are going to be meeting with them, talking to them about this and a number of other priority issues because their industry has been impacted by water quality and many other challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this legislation helps to make sure that all of the various levels of government, together with our nongovernment partners in the private sector and the not-for-profit organizations that are out

there, that we are all working together; that we are ensuring that the regulatory structure that is out there is actually complementary to this effort to help ensure clean water not just now, but for generations to come; that we are using better technology; that we are using better mechanisms, such as vegetative plantings and buffers and other things, to ensure that we are not polluting our waters but that we are cleaning them; that we have safe drinking water; that we have safe, productive ecosystems for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Congressman HECK, Congressman KATKO, my friend Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, and many others who were involved in this legislation. This is going to help us to ensure that the various funding streams that are out there, that we are using them in a complementary manner, not in a stovepipe manner.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 3906, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3906, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a stormwater infrastructure funding task force, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. MARVIN JONES FEDERAL BUILDING AND MARY LOU ROBINSON UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5772) to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the “J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5772

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse located at 205 SE 5th Ave., Amarillo, Texas, shall be known and designated as the “J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to

the “J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5772.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5772 would designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse.

Judge Robinson was a legal pioneer, paving the way for women in what was once a male-dominated profession.

In 1973, Judge Robinson was appointed justice of the Seventh Court of Appeals in Amarillo, Texas, making her the first female appellate judge in Texas. Four years later, she was appointed to chief justice of the same court. Five years later, President Carter appointed Robinson to a Federal judgeship as the second woman to serve as a United States district judge in Texas.

For over 60 years, Judge Robinson was a pioneer, a scholar, and, above all, a judge of fairness and integrity. I support naming this Federal building and courthouse after her.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman in supporting H.R. 5772, which designates the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse.

The new designation is a well-deserved honor for Judge Mary Lou Robinson. You have heard some description of her outstanding career. Let me add a few more points.

She has served as a judge in Amarillo, Texas, for more than 63 years, with 35 years on the Federal judiciary. When she took senior status as a Federal judge in 2016, she became the longest serving Federal judge in both the Northern District of Texas and the entire Fifth Circuit.

Judge Robinson received numerous awards throughout her career for both her legal and her public service to the community. She was named one of the 100 Legal Legends by Texas Lawyer, the 2016 Jurist of the Year by the Texas

Chapters of American Board of Trial Advocates, and the 1973 Texas Woman of the Year by the Texas Federation of Business and Professional Women, among other awards.

Her colleagues reported that she had a reputation for running an orderly and efficient courtroom, and she treated celebrity trials the same way she treated mundane 2-day civil cases.

Judge Robinson certainly served with distinction during her time on the Federal bench. She was deeply respected by the Amarillo legal community, and I am pleased to support this legislation which aptly names the facility in her honor.

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding and the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlewoman from Nevada for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this legislation with a near unanimous request of the legal community and the broader leadership in the Texas Panhandle.

Since 1980, the Federal building and courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, has been known as the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building. Judge Jones led a remarkable life. He served in this House from 1917 to 1940, including as chair of the Committee on Agriculture. He was then appointed to the court of claims, took a leave of absence to serve in the Roosevelt administration during World War II, and went back to the court of claims, where he was the chief judge there from 1947 until his retirement in 1964.

As I said, it was a remarkable life, but there is another remarkable life that has made a lasting impact on the cause of justice in the Northern District of Texas, and it has also been an inspirational life.

Judge Mary Lou Robinson has served as a judge, as Members have heard, for more than 60 years, more than 35 years of which has been as a Federal district judge in the Northern District of Texas.

She is a pioneer:

She attended and graduated law school at the University of Texas at a time when very few women applied or were admitted to the law school at all.

When she went into private practice in Amarillo, she was one of two female attorneys practicing there.

In 1955, Judge Robinson became the first woman in Amarillo history to serve as a judge higher than the justice of the peace level and was the first Potter County court at law judge. Up until that time in Texas, women could not serve on juries.

She was elected State district court judge in 1960.

As you have heard, in 1973, she became an associate justice of the Seventh State Court of Appeals, making

her the first female appellate judge in the entire State of Texas. She later became the chief justice of that court.

In 1979, Judge Robinson was nominated and confirmed to the Federal bench, again being only the second woman to serve as a U.S. district judge in Texas.

Then, day in and day out, for nearly 40 years, Judge Robinson presided over Federal and criminal cases with fairness and with high expectations fitting the American legal system. She took senior judge status in 2016.

As Members have heard, she has been honored repeatedly, such as the Sandra Day O'Connor Award for Professional Excellence from the Texas Center for Legal Ethics and the Texas Lawyer magazine's one of 100 Legal Legends in the State.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that Judge Mary Lou Robinson's influence extends even further than the trailblazing and remarkable longevity that her legal career would indicate.

Throughout it all, Judge Robinson has upheld the highest standards of legal ethics and professionalism, being a role model not only for those in the legal system, but for men and women throughout the region.

She is fair, but she is tough. And here I can speak from a bit of personal experience that no lawyer wanted to go unprepared into her courtroom. With her razor-sharp intellect and knowledge of the law, she was always well prepared and probably knew more about the law of the case than the lawyers arguing it. No one ever doubted that all sides of the case would get a fair hearing.

At the same time, those who know her off the bench know her to have a great sense of humor, compassion, and a warm human touch.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5772 would add Judge Mary Lou Robinson's name to the Federal building and courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, so that it would be known as the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse.

Marvin Jones served in all three branches of our Federal Government. Judge Robinson has served in the judicial branch of the State and Federal Government for more than 60 years. This designation honors each of them in a way that is fitting to each of them.

Adding Judge Robinson's name to that of Marvin Jones will not only honor the careers of two remarkable individuals, it will help inspire all of us to reach toward their high standards of integrity, professionalism, and service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I say again that we are most impressed by the two people whose names are on this Federal building, and I urge my colleagues to support the designation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5772.

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.

JOHN HERVEY WHEELER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3460) to designate the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the "John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3460

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

SECTION 1. JOHN HERVEY WHEELER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse" during the period in which the facility is used as a Federal courthouse.

(b) REFERENCES.—During the period in which the facility referred to in subsection (a) is used as a Federal courthouse, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1730

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3460, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. H.R. 3460 would designate the United States courthouse located in Durham, North Carolina, as the John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse.

Mr. Wheeler played a pivotal role in the civil rights movement. John Wheeler was a respected civil rights leader in Durham, North Carolina, successfully litigating school segregation cases in the 1940s.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed Mr. Wheeler to the United States Equal

Employment Opportunity Commission where he worked alongside Vice President Johnson in drafting civil rights legislation.

Mr. Wheeler also served as president of the Mechanics & Farmers Bank where he was able to continue his work on civil rights issues, making possible the purchase of homes, the acquisition of Federal loans, and a relaxation of racial barriers in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting to name the courthouse in Durham after him. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 3460. This is the bill, as you heard, that would name the United States Federal courthouse located in downtown Durham, North Carolina, as the John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse.

Mr. Wheeler was a prominent community leader. He was a bank president and he was a civil rights lawyer who helped transform the city of Durham over his long and impressive career. Clearly, it is appropriate to name this courthouse after him.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) who brought us this legislation and can speak more personally about the qualities of Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for her friendship, leadership, and for yielding me the time this afternoon. I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3460, that seeks to name the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, has the support from my friends in the North Carolina congressional delegation and the entire Durham community. It was favorably reported out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee several days ago.

John Hervey Wheeler, Mr. Speaker, was a prominent African American bank president, civil rights lawyer, political activist, civic leader, educator, statesman, and philanthropist. He was a family friend as well.

Mr. Wheeler was born on the campus of Kittrell College in Vance County, North Carolina, on New Year's Day in 1908, as the second child to the former Margaret Hervey and John Leonidas Wheeler.

After the Wheeler family relocated to Atlanta, Georgia, John Wheeler attended high school at Morehouse Academy from 1921 to 1925, and then matriculated to Morehouse College from 1925 to 1929, where he graduated summa cum laude in June of 1929.

After graduation, Mr. Wheeler moved to Durham where he began his career

with the Mechanics & Farmers Bank as a bank teller. He advanced through the company's ranks and in 1944, became executive vice president. Eight years later, Mr. Wheeler would become bank president. At the age of 44, he was the youngest African American bank president in the country.

As president, Mr. Wheeler saw the bank grow from operating branches in two cities, Durham and Raleigh, to also having a branch in Charlotte. During his tenure the bank's assets grew from \$5 million to \$41 million.

John Wheeler, Mr. Speaker, was instrumental in making loans to hundreds of families in North Carolina, enabling them to purchase their homes. He made loans to churches and businesses, loans they otherwise would not have been able to obtain because of discriminatory lending practices.

John Wheeler was eager to become a lawyer. He enrolled in law school at the North Carolina College for Negroes, now North Carolina Central University, where in 1947 he was among the first law school graduates.

John Wheeler became a thoughtful activist through his involvement known as the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs, a community-based civil and political organization founded in Durham in 1935. Mr. Wheeler began serving as chairman in 1957, a position he held until 1978. The organization continues today as the Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People.

During my entire time in Durham, Mr. Speaker, as a student at North Carolina Central University, John Wheeler was a titan of a community leader, well respected, and effective. On many occasions, he personally counseled me by providing advice that I recall to this day.

It was through the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs that Attorney Wheeler and Attorney M. Hugh Thompson and Attorney Oliver Hill of Richmond, Virginia, challenged several North Carolina school boards by alleging they were failing to provide equal funding to African American schools. It was a constitutional challenge.

In the case of *Blue v. Durham Public School District* filed on May 18, 1949, Wheeler, Thompson, and Hill were successful in proving that the Durham Public School District was violating the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The court entered its order and I have a copy with me today, Mr. Speaker. I will simply read one sentence:

The net result of what has been done leaves Negro school children at many disadvantages which must be overcome.

The court ordered equal funding for the schools on January 26, 1951, in the very building we are naming today.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the State courthouse in Richmond, Virginia, is named for his cocounsel, Oliver Hill. In my home county of Wilson, also in 1949, Black residents employed Attorney Wheeler to represent them in a similar lawsuit because the Wilson County

School Board refused to build any public schools in the rural portions of the county for African American children.

Mr. Wheeler won that case as well, and because of the litigation, two consolidated schools were constructed. Thousands of African American children in Wilson County benefited by obtaining a high school education.

Mr. Wheeler ultimately filed several school desegregation lawsuits before the end of the decade. In 1956, he and several other Durham attorneys, including future CORE chairman, Floyd B. McKissick, Sr., won the U.S. Supreme Court case of *Frasier v. Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina*, which led to the first three African American undergraduates to gain admission to our State's flagship institution.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed John Wheeler to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. In 1963, Mr. Wheeler became an incorporator of the North Carolina Fund, an ambitious antipoverty agency established by then-Governor Terry Sanford to help eradicate poverty. Mr. Wheeler joined the organization's board, and his bank became the repository for its accounts.

In 1964, then-Governor Terry Sanford named John Wheeler as a delegate to the Democratic Party's national convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Mr. Wheeler was the first African American in North Carolina to be a convention delegate.

That same year, Mr. Wheeler became the first African American President of the Southern Regional Council, a civil rights organization founded in 1944 and based in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1967, John Wheeler received an honorary doctorate from Morehouse College for his tireless leadership as a member of the school's board of trustees. He had previously received honorary doctorates from Shaw University in Raleigh, Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, and Tuskegee University in Tuskegee, Alabama.

In 1970, Mr. Wheeler was awarded an honorary doctorate from Duke University, and that same year received the Frank Porter Graham civil liberties award for his defense of freedom for all North Carolinians.

In 1971, North Carolina Central University, my alma mater, also honored him with an honorary doctorate degree. On January 4, 1976, Morehouse College formally dedicated the John H. Wheeler Hall as the school's social sciences and business administration building.

On December 25, Christmas Day, in 1935, Mr. Wheeler married the former Selena Lucille Warren, the daughter of Julia McCauley and Dr. Stanford L. Warren, a cofounder and one-time president of the Mechanics & Farmers Bank. They had two children, Julia Taylor and Warren Hervey Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler passed away 40 years ago on July 6, 1978, at the age of 70.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, John Hervey Wheeler gave so much of himself to his

community, State, and country. He accomplished more in his time on Earth than some could hope to accomplish in two lifetimes.

It is for these reasons that I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3460, to direct that the United States courthouse be named in his honor.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for sharing with us that amazing life story.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3460, 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.

GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2734) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2734

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2734.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 2734 would designate the Federal building and the United States courthouse located in Laredo, Texas, as the George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Judge Kazen was appointed to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas by President Carter in 1979. He served as chief judge from 1996 to 2003, and assumed senior status in 2009. In March of this year, he retired from the bench.

Prior to his appointment as a Federal judge, Judge Kazen was in private practice for 14 years. Earlier in his career, he served in the United States Air Force as a captain and judge advocate. In addition, Judge Kazen has been an adjunct professor of law at St. Mary's University School of Law and served as judge on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Given Judge Kazen's service, I think it is more than fit to name this Federal building and courthouse after him.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of S. 2734 which designates the Federal building and United States courthouse located in Laredo, Texas, as the George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I would like to commend Congressman CUELLAR, our colleague from Texas, who introduced the House companion to this bill, H.R. 5280, that also has bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), to share with us the impressive story of Judge Kazen's legal and public career.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the great leadership that she has provided in the committee and in the House also.

I also want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for his leadership and for the great service that he has provided the country here in the U.S. Congress.

This particular bill means a lot to my district. I also want to thank, before I forget, the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for unanimous support of this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2734, a bill which would designate the Federal courthouse located in my district at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the George P. Kazen Building and United States Courthouse.

□ 1745

Judge Kazen was born in Laredo, Texas, on February 29—a leap year—in 1940. He received his law degree with honors from the University of Texas

School of Law in 1961. Shortly after graduation, he served a term as a brief attorney for the Texas Supreme Court and entered the United States Air Force as a JAG officer, where he was awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal also.

Judge Kazen would return back to the city of Laredo in 1965, where he practiced law until he was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to become a United States district judge in 1979 for the Southern District of Texas.

During his many years of service in the courtroom, he was known as an honest, humble, and dedicated individual.

He was also among the most respected judges in the State and in the country, and consistently ruled with class and fairness, all while still making time to serve numerous civic organizations throughout south Texas.

Judge Kazen recently retired after almost 40 years of service on the bench.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to honor him and say that this is an outstanding individual and a very noble individual. Dedicating this Federal building and courthouse would serve as a reminder to all of us of this great man of character who served his community and his country for so many years.

Also, I want to convey my legislative intent for this bill that the central jury assembly room on the first floor of this courthouse be known as the Marcel C. Notzon II Jury Room.

Judge Notzon was born on August 24, 1935, in Laredo. His love for the law and justice spanned a legal career over 39 years, with almost a quarter century on the bench as the United States magistrate judge for the Southern District of Texas. Judge Kazen, the man whom this building will be named after, would call Judge Notzon the “heart of the courthouse.”

Judge Notzon, who just recently passed away, will be most remembered as a portrait of a beloved and compassionate public servant and for a full life he served in accordance with the rule of law.

In particular, I want to thank Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator CRUZ for helping to bring this bill to the floor in the Senate and successfully passing the Senate, and all my Texas colleagues, all 36 Members from Texas in the House, for also supporting this piece of legislation that would honor George P. Kazen throughout this earned gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to show their support for this bill to name the Federal courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I want to thank Ms. TITUS and Mr. BARLETTA for their work and their support, and their staff also, and the committee.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague Mr. CUELLAR for helping ex-

plain why it is even more important for us to name this building for Judge Kazen.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2734.

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.

PROMOTING FLOOD RISK MITIGATION ACT

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5846) to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding the buyout practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5846

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 “Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act”.

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY REGARDING BUYOUT PRACTICES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(3) the terms “buyout practice” and “buyout program” mean a practice or program, as applicable, under which the Administrator provides assistance to State and local governments so that those entities may acquire flood-damaged properties committed to open space use in perpetuity in accordance with section 404(b)(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2));

(4) the term “eligible property owner” means a policyholder under the National Flood Insurance Program with a household income that is not more than 120 percent of the mean household income for the community in which the primary residence of the policyholder is located;

(5) the term “National Flood Insurance Program” means the program established under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.);

(6) the term “repetitive loss structure” has the meaning given the term in section 1370(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4121(a)); and

(7) the term “severe repetitive loss structure” has the meaning given the term in section 1366(h) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c(h)).

(b) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess—

(1) the efficacy of buyout practices, as in effect on the date on which the study is conducted; and

(2) ways to streamline the buyout practices described in paragraph (1) in order to provide more timely assistance to a larger number of State and local governments.

(c) **CONSIDERATIONS AND ANALYSIS.**—The study conducted under subsection (b) shall consider and analyze the following:

(1) To the extent possible, current (as of the date on which the study is conducted) and future trends with respect to repetitive loss structures and severe repetitive loss structures that are insured under the National Flood Insurance Program, including, with respect to both inland and coastal areas—

(A) changes in flood risk, flood frequency, and flood magnitude since the inception of the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) projections for changes in flood risk, flood frequency, and flood magnitude by 2025, 2050, and 2075.

(2) To the extent possible, buyout practices (as of the date on which the study is conducted), including—

(A) the availability of funding sources for buyout programs through various grant programs;

(B) the total number of properties acquired through buyout programs;

(C) the average length of time for a State or local government to acquire a flood-damaged property under a buyout program, with that period beginning on the date on which the State or local government, as applicable, begins participating in the buyout program;

(D) an estimate of the number of flood-damaged properties that could be acquired from willing property owners under buyout programs with the full cooperation of State and local governments;

(E) the socioeconomic status of recipients of buyouts under buyout programs; and

(F) examples of successful buyout programs, including best practices employed.

(3) Administrative, financial, or temporal constraints that may impede the timely acquisition of properties under a buyout program, including—

(A) a lack of communication or cooperation between the Administrator and the State and local governments that purchase properties under a buyout program;

(B) pressures to redevelop a property after acquiring a property through a buyout program; and

(C) a lack of adequate funding.

(4) Potential options, methods, and strategies to address the constraints identified under paragraph (3), including evaluating the feasibility of—

(A) a pilot program under which—

(i) an eligible property owner may agree, before a flood event occurs, to have the primary single-family residence of the eligible property owner purchased after the residence has been substantially damaged by a flood;

(ii) the Administrator may provide—

(I) financial assistance to State and local governments that are willing to participate in the program to purchase and acquire the properties of owners that have incurred substantial damage from a flood event; and

(II) a premium credit as an incentive to eligible property owners to agree to participate in the program;

(iii) properties that are acquired—

(I) shall be maintained as open space in accordance with section 404(b)(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2)); and

(II) may be used for non-structural mitigation, conservation, and recreational purposes; and

(iv) not fewer than 5 and not more than 10 State and local governments shall participate; and

(B) the role that nonprofit organizations could play in making buyouts more readily

available or more efficient, similar to the role that those organizations play in the acquisition of properties for conservation purposes.

(5) The ecological, financial, and flood risk reduction benefits that buyout practices, as in effect on the date on which the study is conducted, provide, which shall—

(A) take into account the differences between inland and coastal areas; and

(B) include—

(i) examples in which ecosystem restoration and other nature-based approaches have enhanced the reduction of flood risk; and

(ii) recommendations for best practices.

(6) To the extent possible, an assessment of how the Administrator may use buyout programs to reduce future flood disaster recovery costs that are attributable to future projections of flood risk as a result of sea level rise, population changes, subsidence, and other factors.

(7) A cost-benefit analysis of mitigation and buy-out projects and programs, including an assessment of opportunities and challenges for leveraging different Federal resources and funding to maximize the value of Federal investment in disaster mitigation.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and the Administrator a report that sets forth the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the study conducted under subsection (b).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall detail the feasibility of the Administrator establishing, and the processes required for the Administrator to establish, an alternative buyout program, such as the pilot program described in subsection (c)(4)(A).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5846, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5846, as amended, the Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act, requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study and issue a report to Congress regarding the flood buyout practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The removal of homes and buildings that have been repeatedly flooded to avoid future disaster damages and losses is a critical mitigation technique.

These mitigation measures not only save lives but also reduce disaster costs by minimizing the risk of future damage from disasters. Studies have shown that for every \$1 invested in mitigation, there is a potential savings of \$4 to \$8, because of damages avoided.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5846, the Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act, as amended.

This bill was brought to us by my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The bill requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the efficacy of buyouts of flood-prone property acquired by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and examine ways to streamline funding to provide more timely assistance to a larger number of State and local governments.

One only needs to look at last year's hurricane season to see the devastating impacts of these intense storms that were caused by climate change and what they did to our communities. Unfortunately for many residents, the damage and destruction caused by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria were not occurring for the first time but for a second or third time. These homes have been flooded and then had to be repaired with Federal assistance.

In order to stop this endless repairing and rebuilding of homes in floodplain areas, we must find ways to encourage more homeowners to agree to having their homes bought out, as well as ways to encourage State and local governments to purchase more of these properties.

The bill before you requires the GAO to assess the feasibility of a pilot program that, in exchange for a credit on their flood insurance premiums, property owners would be able to agree, before a flood occurs, to have their residence bought out if their residence is later substantially damaged by flood. The study would also examine the role that nonprofit organizations could play in making buyouts more readily available and more efficient.

We must stop the cycle of destroy, rebuild, destroy, rebuild. This study is a good first step to assess the benefits of buyouts and the feasibility of potential solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to further discuss this.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the gentlewoman from Nevada from the committee of jurisdiction on this issue.

During the markup of the National Flood Insurance Program, a number of us suggested that perhaps there is a way to help this bankrupt program save substantial funds. Right now, the program is \$20 billion in debt, and we have a temporary extension from the March omnibus that expires in July.

The issue is that 2 percent of the properties in America have accounted for 24 percent of the spending by the National Flood Insurance Program. More than 30,000 of them have flooded five times each and been rebuilt by the

bankrupt Federal Flood Insurance Program. Some have flooded more than 30 times.

This is insanity, that we would keep rebuilding in these flood-prone areas, rebuilding, rebuilding, rebuilding, and piling up debt and raising the insurance premiums for everybody else on the program who presents way less risk.

So we decided that a way to go would be to provide a significant incentive to these people, and the incentive would be that they would have an agreed-upon contract with FEMA to purchase their property at preflood market value, and they would also get a discount on their Federal flood insurance. So they get the discount on the insurance and have entered into an agreement to sell the property to FEMA at the full market price. FEMA would remove the structures, and it would be turned into open space that would continue to flood repeatedly, but we wouldn't have to pay anything to rebuild it.

We proposed that. The House Republicans said, oh, they thought it would be too expensive. We don't know if it would be too expensive. It is 2 percent and 24 percent of the costs. I don't think it is going to be more expensive. I think it is going to save a heck of a lot of money.

So this bill would have the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, study this proposal and set up a pilot program to see if, indeed, it would facilitate cost savings and avoid the repeated rebuilding of flood-prone structures and have willing takers on the other side.

The other real incentive is that, if someone has finally tired of it the fifth time their house was flooded and they want out, that process now takes 2 to 5 years and involves a whole lot of negotiations over value, preflood value, and all that sort of thing. Here you get an agreed-upon preflood value; you get a discount on your flood insurance; and you just walk away. FEMA will take care of the rest, the removal of the rubble and turning that into open space.

So I think this would be one thing we need to do to help the Federal Flood Insurance Program, which is critical. Thirty-four thousand people in my State have it. I have had Federal insurance; I don't have it anymore. But this is a critical program for many, many people who are only very, very occasionally going to be flooded, but they can't get a mortgage unless they have flood insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill strongly to my colleagues.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on this bill. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for her work on this bill. It is a bipartisan bill because it makes common sense. So whether it is DEFAZIO or BLUMENAUER or DUFFY—go down the list of

different people who have worked on it—they have worked on something that makes eminent commonsense, and I want to thank them for their efforts.

The saying is: If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

But the corollary to that is: If it is broken, fix it.

What we have just heard are any number of different conversations about the degree to which the buyout program is not just a little bit broken but a whole lot broken.

First off, just at an individual level, it captures people in a hamster wheel that they can never get out of. If you look at the average buyout time, it is about 5 years. In that 5-year time period, people are stuck there waiting and waiting and waiting as their house, in many cases, refloods.

I have been to Shadowmoss in the West Ashley section of Charleston. I remember going in there after a flood. Those people who had a second story had carried stuff up to the second story. Those who didn't were just dealing with the flooding as it occurred on the first floor. But they had been repeatedly flooded.

So at an individual level, this makes sense for the remedy that it offers an individual, so they are not stuck in a house that is repeatedly flooding, as they are trapped in dealing with that.

It makes sense based on what Mother Nature is telling us.

My colleague from Nevada mentioned this notion of climate change. I don't know exactly what is going on, but I know that in Charleston, South Carolina, if you compare the 1950s with the present day, there is 10 times more flooding in what they call king tides, and it has become regular. Something is going on out there that says this buyout program needs to be adjusted, and it needs to be adjusted now.

The final point I would make is that this makes, as has been registered thus far, a whole lot of sense for the taxpayer, because if you look at the numbers, again, 30,000 homes in America have been flooded five or more times with substantial consequence to the taxpayer. We are talking about \$5.5 billion being spent by the taxpayer in rebuilding and repairing. Destroy and repair is the term my colleague from Nevada used. The destroy-and-repair, destroy-and-repair cycle is destructive for the taxpayer.

It is for that reason that everybody from the State floodplain managers to the National Association of Realtors to the Nature Conservancy has supported this measure. I cannot endorse it enough, and I thank the gentleman for his work on it.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge passage of this legislation and all the bills that we have brought before you today from this subcommittee.

I want to thank our chairman, Mr. BARLETTA, for working with us across the aisle on these bipartisan bills.

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

□ 1800

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5846, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5846, 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.

REINSTATING AND EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING GIBSON DAM

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 490) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 490

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

SECTION 1. REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING GIBSON DAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12478-003, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of, and the procedures of the Commission under, that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the project for not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the period required for the commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of that date of expiration.

(2) EXTENSION.—If the Commission reinstates the license under paragraph (1), the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, S. 490, authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, upon request, to extend by 6 years the time period during which construction must commence on a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, which is located on the Sun River in Montana. Additionally, FERC may reinstate the construction license if it is expired.

This bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent back on June 28, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation so that we can send it to the President's desk.

I would also note that when the Senate passed this bill, they also passed five other House bills extending construction licenses for hydro projects in North Carolina, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia. These now have become law. So this is the last one.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 490. This bipartisan legislation, sponsored by Senators STEVE DAINES, JON TESTER, and JIM RISCHE, would reinstate and extend the deadline for the construction of a hydroelectric project on the Gibson Dam in Augusta, Montana. Congressman GIANFORTE of Montana introduced companion legislation last year.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensed the project in 2014, but the developer was unable to commence construction before the statutory deadlines passed.

S. 490 is substantially similar to legislation that, during the previous Congress, was reported unanimously by the Energy and Commerce Committee and passed the House with 410 votes. I know of no objections to the bill on this side of the aisle, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in support of S. 490.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE). I would note that he was the sponsor of the House companion bill. This is a Senate bill that we are taking up, but, obviously, he has great interest in it.

I would note that we passed it with strong bipartisan support through the Energy Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation built the original Gibson Dam on the Sun River between 1926 and 1929. The dam has served to capture spring snowmelt for irrigation and to prevent flooding in the region. This bill would extend the FERC license to build a 15-megawatt turbine at the base of the existing Gibson Dam.

The ability to produce clean energy off Gibson Dam will benefit the county and the State by creating a new source of revenue. Furthermore, the construction of the powerhouse will bring jobs to Montana. Finally, the turbine will be built in such a way that helps the environment and enhances fish and wildlife opportunities. By granting an extension of this permit, we are giving a community in Montana a chance to create jobs and a benefit to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the record. We were going to take this up and pass it like that, but the Senate acted first, which is why we are taking up the Senate bill. It does have bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 490.

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.

OVER-THE-COUNTER MONOGRAPH SAFETY, INNOVATION, AND REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5333) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5333

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 "Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2018".

TITLE I—OTC DRUG REVIEW

SEC. 101. REGULATION OF CERTAIN NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS THAT ARE MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED NEW DRUG APPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting after section 505F of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355g) the following:

“SEC. 505G. REGULATION OF CERTAIN NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS THAT ARE MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED NEW DRUG APPLICATION.

“(a) NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED APPLICATION.—Non-

prescription drugs marketed without an approved new drug application under section 505, as of the date of the enactment of the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2018, shall be treated in accordance with this subsection.

“(1) DRUGS SUBJECT TO A FINAL MONOGRAPH; CATEGORY 1 DRUGS SUBJECT TO A TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPH.—A drug is deemed to be generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), not a new drug under section 201(p), and not subject to section 503(b)(1), if—

“(A) the drug is—

“(i) in conformity with the requirements for nonprescription use of a final monograph issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (except as provided in paragraph (2)), the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and requirements under subsections (b), (c), and (k); and

“(ii) except as permitted by an order issued under subsection (b) or, in the case of a minor change in the drug, in conformity with an order issued under subsection (c), in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time within the meaning of section 201(p)(2); or

“(B) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category I for safety and effectiveness under a tentative final monograph that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with the proposed requirements for nonprescription use of such tentative final monograph, any applicable subsequent determination by the Secretary, the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and requirements under subsections (b), (c), and (k); and

“(iii) except as permitted by an order issued under subsection (b) or, in the case of a minor change in the drug, in conformity with an order issued under subsection (c), in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time within the meaning of section 201(p)(2).

“(2) TREATMENT OF SUNSCREEN DRUGS.—With respect to sunscreen drugs subject to this section, the applicable requirements shall be the requirements specified in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as published on May 21, 1999, beginning on page 27687 of volume 64 of the Federal Register, except that the applicable requirements governing effectiveness and labeling shall be those specified in section 201.327 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, subject to the requirements of subsections (b), (c), and (k).

“(3) CATEGORY III DRUGS SUBJECT TO A TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPH; CATEGORY I DRUGS SUBJECT TO PROPOSED MONOGRAPH OR ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—A drug that is not described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) is not required to be the subject of an application approved under section 505, and is not subject to section 503(b)(1), if—

“(A) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category III for safety or effectiveness in the preamble of a proposed rule establishing a tentative final monograph that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination for such drug issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with—

“(I) the conditions of use, including indication and dosage strength, if any, described for such category III drug in such preamble or in an applicable subsequent proposed rule;

“(II) the proposed requirements for drugs classified in such tentative final monograph in category I in the most recently proposed rule establishing requirements related to such tentative final monograph and in any final rule establishing requirements that are applicable to the drug; and

“(III) the general requirements for non-prescription drugs and requirements under subsections (b) or (k); and

“(iii) in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, was not required to have satisfied the requirements of section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect at that time), in order for such drug to be lawfully marketed without an application approved under section 505; or

“(B) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category I for safety and effectiveness under a proposed monograph or advance notice of proposed rulemaking that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination for such drug issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with the requirements for nonprescription use of such proposed monograph or advance notice of proposed rulemaking, any applicable subsequent determination by the Secretary, the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and requirements under subsections (b) or (k); and

“(iii) in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time within the meaning of section 201(p)(2).

“(4) CATEGORY II DRUGS DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—A drug that is classified in category II for safety or effectiveness under a tentative final monograph or that is subject to a determination to be not safe or effective in a proposed rule that is the most recently applicable proposal issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be a new drug within the meaning of section 201(p), misbranded under section 502(ee), and subject to the requirement for an approved new drug application under section 505 beginning on the day that is 180 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this section, unless, before such day, the Secretary determines that it is in the interest of public health to extend the period during which the drug may be marketed without such an approved new drug application.

“(5) DRUGS NOT GRASE DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—A drug that the Secretary has determined not to be generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1) under a final determination issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be a new drug within the meaning of section 201(p), misbranded under section 502(ee), and subject to the requirement for an approved new drug application under section 505.

“(6) OTHER DRUGS DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—Except as provided in subsection (m), a drug is deemed to be a new drug within the meaning of section 201(p) and misbranded under section 502(ee) if the drug—

“(A) is not subject to section 503(b)(1); and

“(B) is not described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5), or subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary may, on the initiative of the Secretary or at the request of one or more requestors, issue administrative orders determining whether there are conditions under which specific drugs, classes of such drugs, or combinations of such drugs are determined to be—

“(i) not subject to section 503(b)(1); and

“(ii) generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1).

“(B) EFFECT.—A drug or combination of drugs shall be deemed to not require approval under section 505 if such drug or combination of drugs—

“(i) is determined by the Secretary to meet the conditions specified in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A);

“(ii) is marketed in conformity with an administrative order under this subsection;

“(iii) meets the general requirements for non-prescription drugs; and

“(iv) meets the requirements under subsections (c) and (k).

“(C) STANDARD.—The Secretary shall find that a drug is not generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1) if—

“(i) the evidence shows that the drug is not generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1); or

“(ii) the evidence is inadequate to show that the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1).

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS INITIATED BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) upon the Secretary's initiative, the Secretary shall—

“(i) make reasonable efforts to notify informally, not later than 2 business days before the issuance of the proposed order, the sponsors of drugs who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for the drugs or combination of drugs that will be subject to the administrative order;

“(ii) after any such reasonable efforts of notification—

“(I) issue a proposed administrative order by publishing it on the website of the Food and Drug Administration and include in such order the reasons for the issuance of such order; and

“(II) publish a notice of availability of such proposed order in the Federal Register;

“(iii) except as provided in subparagraph (B), provide for a public comment period with respect to such proposed order of not less than 45 calendar days; and

“(iv) if, after completion of the proceedings specified in clauses (i) through (iii), the Secretary determines that it is appropriate to issue a final administrative order—

“(I) issue the final administrative order, together with a detailed statement of reasons, which order shall not take effect until the time for requesting judicial review under paragraph (3)(D)(ii) has expired;

“(II) publish a notice of such final administrative order in the Federal Register;

“(III) afford requestors of drugs that will be subject to such order the opportunity for formal dispute resolution up to the level of the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, which initially must be requested within 45 calendar days of the issuance of the order, and, for subsequent levels of appeal, within 30 calendar days of the prior decision; and

“(IV) except with respect to drugs described in paragraph (3)(B), upon completion of the formal dispute resolution procedure, inform the persons which sought such dispute resolution of their right to request a hearing.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—When issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) on the Secretary's initiative proposing to determine that a drug described in subsection (a)(3) is not generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), the Secretary shall follow the procedures in subparagraph (A), except that—

“(i) the proposed order shall include notice of—

“(I) the general categories of data the Secretary has determined necessary to establish that the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1); and

“(II) the format for submissions by interested persons;

“(ii) the Secretary shall provide for a public comment period of no less than 180 calendar days with respect to such proposed order, except when the Secretary determines, for good cause, that a shorter period is in the interests of public health; and

“(iii) any person who submits data in such comment period shall include a certification that the person has submitted all evidence created, obtained, or received by that person that is both within the categories of data identified in the proposed order and relevant to a determination as to whether the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1).

“(3) HEARINGS; JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Only a person who participated in each stage of formal dispute resolution under subclause (III) of paragraph (2)(A)(iv) of an administrative order with respect to a drug may request a hearing concerning a final administrative order issued under such paragraph with respect to such drug. Such person must submit a request for a hearing, which shall be based solely on information in the administrative record, to the Secretary not later than 30 calendar days after receiving notice of the final decision of the formal dispute resolution procedure.

“(B) NO HEARING REQUIRED WITH RESPECT TO ORDERS RELATING TO CERTAIN DRUGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not be required to provide notice and an opportunity for a hearing pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iv) if the final administrative order involved relates to a drug—

“(I) that is described in subsection (a)(3)(A); and

“(II) with respect to which no human or non-human data studies relevant to the safety or effectiveness of such drug have been submitted to the administrative record since the issuance of the most recent tentative final monograph relating to such drug.

“(ii) HUMAN DATA STUDIES AND NON-HUMAN DATA DEFINED.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) The term ‘human data studies’ means clinical trials of safety or effectiveness (including actual use studies), pharmacokinetics studies, or bioavailability studies.

“(II) The term ‘non-human data’ means data from testing other than with human subjects which provides information concerning safety or effectiveness.

“(C) HEARING PROCEDURES.—

“(i) DENIAL OF REQUEST FOR HEARING.—If the Secretary determines that information submitted in a request for a hearing under subparagraph (A) with respect to a final administrative order issued under paragraph (2)(A)(iv), does not identify the existence of a genuine and substantial question of material fact, the Secretary may deny such request. In making such a determination, the Secretary may consider only information and data that are based on relevant and reliable scientific principles and methodologies.

“(ii) SINGLE HEARING FOR MULTIPLE RELATED REQUESTS.—If more than one request for a hearing is submitted with respect to the same administrative order under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may direct that a single hearing be conducted in which all persons whose hearing requests were granted may participate.

“(iii) PRESIDING OFFICER.—The presiding officer of a hearing requested under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(I) be designated by the Secretary;

“(II) not be an employee of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research; and

“(III) not have been previously involved in the development of the administrative order involved or proceedings relating to that administrative order.

“(iv) RIGHTS OF PARTIES TO HEARING.—The parties to a hearing requested under subparagraph (A) shall have the right to present testimony, including testimony of expert witnesses, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by other parties. Where appropriate, the presiding officer may require that cross-examination by parties representing substantially the same interests be consolidated to promote efficiency and avoid duplication.

“(v) FINAL DECISION.—

“(I) At the conclusion of a hearing requested under subparagraph (A), the presiding officer of the hearing shall issue a decision containing findings of fact and conclusions of law. The decision of the presiding officer shall be final.

“(II) The final decision may not take effect until the period under subparagraph (D)(ii) for submitting a request for judicial review of such decision expires.

“(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The procedures described in section 505(h) shall apply with respect to judicial review of final administrative orders issued under this subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applies to an order described in such section except that the judicial review shall be taken by filing in an appropriate district court of the United States in lieu of the appellate courts specified in such section.

“(ii) PERIOD TO SUBMIT A REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person eligible to request a hearing under this paragraph and seeking judicial review of a final administrative order issued under this subsection shall file such request for judicial review not later than 60 calendar days after the latest of—

“(I) the date on which notice of such order is published;

“(II) the date on which a hearing with respect to such order is denied under subparagraph (B) or (C)(i);

“(III) the date on which a final decision is made following a hearing under subparagraph (C)(v); or

“(IV) if no hearing is requested, the date on which the time for requesting a hearing expires.

“(4) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS INITIATED BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) IMMINENT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a determination by the Secretary that a drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs subject to this section poses an imminent hazard to the public health, the Secretary, after first making reasonable efforts to notify, not later than 48 hours before issuance of such order under this subparagraph, sponsors who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for such drug or combination of drugs—

“(I) may issue an interim final administrative order for such drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs under paragraph (1), together with a detailed statement of the reasons for such order;

“(II) shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of availability of any such order; and

“(III) shall provide for a public comment period of at least 45 calendar days with respect to such interim final order.

“(ii) NONDELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the authority to issue an interim final administrative order under this subparagraph.

“(B) SAFETY LABELING CHANGES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a determination by the Secretary that a change in the labeling of a drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs subject to this section is reasonably expected to mitigate a significant or unreasonable risk of a serious adverse event associated with use of the drug, the Secretary may—

“(I) make reasonable efforts to notify informally, not later than 48 hours before the issuance of the interim final order, the sponsors of drugs who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for such drug or combination of drugs;

“(II) after reasonable efforts of notification, issue an interim final administrative order in accordance with paragraph (1) to require such change, together with a detailed statement of the reasons for such order;

“(III) publish in the Federal Register a notice of availability of such order; and

“(IV) provide for a public comment period of at least 45 calendar days with respect to such interim final order.

“(ii) CONTENT OF ORDER.—An interim final order issued under this subparagraph with respect to the labeling of a drug may provide for new warnings and other information required for safe use of the drug.

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—An order under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall take effect on a date specified by the Secretary.

“(D) FINAL ORDER.—After the completion of the proceedings in subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue a final order in accordance with paragraph (1);

“(ii) publish a notice of availability of such final administrative order in the Federal Register; and

“(iii) afford sponsors of such drugs that will be subject to such an order the opportunity for formal dispute resolution up to the level of the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, which must initially be within 45 calendar days of the issuance of the order, and for subsequent levels of appeal, within 30 calendar days of the prior decision.

“(E) HEARINGS.—A sponsor of a drug subject to a final order issued under subparagraph (D) and that participated in each stage of formal dispute resolution under clause (iii) of such subparagraph may request a hearing on such order. The provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (3), other than paragraph (3)(C)(v)(II), shall apply with respect to a hearing on such order in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply with respect to a hearing on an administrative order issued under paragraph (2)(A)(iv).

“(F) TIMING.—

“(i) FINAL ORDER AND HEARING.—The Secretary shall—

“(I) not later than 6 months after the date on which the comment period closes under subparagraph (A) or (B), issue a final order in accordance with paragraph (1); and

“(II) not later than 12 months after the date on which such final order is issued, complete any hearing under subparagraph (E).

“(ii) DISPUTE RESOLUTION REQUEST.—The Secretary shall specify in an interim final order issued under subparagraph (A) or (B) such shorter periods for requesting dispute resolution under subparagraph (D)(iii) as are necessary to meet the requirements of this subparagraph.

“(G) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A final order issued pursuant to subparagraph (F) shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with paragraph (3)(D).

“(5) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER INITIATED AT THE REQUEST OF A REQUESTOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) at the request of a requestor with respect to certain drugs, classes of drugs, or combinations of drugs—

“(i) the Secretary shall, after receiving a request under this subparagraph, determine whether the request is sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review;

“(ii) if the Secretary determines that the request is sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review, the Secretary shall—

“(I) file the request; and

“(II) initiate proceedings with respect to issuing an administrative order in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3); and

“(iii) except as provided in paragraph (6), if the Secretary determines that a request does not meet the requirements for filing or is not sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review, the requestor may demand that the request be filed over protest, and the Secretary shall initiate proceedings to review the request in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) REQUEST TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A requestor seeking an administrative order under paragraph (1) with respect to certain drugs, classes of drugs, or combinations of drugs, shall submit to the Secretary a request to initiate proceedings for such order in the form and manner as specified by the Secretary. Such requestor may submit a request under this subparagraph for the issuance of an administrative order—

“(I) determining whether a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), exempt from section 503(b)(1), and not required to be the subject of an approved application under section 505; or

“(II) determining whether a change to a condition of use of a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), exempt from section 503(b)(1), and not required to be the subject of an approved application under section 505, if, absent such a changed condition of use, such drug is—

“(aa) generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1) in accordance with subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or an order under this subsection; or

“(bb) subject to subsection (a)(3), but only if such requestor initiates such request in conjunction with a request for the Secretary to determine whether such drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), which is filed by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to complete review of a request for a change described in clause (i)(II) if the Secretary determines that there is an inadequate basis to find the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1) under paragraph (1) and issues a final order announcing that determination.

“(iii) WITHDRAWAL.—The requestor may withdraw a request under this paragraph, according to the procedures set forth pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(B). Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if such request is withdrawn, the Secretary may cease proceedings under this subparagraph.

“(C) EXCLUSIVITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A final administrative order issued in response to a request under this section shall have the effect of authorizing solely the order requestor (or the licensees, assignees, or successors in interest of such requestor with respect to the subject of such order), for a period of 18 months following the effective date of such final order, to market drugs—

“(I) incorporating changes described in clause (ii);

“(II) beginning on the date the requestor (or any such licensees, assignees, or successors in interest) may lawfully market such drugs pursuant to the order; and

“(III) subject to the limitations under clause (iv).

“(ii) CHANGES DESCRIBED.—A change described in this clause is a change subject to an order specified in clause (i), which—

“(I) provides for a drug to contain an active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient) not previously incorporated in a drug described in clause (iii); or

“(II) provides for a change in the conditions of use of a drug, for which new human data studies conducted or sponsored by the requestor (or for which the requestor has an exclusive right of reference) were essential to the issuance of such order.

“(iii) DRUGS DESCRIBED.—The drugs described in this clause are drugs—

“(I) specified in subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3);

“(II) subject to a final order issued under this section;

“(III) subject to a final sunscreen order (as defined in section 586(2)(A)); or

“(IV) described in subsection (m)(1), other than drugs subject to an active enforcement action under chapter III of this Act.

“(iv) LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVITY.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Only one period of exclusivity shall be granted, under each order described in clause (i), with respect to changes (to the drug subject to such order) which are either—

“(aa) changes described in clause (ii)(I), relating to active ingredients; or

“(bb) changes described in clause (ii)(II), relating to conditions of use.

“(II) NO EXCLUSIVITY ALLOWED.—No exclusivity shall apply to changes to a drug which are—

“(aa) the subject of a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request (as defined in section 744N);

“(bb) safety-related changes, as defined by the Secretary, or any other changes the Secretary considers necessary to assure safe use; or

“(cc) changes related to methods of testing safety or efficacy.

“(v) NEW HUMAN DATA STUDIES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘new human data studies’ means clinical trials of safety or effectiveness (including actual use studies), pharmacokinetics studies, or bioavailability studies, the results of which—

“(I) have not been relied on by the Secretary to support—

“(aa) a proposed or final determination that a drug described in subclauses (I), (II), or (III) of clause (iii) is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1); or

“(bb) approval of a drug that was approved under section 505; and

“(II) do not duplicate the results of another study that was relied on by the Secretary to support—

“(aa) a proposed or final determination that a drug described in subclauses (I), (II), or (III) of clause (iii) is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1); or

“(bb) approval of a drug that was approved under section 505.

“(vi) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A final order subject to clause (i) shall take effect on the date when the order requestor (or the licensees, assignees, or successors in interest of such requestor with respect to such order) submits updated drug listing information under subsection (e) with respect to the change which is permitted under such order.

“(vii) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Over-the-Counter Monograph, Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2018, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a study to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate addressing the effectiveness and overall impact of exclusivity under this section, including its impact on consumer access. Such study shall include—

“(I) the number of nonprescription drug products that were granted exclusivity and the indication for which the nonprescription drug products were determined to be generally recognized as safe and effective;

“(II) whether the exclusivity for such drug products was granted for—

“(aa) a new active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient); or

“(bb) changes in the conditions of use of a drug, for which new human data studies conducted or sponsored by the requestor were essential;

“(III) whether, and to what extent, the exclusivity impacted the requestor’s or sponsor’s decision to develop the drug product;

“(IV) an analysis of the implementation of the exclusivity provision in this subparagraph, including—

“(aa) the resources used by the Food and Drug Administration;

“(bb) the impact of such provision on innovation, as well as research and development in the nonprescription drug market;

“(cc) the impact of such provision on competition in the nonprescription drug market;

“(dd) the impact of such provision on consumer access to nonprescription drug products;

“(ee) the impact of such provision on the prices of nonprescription drug products; and

“(ff) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under this section have been sufficient to encourage the development of nonprescription drug products that would likely not be otherwise developed, or developed in as timely a manner; and

“(V) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under this section have been

sufficient incentive to encourage innovation in the nonprescription drug market.

“(6) INFORMATION REGARDING SAFE NON-PRESCRIPTION MARKETING AND USE AS CONDITION FOR FILING A GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE AND EFFECTIVE REQUEST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In response to a request under this section that a drug described in subparagraph (B) be generally recognized as safe and effective, the Secretary—

“(i) may file such request, if the request includes information specified under subparagraph (C) with respect to safe nonprescription marketing and use of such drug; or

“(ii) if the request fails to include information specified under subparagraph (C), shall refuse to file such request and require that nonprescription marketing of the drug be pursuant to a new drug application as described in subparagraph (D).

“(B) DRUG DESCRIBED.—A drug described in this subparagraph is a nonprescription drug which contains an active ingredient not previously incorporated in a drug—

“(i) specified in subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3);

“(ii) subject to a final order under this section; or

“(iii) subject to a final sunscreen order (as defined in section 586(2)(A)).

“(C) INFORMATION DEMONSTRATING PRIMA FACIE SAFE NONPRESCRIPTION MARKETING AND USE.—Information specified in this subparagraph, with respect to a request described in subparagraph (A)(i), is—

“(i) information sufficient for a prima facie demonstration that the drug subject to such request has a verifiable history of being marketed and safely used by consumers in the United States as a nonprescription drug under comparable conditions of use;

“(ii) if the drug has not been previously marketed in the United States as a nonprescription drug, information sufficient for a prima facie demonstration that the drug was marketed and safely used under comparable conditions of marketing and use in a country listed in section 802(b)(1)(A) or designated by the Secretary in accordance with section 802(b)(1)(B)—

“(I) for such period of time as needed to provide reasonable assurances concerning the safe nonprescription use of the drug; and

“(II) during such time was subject to sufficient monitoring by a regulatory body considered acceptable by the Secretary for such monitoring purposes, including for adverse events associated with nonprescription use of the drug; or

“(iii) if the Secretary determines that information described in clauses (i) or (ii) is not needed to provide a prima facie demonstration that the drug can be safely marketed and used as a nonprescription drug, such other information the Secretary determines is sufficient for such purposes.

“(D) MARKETING PURSUANT TO NEW DRUG APPLICATION.—In the case of a request described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the drug subject to such request may be re-submitted for filing only if—

“(i) the drug is marketed as a nonprescription drug, under conditions of use comparable to the conditions specified in the request, for such period of time as the Secretary determines appropriate (not to exceed five consecutive years) pursuant to an application approved under section 505; and

“(ii) during such time period, one million retail packages of the drug, or an equivalent quantity as determined by the Secretary, were distributed for retail sale, as determined in such manner as the Secretary finds appropriate.

“(E) RULE OF APPLICATION.—Except in the case of a request involving a drug described in section 586(9), as in effect on January 1, 2017, if the Secretary refuses to file a request under this paragraph, the requestor may not file such request over protest under paragraph (5)(A)(iii).

“(7) PACKAGING.—An administrative order issued under paragraph (2), (4)(A), or (5) may

include requirements for the packaging of a drug to encourage use in accordance with labeling. Such requirements may include unit dose packaging, requirements for products intended for use by children, requirements to reduce risk of harm from unsupervised ingestion, and other appropriate requirements. This paragraph does not authorize the Food and Drug Administration to require standards or testing procedures as described in part 1700 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(8) FINAL AND TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPHS FOR CATEGORY I DRUGS DEEMED FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A final monograph or tentative final monograph described in subparagraph (B) shall be deemed to be a final administrative order under this subsection and may be amended, revoked, or otherwise modified in accordance with the procedures of this subsection.

“(B) MONOGRAPHS DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a final monograph or tentative final monograph is described in this subparagraph if it—

“(i) establishes conditions of use for a drug described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a); and

“(ii) represents the most recently promulgated version of such conditions, including as modified, in whole or in part, by any proposed or final rule.

“(C) DEEMED ORDERS INCLUDE HARMONIZING TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The deemed establishment of a final administrative order under subparagraph (A) shall be construed to include any technical amendments to such order as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that such order is appropriately harmonized, in terms of terminology or cross-references, with the applicable provisions of this Act (and regulations thereunder) and any other orders issued under this section.

“(c) PROCEDURE FOR MINOR CHANGES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Minor changes in the dosage form of a drug that is described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) or the subject of an order issued under subsection (b) may be made by a requestor without the issuance of an order under subsection (b) if—

“(A) the requestor maintains such information as is necessary to demonstrate that the change—

“(i) will not affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug; and

“(ii) will not materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient in comparison to a suitable reference product; and

“(B) the change is in conformity with the requirements of an applicable administrative order issued by the Secretary under paragraph (3).

“(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

“(A) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—A sponsor shall submit records requested by the Secretary relating to such a minor change under section 704(a)(4), within 15 business days of receiving such a request, or such longer period as the Secretary may provide.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the Secretary determines that the information contained in such records is not sufficient to demonstrate that the change does not affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug or materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient, the Secretary—

“(i) may so inform the sponsor of the drug in writing; and

“(ii) provide the sponsor of the drug with a reasonable opportunity to provide additional information.

“(C) FAILURE TO SUBMIT SUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the sponsor fails to provide such additional information within the prescribed time, or if the Secretary determines that such additional information does not demonstrate that the change does not affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug or materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient, the drug as modified is a new drug

within the meaning of section 201(p) and shall be deemed to be misbranded under section 502(ee).

“(3) DETERMINING WHETHER A CHANGE WILL AFFECT SAFETY OR EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue one or more administrative orders specifying requirements for determining whether a minor change made by a sponsor pursuant to this subsection will affect the safety or effectiveness of a drug or materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to an active ingredient in the drug in comparison to a suitable reference product, together with guidance for applying those orders to specific dosage forms.

“(B) STANDARD PRACTICES.—The orders and guidance issued by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall take into account relevant public standards and standard practices for evaluating the quality of drugs, and may take into account the special needs of populations, including children.

“(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), any information, including reports of testing conducted on the drug or drugs involved, that is submitted by a requestor in connection with proceedings on an order under this section (including any minor change under subsection (c)) and is a trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, or section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, shall not be disclosed to the public unless the requestor consents to that disclosure.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make any information submitted by a requestor in support of a request under subsection (b)(5)(A) available to the public not later than the date on which the proposed order is issued; and

“(ii) make any information submitted by any other person with respect to an order requested (or initiated by the Secretary) under subsection (b), available to the public upon such submission.

“(B) LIMITATIONS ON PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Information described in subparagraph (A) shall not be made public if—

“(i) the information pertains to pharmaceutical quality information, unless such information is necessary to establish standards under which a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1);

“(ii) the information is submitted in a requestor-initiated request, but the requestor withdraws such request, in accordance with withdrawal procedures established by the Secretary, before the Secretary issues the proposed order;

“(iii) the Secretary requests and obtains the information under subsection (c) and such information is not submitted in relation to an order under subsection (b); or

“(iv) the information is of the type contained in raw datasets.

“(e) UPDATES TO DRUG LISTING INFORMATION.—A sponsor who makes a change to a drug subject to this section shall submit updated drug listing information for the drug in accordance with section 510(j) within 30 calendar days of the date when the drug is first commercially marketed, except that a sponsor who was the order requestor with respect to an order subject to subsection (b)(5)(C) (or a licensee, assignee, or successor in interest of such requestor) shall submit updated drug listing information on or before the date when the drug is first commercially marketed.

“(f) APPROVALS UNDER SECTION 505.—The provisions of this section shall not be construed to preclude a person from seeking or maintaining the approval of a drug under sections 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), and 505(j). A determination under this section that a drug is not subject to section 503(b)(1), is generally recognized as safe

and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), and is not a new drug under section 201(p) shall constitute a finding that the drug is safe and effective that may be relied upon for purposes of an application under section 505(b)(2), so that the applicant shall be required to submit for purposes of such application only information needed to support any modification of the drug that is not covered by such determination under this section.

“(g) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—The Secretary shall establish, maintain, update (as determined necessary by the Secretary but no less frequently than annually), and make publicly available, with respect to orders issued under this section—

“(1) a repository of each final order and interim final order in effect, including the complete text of the order; and

“(2) a listing of all orders proposed and under development under subsection (b)(2), including—

“(A) a brief description of each such order; and

“(B) the Secretary's expectations, if resources permit, for issuance of proposed orders over a three-year period.

“(h) DEVELOPMENT ADVICE TO SPONSORS OR REQUESTORS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures under which sponsors or requestors may meet with appropriate officials of the Food and Drug Administration to obtain advice on the studies and other information necessary to support submissions under this section and other matters relevant to the regulation of nonprescription drugs and the development of new nonprescription drugs under this section.

“(i) PARTICIPATION OF MULTIPLE SPONSORS OR REQUESTORS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to facilitate efficient participation by multiple sponsors or requestors in proceedings under this section, including provision for joint meetings with multiple sponsors or requestors or with organizations nominated by sponsors or requestors to represent their interests in a proceeding.

“(j) ELECTRONIC FORMAT.—All submissions under this section shall be in electronic format.

“(k) EFFECT ON EXISTING REGULATIONS GOVERNING NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—

“(1) REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY TO NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Except as provided in this subsection, nothing in this section supersedes regulations establishing general requirements for nonprescription drugs, including regulations of general applicability contained in parts 201, 250, and 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulations. The Secretary shall establish or modify such regulations by means of rulemaking in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) REGULATIONS ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIFIC NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—

“(A) The provisions of section 310.545 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section, shall be deemed to be a final order under subsection (b).

“(B) Regulations in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section, establishing requirements for specific nonprescription drugs marketed pursuant to this section (including such requirements in parts 201 and 250 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations), shall be deemed to be final orders under subsection (b), only as they apply to drugs—

“(i) subject to paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a); or

“(ii) otherwise subject to an order under this section.

“(3) WITHDRAWAL OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall withdraw regulations establishing final monographs and the procedures governing the over-the-counter drug review under part 330 and other relevant parts of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section), or

make technical changes to such regulations to ensure conformity with appropriate terminology and cross references. Notwithstanding subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, any such withdrawal or technical changes shall be made without public notice and comment and shall be effective upon publication through notice in the Federal Register (or upon such date as specified in such notice).

“(l) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance that specifies—

“(1) the procedures and principles for formal meetings between the Secretary and sponsors or requestors for drugs subject to this section;

“(2) the format and content of data submissions to the Secretary under this section;

“(3) the format of electronic submissions to the Secretary under this section;

“(4) consolidated proceedings and the procedures for such proceedings where appropriate; and

“(5) for minor changes in drugs, recommendations on how to comply with the requirements in orders issued under subsection (c)(3).

“(m) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not affect the treatment or status of a nonprescription drug—

“(A) that is marketed without an application approved under section 505 as of the date of the enactment of this section;

“(B) that is not subject to an order issued under this section; and

“(C) to which paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (a) do not apply.

“(2) TREATMENT OF PRODUCTS PREVIOUSLY FOUND TO BE SUBJECT TO TIME AND EXTENT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a drug described in subparagraph (B) may only be lawfully marketed, without an application approved under section 505, pursuant to an order issued under this section.

“(B) A drug described in this subparagraph is a drug which, prior to the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary had determined in a proposed or final rule to be ineligible for review under the OTC drug review (as such phrase ‘OTC drug review’ was used in section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section).

“(3) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—

“(A) Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to preclude or limit the applicability of any other provision of this Act.

“(B) Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from issuing an order under this section finding a drug to be not generally recognized as safe and effective within the meaning of section 201(p)(1), as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(n) INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS.—A drug is not subject to this section if an exemption for investigational use under section 505(i) is in effect for such drug.

“(o) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to collections of information made under this section.

“(p) INAPPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT RULEMAKING AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to orders issued under this section instead of the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(q) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘nonprescription drug’ refers to a drug not subject to the requirements of section 503(b)(1).

“(2) The term ‘sponsor’ refers to any person marketing, manufacturing, or processing a drug that—

“(A) is listed pursuant to section 510(j); and

“(B) is or will be subject to an administrative order of the Food and Drug Administration.

“(3) The term ‘requestor’ refers to any person or group of persons marketing, manufacturing, processing, or developing a drug.”

SEC. 102. MISBRANDING.

Section 502 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(ee) If it is a nonprescription drug that is subject to section 505G, is not the subject of an application approved under section 505, and does not comply with the requirements under section 505G.

“(ff) If it is a drug and it was manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed in a facility for which fees have not been paid as required by section 744O.”.

SEC. 103. DRUGS EXCLUDED FROM THE OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUG REVIEW.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Nothing in this Act (or the amendments made by this Act) shall apply to any nonprescription drug which was excluded by the Food and Drug Administration from the Over-the-Counter Drug Review in accordance with the statement set out at page 9466 of volume 37 of the Federal Register, published on May 11, 1972.

(b) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.*—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude or limit the applicability of any other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

SEC. 104. TREATMENT OF SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT.

(a) *REVIEW OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.*—

(1) *APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 505G FOR PENDING SUBMISSIONS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—A sponsor of a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a proposed sunscreen order under section 586C of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3) may elect, by means of giving written notification to the Secretary of Health and Human Services within 180 calendar days of the enactment of this Act, to transition into the review of such ingredient or combination of ingredients pursuant to the process set out in section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act.

(B) *ELECTION EXERCISED.*—Upon receipt by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of a timely notification under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the proposed sunscreen order involved is deemed to be a request for an order under subsection (b) of section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act; and

(ii) such order is deemed to have been accepted for filing under subsection (b)(6)(A)(i) of such section 505G.

(C) *ELECTION NOT EXERCISED.*—A sponsor of a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients described in subparagraph (A) that does not elect for such ingredient or combination of ingredients to be reviewed under section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act, shall continue to have such ingredient or combination of ingredients reviewed in accordance with section 586C of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3) and may not subsequently elect to transition into the review of such ingredient or combination of ingredients pursuant to the process set out in section 505G of such Act, as added by section 101 of this Act.

(2) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this subsection, the terms “sponsor”, “nonprescription”, “sunscreen active ingredient”, and “proposed sunscreen order” have the meanings given to those terms in section 586 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff).

(b) *AMENDMENTS TO SUNSCREEN PROVISIONS.*—

(1) *FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDERS.*—Paragraph (3) of section 586C(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) *RELATIONSHIP TO ORDERS UNDER SECTION 505G.*—A final sunscreen order shall be deemed to be a final order under section 505G.”.

(2) *MEETINGS.*—Paragraph (7) of section 586C(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “A sponsor may request” and inserting the following:

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—A sponsor may request”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) *CONFIDENTIAL MEETINGS.*—A sponsor may request one or more confidential meetings with respect to a proposed sunscreen order, including a letter deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), to discuss matters involving confidential commercial information or trade secrets. The Secretary shall convene a confidential meeting with such sponsor in a reasonable time period. If a sponsor requests more than one confidential meeting for the same proposed sunscreen order, the Secretary may refuse to grant an additional confidential meeting request if the Secretary determines that such additional confidential meeting is not reasonably necessary for the sponsor to advance its proposed sunscreen order, or if the request for a confidential meeting fails to include sufficient information upon which to base a substantive discussion. The Secretary shall publish a post-meeting summary of each confidential meeting under this subparagraph that does not disclose confidential commercial information or trade secrets.”.

(3) *SUNSET PROVISION.*—Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 586H. SUNSET.

“This subchapter shall cease to be effective at the end of fiscal year 2022.”.

(4) *TREATMENT OF FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.*—The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by striking section 586E of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-5).

(c) *TREATMENT OF NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Any application described in section 586F of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-6) that was submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as such provisions were in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment date of this Act, shall be extinguished as of such date of enactment, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) *ORDER REQUEST.*—Nothing in paragraph (1) precludes the submission of an order request under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act, with respect to a drug that was the subject of an application extinguished under paragraph (1).

SEC. 105. ANNUAL UPDATE TO CONGRESS ON APPROPRIATE PEDIATRIC INDICATION FOR CERTAIN OTC COUGH AND COLD DRUGS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, beginning not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, annually submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a letter describing the progress of the Food and Drug Administration—

(1) in evaluating the cough and cold monograph described in subsection (b) with respect to children under age 6; and

(2) as appropriate, revising such cough and cold monograph to address such children through the order process under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act.

(b) *COUGH AND COLD MONOGRAPH DESCRIBED.*—The cough and cold monograph described in this subsection consists of the condi-

tions under which nonprescription drugs containing antitussive, expectorant, nasal decongestant, or antihistamine active ingredients (or combinations thereof) are generally recognized as safe and effective, as specified in part 341 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act), and included in an order deemed to be established under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of this Act.

(c) *DURATION OF AUTHORITY.*—The requirement under subsection (a) shall terminate as of the date of a letter submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to such subsection in which the Secretary indicates that the Food and Drug Administration has completed its evaluation and revised, in a final order, as applicable, the cough and cold monograph as described in subsection (a)(2).

TITLE II—USER FEES**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.**

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This title may be cited as the “Over-the-Counter Monograph User Fee Act of 2018”.

(b) *FINDING.*—The Congress finds that the fees authorized by the amendments made in this title will be dedicated to OTC monograph drug activities, as set forth in the goals identified for purposes of part 10 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 202. FEES RELATING TO OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS.

Subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.) is amended by inserting after part 9 the following:

“PART 10—FEES RELATING TO OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS**“SEC. 744N. DEFINITIONS.**

“In this part:

“(1) The term ‘affiliate’ means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity if, directly or indirectly—

“(A) one business entity controls, or has the power to control, the other business entity; or

“(B) a third party controls, or has power to control, both of the business entities.

“(2) The term ‘contract manufacturing organization facility’ means an OTC monograph drug facility where neither the owner of such manufacturing facility nor any affiliate of such owner or facility sells the OTC monograph drug produced at such facility directly to wholesalers, retailers, or consumers in the United States.

“(3) The term ‘costs of resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities’ means the expenses in connection with OTC monograph drug activities for—

“(A) officers and employees of the Food and Drug Administration, contractors of the Food and Drug Administration, advisory committees, and costs related to such officers, employees, and committees and costs related to contracts with such contractors;

“(B) management of information, and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of computer resources;

“(C) leasing, maintenance, renovation, and repair of facilities and acquisition, maintenance, and repair of fixtures, furniture, scientific equipment, and other necessary materials and supplies; and

“(D) collecting fees under section 744O and accounting for resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities.

“(4) The term ‘FDA establishment identifier’ is the unique number automatically generated by

Food and Drug Administration's Field Accomplishments and Compliance Tracking System (FACTS) (or any successor system).

“(5) The term ‘OTC monograph drug’ means a nonprescription drug without an approved new drug application which is governed by the provisions of section 505G.

“(6) The term ‘OTC monograph drug activities’ means activities of the Secretary associated with OTC monograph drugs and inspection of facilities associated with such products, including the following activities:

“(A) The activities necessary for review and evaluation of OTC monographs and OTC monograph order requests, including—

“(i) orders proposing or finalizing applicable conditions of use for OTC monograph drugs;

“(ii) orders affecting status regarding general recognition of safety and effectiveness of an OTC monograph ingredient or combination of ingredients under specified conditions of use;

“(iii) all OTC monograph drug development and review activities, including intraagency collaboration;

“(iv) regulation and policy development activities related to OTC monograph drugs;

“(v) development of product standards for products subject to review and evaluation;

“(vi) meetings referred to in section 505G(i);

“(vii) review of labeling prior to issuance of orders related to OTC monograph drugs or conditions of use; and

“(viii) regulatory science activities related to OTC monograph drugs.

“(B) Inspections related to OTC monograph drugs.

“(C) Monitoring of clinical and other research conducted in connection with OTC monograph drugs.

“(D) Safety activities with respect to OTC monograph drugs, including—

“(i) collecting, developing, and reviewing safety information on OTC monograph drugs, including adverse event reports;

“(ii) developing and using improved adverse event data-collection systems, including information technology systems; and

“(iii) developing and using improved analytical tools to assess potential safety risks, including access to external databases.

“(E) Other activities necessary for implementation of section 505G.

“(7) The term ‘OTC monograph order request’ means a request for an order submitted under section 505G(b)(5).

“(8) The term ‘Tier 1 OTC monograph order request’ means any OTC monograph order request not determined to be a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request.

“(9)(A) The term ‘Tier 2 OTC monograph order request’ means, subject to subparagraph (B), an OTC monograph order request for—

“(i) the reordering of existing information in the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug;

“(ii) the addition of information to the other information section of the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug, as limited by section 201.66(c)(7) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(iii) modification to the directions for use section of the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug, if such changes conform to changes made pursuant to section 505G(c)(3)(A);

“(iv) the standardization of the concentration or dose of a specific finalized ingredient within a particular finalized monograph;

“(v) a change to ingredient nomenclature to align with nomenclature of a standards-setting organization; or

“(vi) addition of an interchangeable term in accordance with section 330.1 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(B) The Secretary may, based on program implementation experience or other factors found appropriate by the Secretary, characterize any OTC monograph order request as a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request (including

recharacterizing a request from Tier 1 to Tier 2) and publish such determination in a proposed order issued pursuant to section 505G.

“(10)(A) The term ‘OTC monograph drug facility’ means a foreign or domestic business or other entity that—

“(i) is—

“(I) under one management, either direct or indirect; and

“(II) at one geographic location or address engaged in manufacturing or processing the finished dosage form of an OTC monograph drug;

“(ii) includes a finished dosage form manufacturer facility in a contractual relationship with the sponsor of one or more OTC monograph drugs to manufacture or process such drugs; and

“(iii) does not include a business or other entity whose only manufacturing or processing activities are one or more of the following: production of clinical research supplies, or testing.

“(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(II), separate buildings or locations within close proximity are considered to be at one geographic location or address if the activities conducted in such buildings or locations are—

“(i) closely related to the same business enterprise;

“(ii) under the supervision of the same local management; and

“(iii) under a single FDA establishment identifier and capable of being inspected by the Food and Drug Administration during a single inspection.

“(C) If a business or other entity would meet criteria specified in subparagraph (A), but for being under multiple management, the business or other entity is deemed to constitute multiple facilities, one per management entity, for purposes of this paragraph.

“(11) The term ‘OTC monograph drug meeting’ means any meeting regarding the content of a proposed OTC monograph order request.

“(12) The term ‘person’ includes an affiliate of a person.

“(13) The terms ‘requestor’ and ‘sponsor’ have the meanings given such terms in section 505G.

“SEC. 744O. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE OTC MONOGRAPH FEES.

“(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall assess and collect fees in accordance with this section as follows:

“(1) FACILITY FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that owns a facility identified as an OTC monograph drug facility on December 31 of the fiscal year or at any time during the preceding 12-month period shall be assessed an annual fee for each such facility as determined under subsection (c).

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) A fee shall not be assessed under subparagraph (A) if the identified OTC monograph drug facility has ceased all activities related to OTC monograph drugs prior to the date specified in subparagraph (D)(ii) and has updated its registration to reflect such change under the requirements for drug establishment registration set forth in section 510.

“(ii) The amount of the fee for a contract manufacturing organization facility shall be equal to $\frac{2}{3}$ the amount of the fee for an OTC monograph drug facility that is not a contract manufacturing organization facility.

“(C) AMOUNT.—The amount of fees established under subparagraph (A) shall be established under subsection (c).

“(D) DUE DATE.—

“(i) FOR FIRST PROGRAM YEAR.—For fiscal year 2019, the facility fees required under subparagraph (A) shall be due 45 calendar days after publication of the Federal Register notice provided for under subsection (c)(4)(A).

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For each fiscal year after fiscal year 2019, the facility fees required under subparagraph (A) shall be due on the later of—

“(I) the first business day of June of such year; or

“(II) the first business day after the enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees under this section for such year.

“(2) OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that submits an OTC monograph order request shall be subject to a fee for an OTC monograph order request. The amount of such fee shall be—

“(i) for a Tier 1 OTC monograph order request, \$500,000, adjusted for inflation for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1)(B)); and

“(ii) for a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request, \$100,000 adjusted for inflation for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1)(B)).

“(B) DUE DATE.—The OTC monograph order request fees required under subparagraph (A) shall be due on the date of submission of the OTC monograph order request.

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN SAFETY CHANGES.—A person who is named as the requestor in an OTC monograph order shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary finds that the OTC monograph order request seeks to change the drug facts labeling of an OTC monograph drug in a way that would add to or strengthen—

“(i) a contraindication, warning, or precaution;

“(ii) a statement about risk associated with misuse or abuse; or

“(iii) an instruction about dosage and administration that is intended to increase the safe use of the OTC monograph drug.

“(D) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST IS RE-CATEGORIZED AS A TIER 2 OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST.—If the Secretary determines that an OTC monograph request initially characterized as Tier 1 shall be re-characterized as a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request, and the requestor has paid a Tier 1 fee in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall refund the requestor the difference between the Tier 1 and Tier 2 fees determined under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (A)(ii), respectively.

“(E) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST REFUSED FOR FILING OR WITHDRAWN BEFORE FILING.—The Secretary shall refund 75 percent of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) for any order request which is refused for filing or was withdrawn before being accepted or refused for filing.

“(F) FEES FOR ORDER REQUESTS PREVIOUSLY REFUSED FOR FILING OR WITHDRAWN BEFORE FILING.—An OTC monograph order request that was submitted but was refused for filing, or was withdrawn before being accepted or refused for filing, shall be subject to the full fee under subparagraph (A) upon being resubmitted or filed over protest.

“(G) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST WITHDRAWN.—If an order request is withdrawn after the order request was filed, the Secretary may refund the fee or a portion of the fee if no substantial work was performed on the order request after the application was filed. The Secretary shall have the sole discretion to refund a fee or a portion of the fee under this subparagraph. A determination by the Secretary concerning a refund under this subparagraph shall not be reviewable.

“(3) REFUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Other than refunds provided in subparagraphs (D) through (G) of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall not refund any fee paid under paragraph (1) except as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) DISPUTES CONCERNING FEES.—To qualify for the return of a fee claimed to have been paid in error under paragraph (1) or (2), a person shall submit to the Secretary a written request justifying such return within 180 calendar days after such fee was paid.

“(4) NOTICE.—Within the timeframe specified in subsection (c), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the amount of the fees under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year.

“(b) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—

“(1) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—For fiscal year 2019, fees under subsection (a)(1) shall be established to generate a total facility fee revenue amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the annual base revenue for fiscal year 2019 (as determined under paragraph (3);

“(B) the dollar amount equal to the operating reserve adjustment for the fiscal year, if applicable (as determined under subsection (c)(2)); and

“(C) additional direct cost adjustments (as determined under subsection (c)(3)).

“(2) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2023, fees under subsection (a)(1) shall be established to generate a total facility fee revenue amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the annual base revenue for the fiscal year (as determined under paragraph (3));

“(B) the dollar amount equal to the inflation adjustment for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1));

“(C) the dollar amount equal to the operating reserve adjustment for the fiscal year, if applicable (as determined under subsection (c)(2));

“(D) additional direct cost adjustments (as determined under subsection (c)(3)); and

“(E) additional dollar amounts for each fiscal year as follows:

“(i) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.

“(ii) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.

“(iii) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.

“(iv) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

“(3) ANNUAL BASE REVENUE.—For purposes of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A), the dollar amount of the annual base revenue for a fiscal year shall be—

“(A) for fiscal year 2019, \$8,000,000; and

“(B) for fiscal years 2020 through 2023, the dollar amount of the total revenue amount established under this subsection for the previous fiscal year, not including any adjustments made under subsection (c)(2) or (c)(3).

“(c) ADJUSTMENTS; ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—

“(1) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), the dollar amount of the inflation adjustment to the annual base revenue for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to the product of—

“(i) such annual base revenue for the fiscal year under subsection (b)(2); and

“(ii) the inflation adjustment percentage under subparagraph (C).

“(B) OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST FEES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the dollar amount of the inflation adjustment to the fee for OTC monograph order requests for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to the product of—

“(i) the applicable fee under subsection (a)(2) for the preceding fiscal year; and

“(ii) the inflation adjustment percentage under subparagraph (C).

“(C) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT PERCENTAGE.—The inflation adjustment percentage under this subparagraph for a fiscal year is equal to—

“(i) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; Not Seasonally Adjusted; All items; Annual Index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years of available data; and

“(ii) for each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the sum of—

“(I) the average annual percent change in the cost, per full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration, of all personnel compensation and benefits paid with respect to such positions for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years, multiplied by the proportion of personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of OTC monograph drug activities for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years; and

“(II) the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban

consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; Not Seasonally Adjusted; All items; Annual Index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years of available data multiplied by the proportion of all costs other than personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of OTC monograph drug activities for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years.

“(2) OPERATING RESERVE ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2019 and subsequent fiscal years, for purposes of subsections (b)(1)(B) and (b)(2)(C), the Secretary may, in addition to adjustments under paragraph (1), further increase the fee revenue and fees if such an adjustment is necessary to provide operating reserves of carryover user fees for OTC monograph drug activities for not more than the number of weeks specified in subparagraph (B).

“(B) NUMBER OF WEEKS.—The number of weeks specified in this subparagraph is—

“(i) 3 weeks for fiscal year 2019;

“(ii) 7 weeks for fiscal year 2020;

“(iii) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2021;

“(iv) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2022; and

“(v) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2023.

“(C) DECREASE.—If the Secretary has carryover balances for such process in excess of 10 weeks of the operating reserves referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall decrease the fee revenue and fees referred to in such subparagraph to provide for not more than 10 weeks of such operating reserves.

“(D) RATIONALE FOR ADJUSTMENT.—If an adjustment under this paragraph is made, the rationale for the amount of the increase or decrease (as applicable) in fee revenue and fees shall be contained in the annual Federal Register notice under paragraph (4) establishing fee revenue and fees for the fiscal year involved.

“(3) ADDITIONAL DIRECT COST ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall, in addition to adjustments under paragraphs (1) and (2), further increase the fee revenue and fees for purposes of subsection (b)(2)(D) by an amount equal to—

“(A) \$14,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(B) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(C) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(D) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(E) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

“(4) ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—The Secretary shall, not later than January 31, 2019—

“(i) establish OTC monograph drug facility fees for fiscal year 2019 under subsection (a), based on the revenue amount for such year under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection; and

“(ii) publish fee revenue, facility fees, and OTC monograph order requests in the Federal Register.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—The Secretary shall, not later than January 31 of each fiscal year that begins after September 30, 2019, establish for each such fiscal year, based on the revenue amounts under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection—

“(i) OTC monograph drug facility fees under subsection (a)(1);

“(ii) OTC monograph order request fees under subsection (a)(2); and

“(iii) publish such fee revenue amounts, facility fees, and OTC monograph order request fees in the Federal Register.

“(d) IDENTIFICATION OF FACILITIES.—Each person that owns an OTC monograph drug facility shall submit to the Secretary the information required under this subsection each year. Such information shall, for each fiscal year—

“(1) be submitted as part of the requirements for drug establishment registration set forth in section 510; and

“(2) include for each such facility, at a minimum, identification of the facility's business operation as that of an OTC monograph drug facility.

“(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—

“(1) OTC MONOGRAPH DRUG FACILITY FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Failure to pay the fee under subsection (a)(1) within 20 calendar days of the due date as specified in subparagraph (D) of such subsection shall result in the following:

“(i) The Secretary shall place the facility on a publicly available arrears list.

“(ii) All OTC monograph drugs manufactured in such a facility or containing an ingredient manufactured in such a facility shall be deemed misbranded under section 502(a).

“(B) APPLICATION OF PENALTIES.—The penalties under this paragraph shall apply until the fee established by subsection (a)(1) is paid.

“(2) ORDER REQUESTS.—An OTC monograph order request submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for filing by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person under this section have been paid.

“(3) MEETINGS.—A person subject to fees under this section shall be considered ineligible for OTC monograph drug meetings until all such fees owed by such person have been paid.

“(f) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Fees authorized under subsection (a) shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salaries and expenses with such fiscal year limitation. The sums transferred shall be available solely for OTC monograph drug activities.

“(2) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the fees authorized by this section shall be collected and available in each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the amount specified in appropriation Acts, or otherwise made available for obligation, for such fiscal year.

“(B) USE OF FEES AND LIMITATION.—The fees authorized by this section shall be available to defray increases in the costs of the resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities (including increases in such costs for an additional number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services to be engaged in such activities), only if the Secretary allocates for such purpose an amount for such fiscal year (excluding amounts from fees collected under this section) no less than \$12,000,000, multiplied by the adjustment factor applicable to the fiscal year involved under subsection (c)(1).

“(C) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall be considered to have met the requirements of subparagraph (B) in any fiscal year if the costs funded by appropriations and allocated for OTC monograph drug activities are not more than 15 percent below the level specified in such subparagraph.

“(D) PROVISION FOR EARLY PAYMENTS IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Payment of fees authorized under this section for a fiscal year (after fiscal year 2019), prior to the due date for such fees, may be accepted by the Secretary in accordance with authority provided in advance in a prior year appropriations Act.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023, there is authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section an amount equal to the total amount of fees assessed for such fiscal year under this section.

“(g) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 calendar days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

“(h) CONSTRUCTION.—This section may not be construed to require that the number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of

Health and Human Services, for officers, employers, and advisory committees not engaged in OTC monograph drug activities, be reduced to offset the number of officers, employees, and advisory committees so engaged.

“SEC. 744P. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) PERFORMANCE REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, and not later than 120 calendar days after the end of each fiscal year thereafter for which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report concerning the progress of the Food and Drug Administration in achieving the goals identified in the letters described in section 201(b) of the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2018 during such fiscal year and the future plans of the Food and Drug Administration for meeting such goals.

“(b) FISCAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 calendar days after the end of fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year for which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the implementation of the authority for such fees during such fiscal year and the use, by the Food and Drug Administration, of the fees collected for such fiscal year.

“(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the reports required under subsections (a) and (b) available to the public on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.

“(d) REAUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) CONSULTATION.—In developing recommendations to present to the Congress with respect to the goals described in subsection (a), and plans for meeting the goals, for OTC monograph drug activities for the first 5 fiscal years after fiscal year 2023, and for the reauthorization of this part for such fiscal years, the Secretary shall consult with—

“(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

“(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

“(C) scientific and academic experts;

“(D) health care professionals;

“(E) representatives of patient and consumer advocacy groups; and

“(F) the regulated industry.

“(2) PUBLIC REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—After negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall—

“(A) present the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) to the congressional committees specified in such paragraph;

“(B) publish such recommendations in the Federal Register;

“(C) provide for a period of 30 calendar days for the public to provide written comments on such recommendations;

“(D) hold a meeting at which the public may present its views on such recommendations; and

“(E) after consideration of such public views and comments, revise such recommendations as necessary.

“(3) TRANSMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 15, 2023, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress the revised recommendations under paragraph (2), a summary of the views and comments received under such paragraph, and any changes made to the recommendations in response to such views and comments.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5333, the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act.

Over-the-counter medications are widely used to treat common ailments such as colds, headaches, and seasonal allergies. In fact, more than 240 million Americans use OTC products every year and trust these affordable remedies to get well and stay well.

Despite the success and high utilization of these medicines, the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory framework for oversight of OTC products, also called the monograph system, is outdated and incomplete. The system was created more than 45 years ago, yet movement on unfinished items has ground to a halt due to the cumbersome notice and comment rule-making process. I will give an example that was pointed out in committee that the FDA brought out.

The FDA advanced notice proposed rulemaking for this one started on December 4, 1979. Through a process of 20 different procedures they went through, they got to November 19, 1997, almost 18 years later, and what do they do? They reopen the administrative records to consider new data. It is taking too long. That is what this bill would remedy.

The lack of modernization makes it impossible for manufacturers to address safety concerns and offers little incentive to develop new products.

H.R. 5333, which I introduced with the Health Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS); the Health Subcommittee vice chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE); the Health Subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE); and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) would provide meaningful and long overdue reform to FDA's monograph system.

The necessary reforms would create a more flexible framework that accounts for advances in science, permits timely updates to safety information and label changes, and creates a workable process for completing unfinished monographs.

By updating the current burdensome process, Congress would also create a pathway to market for new and innovative products that greatly benefit our constituents and reduce strain on our healthcare system.

Safe, reliable, and affordable OTC drugs allow consumers to treat common ailments at home, usually without visiting a healthcare provider, saving the healthcare system \$102 billion annually.

Our bill would improve regulatory certainty for manufacturers and, over time, we would see additional investment in research and development, leading to new, innovative OTC medicines that will continue to save Americans and our healthcare system money.

I thank my colleagues, FDA, and stakeholders for working so closely with me over the last 2 years to ensure that this modernization effort appropriately addresses and resolves this complex issue.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 5333 to modernize the broken monograph system, strengthen consumer protection, spur innovation, and increase consumer choice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5333, the Over-the-Counter Monograph, Safety, Innovation and Reform Act.

I am a proud original cosponsor of this legislation that will strengthen the Food and Drug Administration's ability to oversee the over-the-counter drug market and establish a user fee program for this market for the first time.

H.R. 5333 is legislation that enjoys bipartisan support and would reform the current monograph system that is relied upon by industry to legally market over-the-counter drugs in response to concerns raised by both the FDA and the industry that the current system is outdated and burdensome.

Under current law, the safety and effectiveness of over-the-counter drugs is established through conformance with a monograph. Monographs serve as a type of rule book outlining the conditions of use for a particular drug ingredient, including the dosage form, patient population, labeling and warnings, and other requirements. This rule book is established currently through a three-phase rulemaking process and is very resource and time intensive.

This process has made it difficult for the FDA to finalize, revise, or update monographs to reflect innovations, changes in science, or to respond to safety issues.

We also have heard from the industry that the current process inadvertently discourages innovation, as it is not nimble enough to respond to evolving science and technology.

The legislation we are considering today would address these concerns by transitioning the monograph system from rulemaking to administrative order, create a procedure for the FDA to respond to the needs for safety label changes, and establish an innovation pathway.

These reforms can only be successful if it is also accompanied by stable and reliable funding that more appropriately represents the growth and science of the over-the-counter industry.

Today, the over-the-counter monograph program oversees more than 100,000 products with a staff of about 30 people and a budget of just over \$8 million. The user fees provided in this bill would help the FDA transition the monograph program from rulemaking to administrative order, provide for additional staff capacity, and enable the FDA to respond to innovation and safety changes in the current market.

I want to thank my colleague from Ohio, Congressman BOB LATTA, for introducing this legislation and for working with me and other members of our committee. I would like to thank the original cosponsors of the bill, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, Representative DEBBIE DINGELL, Chairman MIKE BURGESS, and Representative BRETT GUTHRIE for their dedication and hard work on this important issue.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of this important, bipartisan bill to modernize the regulation of over-the-counter medicines.

An over-the-counter product is one that the Food and Drug Administration has found to be safe and effective for direct consumer use. To date, consumers have access to over 300,000 of these nonprescription items. We are all familiar with these products, from cough and cold medicines to antiperspirants, antacids, and sunscreens. Our pharmacy aisles and medicine cabinets are filled with over-the-counter products that American consumers rely on each and every day.

These products do not need pre-market approval but are required to be consistent with monographs established by the Food and Drug Administration. Making a simple change to existing monographs requires a time-consuming and resource-intensive rule-making process that can, in fact, take years to effectuate even if the change is to enhance the safety of a product. This creates undue delay in potential benefits seen by consumers and is an inefficient use of public resources.

□ 1815

Fortunately, the Food and Drug Administration, patient and consumer groups, and the regulated industry all agreed that reform is necessary and have spent the past several years engaged in discussions about moderniza-

tion of the over-the-counter regulation. Congress worked with these groups to turn these discussions into legislation that we are considering this afternoon.

This bill would make the over-the-counter regulatory framework more science based and responsive to public health concerns. It would encourage the development of more innovative products and would provide resources to the Food and Drug Administration to bolster the agency's ability to review over-the-counter applications and regulate this sector in a consistent manner.

Quite simply, it is a meaningful bill for each American.

I want to thank our Energy and Commerce Committee Members, Representatives LATTA from Ohio, DIANA DEGETTE from Colorado, BRETT GUTHRIE from Kentucky, DEBBIE DINGELL from Michigan, as well as Ranking Member GREEN, my colleague from Texas, for their leadership in this legislation.

I also want to recognize the hard work and the dedication of committee staff on this legislation, particularly Warren Burke and Michelle Vanek of the Office of Legislative Counsel; Danielle Steele, with our majority staff; and Kim Trzeciak, with the committee's Democratic staff. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5333, the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2018, and I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE for bringing this important bill to the floor.

The monograph system for regulating over-the-counter drugs is broken, plain and simple. Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of all medicines sold in the United States are over the counter, yet the FDA only has 18 full-time employees overseeing the market. It doesn't work for patients; it doesn't work for companies; and it doesn't work for the FDA.

Companies cannot bring new, innovative products to market and the FDA cannot act quickly when they are faced with a safety risk. This is not reflective of how our healthcare system should be run, and it is putting patients at risk.

Our legislation helps bring the agency into the 21st century by creating a user fee program at FDA for OTC drugs and by making it easier to bring a new, innovative product to the market. From past experience, we know that user fee programs have been very successful at FDA, and this bill extends that successful model to the OTC space.

Today, the FDA has to go through the cumbersome rulemaking process to

update a monograph, which is problematic for many different reasons. Not only does it make it harder for innovative products to come to market, but it also makes it nearly impossible for the FDA to amend existing monographs if they see safety concerns in certain products.

We need to make sure FDA has the ability to act quickly if they see unsafe products in the market, and our legislation makes it easier for the agency to do so. This is why the bill has the support of industry groups and consumer groups.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there has been much discussion about the exclusivity provisions of this legislation. It has been debated in committee, and we compromised with 18 months of exclusivity. I will be the first to admit it is not perfect, but, on balance, the public health benefits of this bill outweigh any concerns about exclusivity.

Americans deserve to have the most innovative products on the market available to them, while ensuring the FDA has the resources they need to protect public health. I am proud to say that this legislation accomplishes both these goals.

I, too, want to thank my colleagues, BOB LATTA, DIANA DEGETTE, BRETT GUTHRIE, GENE GREEN, Dr. BURGESS, Chairman WALDEN, and Ranking Member PALLONE for all their hard work on this legislation. Their staffs worked tirelessly as well on this, and I want to thank all of them for their efforts.

Passage of this bill represents another step towards getting our legislation signed into law this year. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5333.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for introducing this critical legislation.

As it stands, the OTC monograph system is slow and outdated, leading to new changes being stuck in the pipeline for years with no light at the end of the tunnel. As a pharmacist, I know how important it is to my patients that they have access to new uses and applications.

Regardless of the application needed under a monograph, today's legislation puts in place changes that will help those who I have spent my life assisting: the patient.

This legislation establishes a mechanism for safety label changes, giving these new efforts an outlet through which to get changes for the public quickly available and on shelves.

This critical legislation will shorten market exclusivity by 6 months for certain new over-the-counter products approved without a new drug application and will also bolster the staffing capability at the FDA overseeing the OTC drug industry.

Over-the-counter drug innovation has faced challenges for years, and, with

this legislation, we finally have an opportunity to open up these channels that will help everyone.

I voted for this legislation through the subcommittee and through full committee and am proud to offer my full support to pass this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), my colleague and a member of our committee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to make long-overdue reforms to the way that the FDA reviews over-the-counter medicines. These medicines play a critical role in treating Americans' ailments and in helping us stay healthy. In fact, almost 7 in 10 parents report giving their kids OTC medicine to help treat sudden medical symptoms. Similarly, 81 percent of adults use these drugs as a first response to treat a minor ailment.

Think about it. Despite the widespread use of over-the-counter medicines, the FDA is currently forced to use a cumbersome and laborious monograph pathway to approve them. This antiquated, 40-year-old OTC review system has not kept pace with new medical advances and the rapid expansion of this market, which now comprises over 300,000 drugs. As a result, the current monograph review system fails to respond to the OTC safety issues in a timely and effective way, which can pose serious healthcare risks for children and families.

Between 2004 and 2005, for example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported 1,500 cases of children under the age of 2 visiting emergency rooms due to serious side effects or overdoses associated with over-the-counter cough and cold products.

Since the CDC made this startling finding, the FDA has been trying to revise the cough and cold monograph system to warn parents about the risks that these common drugs can pose to children, but the FDA can't do it because they have been hamstrung due to the burdensome process it must undergo to revise these monographs.

The Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act would streamline the FDA's review of over-the-counter drugs and provide it with new tools to protect children and warn parents about potentially dangerous OTC drugs.

I want to add my thanks to the bipartisan team that passed this bill, Representatives LATTA, BURGESS, GREEN, GUTHRIE, and DINGELL for all working together with me on this important legislation, and, in addition, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman WALDEN, the FDA, and the many stakeholders that have worked closely with us throughout the process.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is a rare triple win for regulators, consumers, and industry. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, once again, I just want to thank all the members for all their hard work on this. Especially, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon, the chairman of the full committee, for his work on this piece of legislation. Also, I want to thank the staff.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5333, 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.

ANIMAL DRUG AND ANIMAL GENERIC DRUG USER FEE AMENDMENTS OF 2018

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5554) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5554

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 "Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS; REFERENCES IN ACT.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents; references in Act.

TITLE I—FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS

Sec. 101. Short title; finding.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Authority to assess and use animal drug fees.

Sec. 104. Reauthorization; reporting requirements.

Sec. 105. Savings clause.

Sec. 106. Effective date.

Sec. 107. Sunset dates.

TITLE II—FEES RELATING TO GENERIC ANIMAL DRUGS

Sec. 201. Short title; finding.

Sec. 202. Authority to assess and use generic new animal drug fees.

Sec. 203. Reauthorization; reporting requirements.

Sec. 204. Savings clause.

Sec. 205. Effective date.

Sec. 206. Sunset dates.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Electronic submissions.

Sec. 302. Index of legally marketed unapproved new animal drugs for minor species.

Sec. 303. Misbranded drugs and devices.

Sec. 304. Conditional approval of new animal drugs.

Sec. 305. Guidance addressing investigation designs.

Sec. 306. Food additives intended for use in animal food.

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as otherwise specified, amendments made by this Act to a section or other provision of law are amendments to such section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

TITLE I—FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018".

(b) FINDING.—Congress finds that the fees authorized by the amendments made in this title will be dedicated toward expediting the animal drug development process and the review of new and supplemental animal drug applications and investigational animal drug submissions as set forth in the goals identified for purposes of part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 739 (21 U.S.C. 379j-11) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1)(A) The term 'animal drug application' means—

"(i) an application for approval of any new animal drug submitted under section 512(b)(1); or

"(ii) an application for conditional approval of a new animal drug submitted under section 571.

"(B) Such term does not include either a new animal drug application submitted under section 512(b)(2) or a supplemental animal drug application."; and

(2) in paragraph (8), by adding at the end the following:

"(I) The activities necessary for implementation of the United States and European Union Good Manufacturing Practice Mutual Inspection Agreement with respect to animal drug products subject to review, including implementation activities prior to and following product approval.".

SEC. 103. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

(a) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—Section 740(b) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "2014" and inserting "2019"; and

(ii) by striking "\$23,600,000" and inserting "\$30,331,240"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "2015 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2023"; and

(ii) by striking "\$21,600,000" and inserting "\$29,931,240"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "determined" and inserting "established".

(b) ANNUAL FEE SETTING; ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 740(c)(2) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "For fiscal year 2015" and inserting "(A) For fiscal year 2020"; and

(ii) by inserting "multiplying such revenue amounts by" before "an amount";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(C) by striking the flush text at the end; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) COMPOUNDED BASIS.—The adjustment made each fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 under this paragraph shall be applied on a compounded basis to the revenue amount calculated under this paragraph for the most recent previous fiscal year.”.

(2) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 740(c) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020 and subsequent fiscal years, after the fee revenue amounts established under subsection (b) are adjusted for inflation in accordance with paragraph (2), the fee revenue amounts shall be further adjusted for such fiscal year to reflect changes in the workload of the Secretary for the process for the review of animal drug applications, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C). With respect to such adjustment—

“(i) such adjustment shall be determined by the Secretary based on a weighted average of the change in the total number of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications for which data with respect to safety or effectiveness are required, manufacturing supplemental animal drug applications, investigational animal drug study submissions, and investigational animal drug protocol submissions submitted to the Secretary; and

“(ii) the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the fees resulting from such adjustment and the supporting methodologies.

“(B) REDUCTION OF WORKLOAD-BASED INCREASE BY AMOUNT OF CERTAIN EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2023, if application of the workload adjustment under subparagraph (A) increases the fee revenue amounts otherwise established for the fiscal year under subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under paragraph (2), such fee revenue increase shall be reduced by the amount of any excess collections, as described in subsection (g)(4), for the second preceding fiscal year, up to the amount of such fee revenue increase.

“(C) RULE OF APPLICATION.—Under no circumstances shall the workload adjustments under this paragraph result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established under subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under paragraph (2).”.

(3) FINAL YEAR ADJUSTMENT.—Section 740(c)(4) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(c)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”; and

(B) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

(C) EXEMPTIONS FROM FEES.—Section 740(d) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(d)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “; EXEMPTIONS FROM FEES” after “REDUCTION”;

(2) by striking the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting “WAIVER OR REDUCTION”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTIONS FROM FEES.—

“(A) CERTAIN LABELING SUPPLEMENTS TO ADD NUMBER OF APPROVED APPLICATION.—Fees under this section shall not apply with respect to any person who—

“(i) not later than September 30, 2023, submits a supplemental animal drug application relating to a new animal drug application approved under section 512, solely to add the new animal drug application number to the labeling of the drug in the manner specified in section 502(w)(3); and

“(ii) otherwise would be subject to fees under this section solely on the basis of such supplemental application.

“(B) CERTAIN ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATIONS.—Fees under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of sub-

section (a) shall not apply with respect to any person who is the named applicant or sponsor of an animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application, or investigational animal drug submission if such application or submission involves the intentional genomic alteration of an animal that is intended to produce a drug, device, or biological product subject to fees under section 736, 738, 744B, or 744H.”.

(d) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 740(g)(3) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(g)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”; and

(B) by striking “determined” and inserting “established”; and

(C) by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (5)”.

(2) EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—Section 740(g) (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(g)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—If the sum total of fees collected under this section for a fiscal year exceeds the amount of fees authorized to be appropriated for such year under paragraph (3), the excess collections shall be credited to the appropriations account of the Food and Drug Administration as provided in paragraph (1).

“(5) RECOVERY OF COLLECTION SHORTFALLS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B)—

“(i) for fiscal year 2021, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section shall be increased by the amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal year 2019 falls below the amount of fees authorized for fiscal year 2019 under paragraph (3);

“(ii) for fiscal year 2022, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section shall be increased by the amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal year 2020 falls below the amount of fees authorized for fiscal year 2020 under paragraph (3); and

“(iii) for fiscal year 2023, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section shall be increased by the cumulative amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal years 2021 and 2022 (including estimated collections for fiscal year 2022) falls below the cumulative amount of fees authorized for such fiscal years under paragraph (3).

“(B) REDUCTION OF SHORTFALL-BASED FEE INCREASE BY PRIOR YEAR EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Secretary shall, in such manner as the Secretary determines appropriate, reduce any fee increase otherwise applicable for a fiscal year under subparagraph (A) by the amount of any excess collections under this section for preceding fiscal years (after fiscal year 2018).

“(ii) WORKLOAD-BASED FEE ACCOUNTING.—In applying clause (i), the Secretary shall account for the reduction of workload-based fee revenue increases by excess collections under subsection (c)(3)(B), in such manner as needed to provide that no portion of any excess collections described in clause (i) is applied for purposes of reducing fee increases under both such subsection (c)(3)(B) and this paragraph.

“(C) RULE OF APPLICATION.—Under no circumstances shall adjustments under this paragraph result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established in subsection (b),

as adjusted or otherwise affected under subsection (c).”.

SEC. 104. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 740A (21 U.S.C. 379j-13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2013” and inserting “2018”;

(2) by striking “2014” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “2019”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 105. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding the amendments made by this title, part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-11 et seq.), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this title, shall continue to be in effect with respect to animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications (as defined in such part as of such day) that on or after October 1, 2013, but before October 1, 2018, were accepted by the Food and Drug Administration for filing with respect to assessing and collecting any fee required by such part for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 106. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later, except that fees under part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by this title, shall be assessed for animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications received on or after October 1, 2018, regardless of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. SUNSET DATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 740 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-12) shall cease to be effective October 1, 2023.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 740A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-13) shall cease to be effective January 31, 2024.

(c) PREVIOUS SUNSET PROVISION.—Effective October 1, 2018, subsections (a) and (b) of section 107 of the Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013 (Public Law 113-14) are repealed.

TITLE II—FEES RELATING TO GENERIC ANIMAL DRUGS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018”.

(b) FINDING.—Congress finds that the fees authorized by the amendments made in this title will be dedicated toward expediting the generic new animal drug development process and the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, supplemental abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, and investigational submissions for generic new animal drugs as set forth in the goals identified for purposes of part 5 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

(a) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—Subsection (b) of section 741 (21 U.S.C. 379j-21) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (c), (d), (f), and (g), for each of fiscal years

2019 through 2023, the fees required under subsection (a) shall be established to generate a total revenue amount of \$18,336,340.

“(2) TYPES OF FEES.—Of the total revenue amount established for a fiscal year under paragraph (1)—

“(A) 25 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(1) (relating to abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug);

“(B) 37.5 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(2) (relating to generic new animal drug products); and

“(C) 37.5 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(3) (relating to generic new animal drug sponsors).”.

(b) ANNUAL FEE SETTING; ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 741(c) (21 U.S.C. 379j-21(c)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020 and subsequent fiscal years, the revenue amounts established under subsection (b) shall be adjusted by the Secretary by notice, published in the Federal Register, for a fiscal year, by multiplying such revenue amounts by an amount equal to the sum of—

“(i) one;

“(ii) the average annual percent change in the cost, per full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration, of all personnel compensation and benefits paid with respect to such positions for the first three of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available, multiplied by the average proportion of personnel compensation and benefits costs to total Food and Drug Administration costs for the first three of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available; and

“(iii) the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; not seasonally adjusted; all items less food and energy; annual index) for the first three of the preceding 4 years for which data are available multiplied by the average proportion of all costs other than personnel compensation and benefits costs to total Food and Drug Administration costs for the first three of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available.

“(B) COMPOUNDED BASIS.—The adjustment made each fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 under this paragraph shall be applied on a compounded basis to the revenue amount calculated under this paragraph for the most recent previous fiscal year.”.

(2) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 741(c) (21 U.S.C. 379j-21(c)), as redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020 and subsequent fiscal years, after the fee revenue amounts established under subsection (b) are adjusted for inflation in accordance with paragraph (2), the fee revenue amounts shall be further adjusted for each such fiscal year to reflect changes in the workload of the Secretary for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C). With respect to such adjustment—

“(i) this adjustment shall be determined by the Secretary based on a weighted average of the change in the total number of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, manufacturing supplemental abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, investigational generic new animal drug study submissions, and investigational generic new animal drug protocol submissions submitted to the Secretary; and

“(ii) the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the fees resulting from this adjustment and the supporting methodologies.

“(B) REDUCTION OF WORKLOAD-BASED INCREASE BY AMOUNT OF CERTAIN EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2023, if application of the workload adjustment under subparagraph (A) increases the fee revenue amounts otherwise established for the fiscal year under subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under paragraph (2), such fee revenue increase shall be reduced by the amount of any excess collections, as described in subsection (g)(4), for the second preceding fiscal year, up to the amount of such fee revenue increase.

“(C) RULE OF APPLICATION.—Under no circumstances shall workload adjustments under this paragraph result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established under subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under paragraph (2).”.

(3) FINAL YEAR ADJUSTMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 741(c) (21 U.S.C. 379j-21(c)), as redesignated, is amended by—

(A) striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”; and

(B) striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

(c) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM FEES.—Subsection (d) of section 741 (21 U.S.C. 379j-21) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM FEES.—

“(1) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION.—The Secretary shall grant a waiver from or a reduction of one or more fees assessed under subsection (a) where the Secretary finds that the generic new animal drug is intended solely to provide for a minor use or minor species indication.

“(2) EXEMPTION FROM FEES.—Fees under this section shall not apply with respect to any person who—

“(A) not later than September 30, 2023, submits a supplemental abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug approved under section 512, solely to add the application number to the labeling of the drug in the manner specified in section 502(w)(3); and

“(B) otherwise would be subject to fees under this section solely on the basis of such supplemental abbreviated application.”.

(d) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Section 741(g) (21 U.S.C. 379j-21) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following paragraphs:

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023, there is authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section an amount equal to the total revenue amount established under subsection (b) for the fiscal year, as adjusted or otherwise affected under subsection (c).

“(4) EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—If the sum total of fees collected under this section for a fiscal year exceeds the amount of fees authorized to be appropriated for such year under paragraph (3), the excess collections shall be credited to the appropriations account of the Food and Drug Administration as provided in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 203. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 742 (21 U.S.C. 379j-22) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2013” and inserting “2018”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions” and inserting “the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions”;

(3) by striking “2014” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “2019”; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 204. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding the amendments made by this title, part 5 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-21 et seq.), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this title, shall continue to be in effect with respect to abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug and supplemental abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug (as defined in such part as of such day) that on or after October 1, 2013, but before October 1, 2018, were accepted by the Food and Drug Administration for filing with respect to assessing and collecting any fee required by such part for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later, except that fees under part 5 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by this title, shall be assessed for abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug and supplemental abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug received on or after October 1, 2018, regardless of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. SUNSET DATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 741 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-21) shall cease to be effective October 1, 2023.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 742 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-22) shall cease to be effective January 31, 2024.

(c) PREVIOUS SUNSET PROVISION.—Effective October 1, 2018, subsections (a) and (b) of section 206 of the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013 (Public Law 113-14) are repealed.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS.

(a) NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATIONS AND ABBREVIATED APPLICATIONS FOR A GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG.—Section 512(b) (21 U.S.C. 360b(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Beginning on October 1, 2018, all applications or submissions pursuant to this subsection shall be submitted by electronic means in such format as the Secretary may require.”.

(b) CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR MINOR USE AND MINOR SPECIES.—Section 571(a) (21 U.S.C. 360ccc(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Beginning on October 1, 2018, all applications or submissions pursuant to this subsection shall be submitted by electronic means in such format as the Secretary may require.”.

SEC. 302. INDEX OF LEGALLY MARKETED UNAPPROVED NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR MINOR SPECIES.

Effective on October 1, 2018, section 572(h) (21 U.S.C. 360ccc-1(h)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) ‘LEGAL STATUS—In order to be legally marketed, a new animal drug intended for a minor species must be Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Indexed by the Food and Drug Administration. THIS PRODUCT IS INDEXED—MIF #’ (followed by the applicable minor species index file number and a period) ‘Extra-label use is prohibited.’;”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “other animals” and inserting “food-producing animals”.

SEC. 303. MISBRANDED DRUGS AND DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 502(w) (21 U.S.C. 352(w)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (1), by striking “; or” and inserting “;”;

(2) in subparagraph (2), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) for which an application has been approved under section 512 and the labeling of such drug does not include the application number in the format: ‘Approved by FDA under (A)NADA # xxx-xxx’, except that this subparagraph shall not apply to representative labeling required under section 514.1(b)(3)(v)(b) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) for animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—Section 502(w)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply beginning on September 30, 2023.

SEC. 304. CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 571 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “SPECIES” and inserting “SPECIES AND CERTAIN NEW ANIMAL DRUGS”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraph (3), any person may file with the Secretary an application for conditional approval of—

“(i) a new animal drug intended for a minor use or a minor species; or

“(ii) a new animal drug not intended for a minor use or minor species—

“(I) that is intended to treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition or addresses an unmet animal or human health need; and

“(II) for which the Secretary determines that a demonstration of effectiveness would require a complex or particularly difficult study or studies.

“(B) The Secretary shall, not later than September 30, 2019, issue guidance or regulations further clarifying the criteria specified in subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(C) An application under this paragraph shall comply in all respects with the provisions of section 512 except for subsections (a)(4), (b)(2), (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), (d)(1), (e), (h), and (n) of such section unless otherwise stated in this section, and any additional provisions of this section.

“(D) New animal drugs for which conditional approval is sought under this section are subject to the same safety standards that would be applied to new animal drugs under section 512(d) (including, for antimicrobial new animal drugs, with respect to antimicrobial resistance).”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, or” and inserting “; or”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(iii) by striking “A person may not file” and inserting “(A) A person may not file”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) A person may not file an application under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) if the application seeks conditional approval of a new animal drug that contains an antimicrobial active ingredient.”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “for the conditionally approved use” after “shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “An intended use” and inserting “The Secretary shall, through regu-

lation or guidance, determine under what conditions an intended use”;

(ii) by striking “shall not” and inserting “may”; and

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

“(k) **SUNSET.**—

“(1) The Secretary’s authority to grant conditional approval of new animal drugs not intended for a minor use or minor species pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii) terminates on October 1, 2028.

“(2) The Secretary—

“(A) may not accept any new applications for such conditional approval pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii) on or after such date; and

“(B) may continue all activities under this section with respect to drugs that were conditionally approved pursuant to (a)(1)(A)(ii) prior to such date.

“(3) The Secretary may, until October 1, 2032, accept applications for approval under 512 of drugs conditionally approved pursuant to (a)(1)(A)(ii).”.

(b) **EXCEPTION FROM FEES IN CASE OF CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED APPLICATIONS FOR CONDITIONAL APPROVAL.**—Section 740(a)(1)(C) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-12(a)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) in the caption by striking “EXCEPTION” and inserting “EXCEPTIONS”;

(2) by striking “If an animal drug” and inserting the following:

“(i) If an animal drug”; and

(3) by inserting after clause (i), as so designated, the following new clause:

“(ii) Beginning with fiscal year 2019, in the case of an animal drug application submitted by a person under section 512(b)(1), where such person (or their licensor, assignor, or predecessor-in-interest) previously submitted an application for conditional approval under section 571 for the same product and paid the applicable fee under subparagraph (A), the application under section 512(b)(1) shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A) if submitted within the timeframe specified in section 571(h).”.

(c) **REPORT ON INCORPORATING VETERINARY OVERSIGHT.**—Not later than September 30, 2019, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate identifying how the Food and Drug Administration will incorporate veterinary oversight for all approved medically important antimicrobial drugs administered to animals that are not yet subject to veterinary oversight. Such report shall address requirements related to revisions of labeling to reflect that medically important antimicrobial drugs administered to animals shall be subject to veterinary oversight.

(d) **GAO STUDY OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this section as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study on the effectiveness and overall impact of the conditional approval pathway under section 571 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc).

(2) **ISSUANCE OF REPORT.**—Not later than January 1, 2026, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the study under paragraph (1).

(3) **CONTENTS OF REPORTS.**—The report submitted under paragraph (2) shall address—

(A) for each drug for which a conditional approval has been awarded since October 1, 2018—

(i) whether the drug was granted conditional approval pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 571(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by subsection (a);

(ii) whether the drug was dual labeled during its conditional approval;

(iii) the indications for which the drug was granted conditional approval under section 571 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc) and whether the drug was approved or not approved under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b);

(iv) the number of years the drug was so conditionally approved and a description of the complexity of the investigation to demonstrate the drug’s effectiveness;

(v) whether, and to what extent, the conditional approval pathway under such section 571 (21 U.S.C. 360ccc) impacted the sponsor’s decision to develop the drug or seek approval of the drug under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b);

(vi) whether, and to what extent, conditional approval pursuant to clause (ii) of section 571(a)(1)(A) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(a)(1)(A)) addressed a serious or life-threatening condition; and

(vii) whether, and to what extent, conditional approval pursuant to clause (ii) of section 571(a)(1)(A) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(a)(1)(A)) addressed an unmet animal or human health need, and whether before such conditional approval there were available therapies for the disease or condition involved;

(B) an analysis of the conditional approval program under section 571 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc), including—

(i) the resources used by the Food and Drug Administration in reviewing applications for conditional approval of drugs pursuant to such program and renewal of such conditional approval, including the effects of the program on the Food and Drug Administration’s review of animal drugs for which conditional approval is not used;

(ii) whether any improvements to the program under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b) are necessary to incentivize the development of animal drugs that would likely not otherwise be developed, or developed in as timely a manner, to address—

(I) serious or life-threatening conditions; and

(II) an unmet animal or human health need; and

(iii) whether the conditional approval pathway has resulted in a greater number of animal drugs approved under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b) for serious or life-threatening conditions or unmet animal or human health needs than would have otherwise come to market under the practices and commitments of the Center for Veterinary Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration as such practices and commitments existed as of the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) how the Center for Veterinary Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration has utilized complex adaptive or other novel investigation designs, data from foreign countries, real-world evidence (including ongoing surveillance activities, observational studies, and registry data), biomarkers, or surrogate endpoints—

(i) to support the approval of products under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b), including how many such products have been approved since October 1, 2018; and

(ii) to support the approval of products under section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360b)

that received conditional approval under section 571 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc), including how many such products have been approved since October 1, 2018.

SEC. 305. GUIDANCE ADDRESSING INVESTIGATION DESIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of assisting sponsors in incorporating complex adaptive and other novel investigation designs, data from foreign countries, real world evidence (including ongoing surveillance activities, observational studies, and registry data), biomarkers, and surrogate endpoints (referred to in this section as “elements of investigations”) into proposed clinical investigation protocols and applications for new animal drugs under sections 512 and 571 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b; 360ccc), the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall issue guidance addressing the use of such elements of investigations in the development and regulatory review of such new animal drugs.

(b) CONTENTS.—The guidance under subsection (a) shall address how the Secretary will evaluate the elements of investigations proposed or submitted pursuant to section 512(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or to meet the commitment under section 571(a)(2)(F) of such Act, and how sponsors of such applications may obtain feedback from the Secretary on technical issues related to such investigations prior to the submission of an application to the Secretary.

(c) MEETING.—Prior to issuing the guidance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including representatives of regulated industry, consumer groups, academia, veterinarians, and food producers, through a public meeting to be held not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) TIMING.—The Secretary shall issue a draft guidance under subsection (a) not later than 1 year after the date of the public meeting under subsection (c), and shall finalize such guidance not later than 1 year after the date on which the public comment period on such draft guidance ends.

SEC. 306. FOOD ADDITIVES INTENDED FOR USE IN ANIMAL FOOD.

(a) FOOD ADDITIVE PETITIONS FOR ANIMAL FOOD.—Section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 348) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) FOOD ADDITIVES INTENDED FOR USE IN ANIMAL FOOD.—(1) In taking action on a petition under subsection (c) for, or for recognition of, a food additive intended for use in animal food, the Secretary shall review reports of investigations conducted in foreign countries, provided by the petitioner.

“(2) Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018, the Secretary shall post on the internet website of the Food and Drug Administration—

“(A) the number of petitions for food additives intended for use in animal food filed under subsection (b) that are pending;

“(B) how long each such petition submitted under subsection (b) has been pending, including such petitions the Secretary has extended under subsection (c)(2); and

“(C) the number of study protocols that have been pending review for over 50 days, and the number that have received an extension.

“(3) In the case of a food additive petition intended for use in animal food, the Secretary shall provide information to the petitioner on the required contents of such petition. If the Secretary requires additional studies beyond what the petitioner proposed,

the Secretary shall provide the scientific rationale for such requirement.”.

(b) ENSURING THE SAFETY OF PET FOOD.—Section 1002(a) of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007 (21 U.S.C. 2102(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(c) GUIDANCE ON PRE-PETITION CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR ANIMAL FOOD ADDITIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”) shall publish draft guidance relating to the voluntary pre-petition consultation process for food additives intended for use in animal food.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidance under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the recommended format to submit to the Food and Drug Administration existing data, including any applicable foreign data, for assessment prior to submission of a food additive petition for animal food under section 409(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

(B) the manner and the number of days by which the Food and Drug Administration intends to review and respond to such existing data, including with respect to providing a scientific rationale for any additional data request;

(C) circumstances under which the submission of study protocols is recommended prior to submission of a food additive petition under such section 409(b);

(D) the manner in which the Secretary intends to inform the person submitting a study protocol for a food additive if the review of such study protocol will take longer than 50 days; and

(E) best practices for communication between the Food and Drug Administration and industry on the development of pre-petition submissions of study protocols and existing data for food additives.

(3) FINAL GUIDANCE.—The guidance under paragraph (1) shall be finalized, withdrawn, or reissued not later than 1 year after the close of the comment period on the draft guidance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this legislation to reauthorize the Animal Drug User Fee Act, ADUFA, which will continue agreements between the FDA and the animal drug industry to pay user fees that will help speed the approval of new drugs.

Farmers, ranchers, families, and veterinarians need ADUFA so they can keep their animals and pets safe and healthy.

In the rural and agricultural communities across the country, including my home State of Oklahoma, ADUFA is critical to farmers, ranchers, and all American consumers. These animals are a major food source for our communities and our families, so it is vitally important that we move quickly today and reauthorize ADUFA.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5554, the Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018.

This bill reauthorizes the Food and Drug Administration's animal drug and animal generic drug user fee programs and ensures that the FDA continues to have the tools it needs to approve animal drugs to help our pets and livestock live healthier lives.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the remainder of my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5554, the Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018.

This bill reauthorizes the Food and Drug Administration's Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Programs and ensures the FDA continues to have the tools it needs to approve animal drugs to help our pets and livestock live healthier lives.

This legislation reauthorizes the FDA's authority to collect user fees from the animal drug and generic animal drug industries for additional five years and reflects bipartisan agreement and recommendations negotiated between the FDA and the animal drug industry with input from farmers and ranchers, veterinarians, food and feed producers, and other public health stakeholders.

These critical user fee agreements have helped to accelerate the development of animal drugs, reduce application review times at the FDA, and create a more predictable and streamlined process for getting animal drugs to market.

It is critical that we pass H.R. 5554 today as the current authorization for these programs will expire on September 30th of this year. If ADUFA and AGDUFA are not reauthorized by the deadline, the FDA will lack the resources and subject matter experts it needs to do this important work.

This will be the fourth reauthorization of ADUFA and the third reauthorization of AGDUFA. These user fee programs have proven to be highly successful and allow the Center for Veterinary Medicine at FDA to meet and exceed its performance goals.

The FDA's gold standard for safety and efficacy extends beyond products just for humans, but also for animal drugs. Safe and effective animal medications, as approved by FDA, protect our companion animals and keep our food supply safe. Reauthorizing ADUFA and AGDUFA ensures this continues.

As a result of our bipartisan compromise, this bill also creates a conditional approval pathway for certain new animal drugs that are intended to treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition or address an unmet health need for which ongoing efficacy studies are complex or particularly difficult. I am

pleased we have reached consensus on this policy and that the provision includes a 10-year sunset.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has worked in a strong bipartisan fashion to move this bill forward. I commend my colleagues, Rep. KURT SCHRADER and Rep. MARKWAYNE MULLIN, for introducing this important legislation and advancing it for floor consideration.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote in support of the Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this critical bill to reauthorize the Animal Drug User Fee Act and the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for an additional 5 years. Among other things, these user fees provide critical resources to the Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine to ensure efficient and timely review of animal drug applications, quality assurance measures for animal feed, and surveillance of the safety and efficacy of animal drugs on the market.

In addition to reauthorizing these user fee programs, this legislation also includes new authority to facilitate greater innovation in the animal drug space.

Mr. Speaker, these user fee programs must be reauthorized by September 30 to avoid a major disruption of the operations of the Center for Veterinary Medicine. The clock is ticking. The agency must start sending pink slips to employees 60 calendar days before the end of the fiscal year. That is the end of this month.

We are talking about real consequences for animal health and for the American people. House passage of this bill today is an important step, and I urge the Senate to do its work and promptly take up and pass this bill so that President Trump can sign it into law. I thank the gentleman for the recognition.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER), our colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5554 is a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the animal drug and animal generic drug user fee programs, and I am proud to lead it with my colleague, Mr. MULLIN.

ADUFA and AGDUFA are crucial to FDA's work to review and approve applications for animal drugs. Over the past several years, animal drug user fee programs have streamlined the approval process for pharmaceuticals and eliminated the FDA's application backlog, reduced review times, and created a more predictable process.

As a veterinarian from Oregon, I am particularly grateful to see this bill come to the floor. I am acutely aware

of the great innovations that are occurring in the human health sphere, and I want to ensure our four-footed friends also have access to the latest and greatest medical innovations. That is why I am particularly pleased with this bill and its language to expand conditional approval for animal drugs with major uses in major species.

□ 1830

Conditional approval is a careful, deliberative process based on similar pathways for drugs for minor uses and minor species that was already established in 2004.

Conditional approval is critical for veterinary medicine since it is not cost-effective for drug companies to pursue large, complete clinical trials, given the small population of intended beneficiaries, without some initial interest and success under the conditional approval program.

Before being conditionally approved, drugs must demonstrate a reasonable expectation of effectiveness and meet every other FDA standard for approval, including safety. They still need to get complete FDA approval within 5 years and must apply for annual renewal.

I thank Chairman WALDEN; Ranking Member PALLONE; Mr. GREEN; my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), who worked very hard on the bill; and certainly Mr. MULLIN for his partnership in leading this way.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their bipartisan approach, and I urge a "yes" vote from all my colleagues.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5554, the Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2018. These user fee agreements are important to millions of North Carolinians living with companion animals. They are also important to the agricultural community. Some of you may not be aware that North Carolina is the second largest pork producer, the second largest turkey producer, and the third largest poultry producer in the country. Our agricultural community and family farms are essential to feeding our nation and they depend on medicines to keep animals healthy.

I am pleased that the final legislation includes language that I have worked on with my colleagues including Representatives HUDSON and SCHRADER to enable conditional approval of innovative veterinary drugs that have been demonstrated to be safe to use and have a reasonable expectation of effectiveness. The FDA already has this authority for unmet medical needs in minor uses and minor species, and this expanded authority can help improve protections for animal and human health.

This legislation must be passed before Congress adjourns for August or the FDA will be

required to halt the programs. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5554, 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.

REPORT ON H.R. 6385, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-829) on the bill (H.R. 6385) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4946, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4960, by the yeas and nays.

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

SPECIALIST TREVOR A. WIN'E POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4946) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—368

Abraham	Allen	Arrington
Adams	Amash	Babin
Aguilar	Amodei	Bacon

Banks (IN)	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Scott, Austin	Swalwell (CA)	Walker	Bera	Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal
Barletta	Espallat	Lewis (MN)	Scott, David	Takano	Walorski	Bergman	Fleischmann	Lucas
Barr	Estes (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Sensenbrenner	Taylor	Walters, Mimi	Beyer	Flores	Luján, Ben Ray
Barragán	Esty (CT)	LoBiondo	Serrano	Tenney	Waters, Maxine	Biggs	Fortenberry	Lynch
Bass	Evans	Lofgren	Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman	Bilirakis	Foster	MacArthur
Beatty	Faso	Long	Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Weber (TX)	Bishop (MI)	Foxo	Maloney,
Bera	Ferguson	Loudermilk	Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)	Bishop (UT)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Love	Shinkus	Thornberry	Welch	Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Maloney, Sean
Beyer	Fleischmann	Lowenthal	Shuster	Tipton	Wenstrup	Blum	Fudge	Marino
Biggs	Flores	Lucas	Sinema	Titus	Westerman	Gabbard	Gabbard	Marshall
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires	Tonko	Williams	Blunt Rochester	Gaetz	Mast
Bishop (MI)	Foster	Lynch	Smith (MO)	Torres	Wilson (FL)	Bonomici	Gallagher	Matsui
Bishop (UT)	Foxo	MacArthur	Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (SC)	Bost	Gallego	McCarthy
Blackburn	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wittman	Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	McCaul
Blum	Frelinghuysen	Carolyn B.	Smith (TX)	Valadao	Womack	F.	Garrett	McClintock
Blumenauer	Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Vargas	Woodall	Brady (TX)	Gianforte	McCollum
Blunt Rochester	Gabbard	Marino	Smucker	Veasey	Yoder	Brat	Gibbs	McEachin
Bonomici	Gaetz	Marshall	Soto	Vela	Yoho	Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	McGovern
Bost	Gallagher	Mast	Stefanik	Velázquez	Young (AK)	Brooks (IN)	Gomez	McHenry
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	Matsui	Stewart	Wagner	Young (IA)	Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	McKinley
F.	Garamendi	McCarthy	Stivers	Walberg	Zeldin	Brownley (CA)	Goodlatte	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Garrett	McCaul	Suoizzi	Walden		Buchanan	Gosar	Rodgers
Brat	Gianforte	McClintock				Buck	Gottheimer	McNerney
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	McCollum	Aderholt	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)	Bucshon	Granger	McSally
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	McEachin	Barton	Kelly (PA)	Richmond	Budd	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Brown (MD)	Gomez	McGovern	Bishop (GA)	Kinzing	Roby	Burgess	Graves (LA)	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	McHenry	Black	Lamb	Roe (TN)	Bustos	Graves (MO)	Messer
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McKinley	Brady (PA)	Lawrence	Rohrabacher	Byrne	Green, Al	Mitchell
Buck	Gosar	McMorris	Cárdenas	Lipinski	Rooney, Thomas	Calvert	Green, Gene	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Gottheimer	Rodgers	Cleaver	Loeb sack	J.	Capuano	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Budd	Granger	McNerney	Graves, Danny	Lowe	Rush	Carbajal	Grothman	Moulton
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McSally	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)	Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Mullin
Bustos	Graves (LA)	Meadows	Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Scott (VA)	Carter (GA)	Handel	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Graves (MO)	Meng	F.	M.	Shea-Porter	Carter (TX)	Harper	Nadler
Byrne	Green, Al	Messer	Duffy	Marchant	Simpson	Cartwright	Harris	Napolitano
Calvert	Green, Gene	Mitchell	Ellison	Massie	Speier	Castor (FL)	Hartzler	Newhouse
Capuano	Griffith	Moolenaar	Gowdy	Meeks	Trott	Castro (TX)	Hastings	Noem
Carbajal	Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Grijalva	Moore	Tsongas	Chabot	Heck	Nolan
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Moulton	Gutiérrez	Neal	Visclosky	Cheney	Hensarling	Norcross
Carter (GA)	Handel	Mullin	Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Walz	Chu, Judy	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Carter (TX)	Harper	Murphy (FL)	Holding	Palmer	Wasserman	Clark (MA)	Hice, Jody B.	Nunes
Cartwright	Harris	Nadler	Huizenga	Pingree	Schultz	Clarke (NY)	Higgins (LA)	O'Halloran
Castor (FL)	Hartzler	Napolitano	Jackson Lee	Poe (TX)	Yarmuth	Higgins (NY)	Hill	Olson
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Newhouse	Johnson, Sam	Reed		Clay	Palazzo	Palazzo
Chabot	Heck	Noem	Kaptur	Renacci		Cloud	Himes	Pallone
Cheney	Hensarling	Nolan				Clyburn	Hollingsworth	Palmer
Chu, Judy	Herrera Beutler	Norcross				Coffman	Hoyer	Panetta
Cicilline	Hice, Jody B.	Norman				Cole	Hudson	Pascarell
Clark (MA)	Higgins (LA)	Nunes				Collins (GA)	Huffman	Paulsen
Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halloran				Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Payne
Clay	Hill	Olson				Comer	Hunter	Pearce
Cloud	Himes	Palazzo				Comstock	Hurd	Pelosi
Clyburn	Hollingsworth	Pallone				Conaway	Issa	Perlmutter
Coffman	Hoyer	Panetta				Connolly	Jayapal	Perry
Cohen	Hudson	Pascarell				Cook	Jeffries	Peters
Cole	Huffman	Paulsen				Cooper	Jenkins (WV)	Peterson
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Payne				Correa	Johnson (GA)	Pittenger
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pearce				Costa	Johnson (LA)	Pocan
Comer	Hurd	Pelosi				Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Poliquin
Comstock	Issa	Perlmutter				Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Conaway	Jayapal	Perry				Cramer	Jones	Posey
Connolly	Jeffries	Peters				Crawford	Jordan	Price (NC)
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Peterson				Crist	Joyce (OH)	Quigley
Cooper	Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger				Crowley	Katko	Raskin
Correa	Johnson (GA)	Pocan				Cuellar	Keating	Ratcliffe
Costa	Johnson (LA)	Poliquin				Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Polis				Cummings	Kennedy	Rice (SC)
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Posey				Curbelo (FL)	Khanna	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Jones	Price (NC)				Curtis	Kihuen	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Jordan	Quigley				Davidson	Kildee	Rokita
Crist	Joyce (OH)	Raskin				Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Rooney, Francis
Crowley	Katko	Ratcliffe				Davis, Rodney	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Keating	Reichert				DeFazio	King (IA)	Rosen
Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)				DeGette	King (NY)	Roskam
Cummings	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)				Delaney	Knight	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	Khanna	Rogers (KY)				DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi	Rothfus
Curtis	Kihuen	Rokita				DelBene	Kuster (NH)	Rouzer
Davidson	Kildee	Rooney, Francis				Demings	Kustoff (TN)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen				Denham	Labrador	Royce (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Kind	Rosen				DeSaulnier	LaHood	Ruiz
DeFazio	King (IA)	Roskam				DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ruppersberger
DeGette	King (NY)	Ross				Deutch	Lamborn	Russell
Delaney	Knight	Rothfus				Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rutherford
DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi	Rouzer				Dingell	Langevin	Sánchez
DelBene	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard				Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Sanford
Demings	Kustoff (TN)	Royce (CA)				Donovan	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Denham	Labrador	Ruiz				Duffy	Latta	Scalise
DeSaulnier	LaHood	Ruppersberger				Duncan (SC)	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Russell				Duncan (TN)	Lee	Schiff
Deutch	Lamborn	Rutherford				Dunn	Lesko	Schneider
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Sánchez				Emmer	Levin	Schrader
Dingell	Langevin	Sanford				Engel	Lewis (GA)	Schweikert
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes				Eshoo	Lewis (MN)	Scott, Austin
Donovan	Larson (CT)	Scalise				Espallat	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Schakowsky	Abraham	Amodei	Barletta	Estes (KS)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff	Adams	Arrington	Barr	Esty (CT)	Lofgren	Serrano
Dunn	Lee	Schneider	Aguilar	Babin	Barragán	Evans	Long	Sessions
Emmer	Lesko	Schrader	Allen	Bacon	Bass	Faso	Loudermilk	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Levin	Schweikert	Amash	Banks (IN)	Beatty	Ferguson	Love	Sherman

NOT VOTING—60

□ 1856

Mr. PERLMUTTER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPC. STERLING WILLIAM WYATT
POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4960) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the “SpC. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—368

Abraham	Amodei	Barletta
Adams	Arrington	Barr
Aguilar	Babin	Barragán
Allen	Bacon	Bass
Amash	Banks (IN)	Beatty

Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Shuster	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Sinema	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine
Sires	Tipton	Watson Coleman
Smith (MO)	Titus	Weber (TX)
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Torres	Welch
Smith (TX)	Turner	Wenstrup
Smith (WA)	Upton	Westerman
Smucker	Valadao	Williams
Soto	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Stefanik	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Stewart	Vela	Wittman
Stivers	Velázquez	Womack
Suozi	Wagner	Woodall
Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Yoder
Takano	Walden	Yoho
Taylor	Walker	Young (AK)
Tenney	Walorski	Young (IA)
Thompson (CA)	Walters, Mimi	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—60

Aderholt	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Barton	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Bishop (GA)	Kaptur	Renacci
Black	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Brady (PA)	Kelly (PA)	Richmond
Butterfield	Kinzinger	Roby
Cárdenas	Lamb	Roe (TN)
Ciilline	Lawrence	Rohrabacher
Cleaver	Lipinski	Rooney, Thomas
Davis, Danny	Loebach	J.
DeSantis	Lowey	Rush
Doyle, Michael	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
F.	Lujan Grisham,	Scott (VA)
Ellison	M.	Shea-Porter
Gowdy	Marchant	Simpson
Grijalva	Massie	Speier
Gutiérrez	Meeke	Trott
Hanabusa	Moore	Tsongas
Holding	Neal	Visclosky
Huizenga	O'Rourke	Walz
Jackson Lee	Pingree	Yarmuth

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MAYTEE SANZ

(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 tonight to recognize my dear friend and chief of staff, Maytee Sanz.

This week, the Congressional Hispanic Leadership Institute, CHLI, will honor Maytee with the Stephen Vermillion Congressional Staff Appreciation Award.

Oftentimes—most of the time—Members of Congress receive the praise for the excellent work of their staff. That has certainly been the case with Maytee. Leading my staff, Maytee has been instrumental in the effective functioning of my office and keeping our policy priorities on track and connected to the community.

Maytee started working with me since my early days in the Florida Legislature, a long time ago, and rose from her role as my district aide to become my congressional chief of staff. Along the way, she earned both her master's and bachelor's degrees from NSU, Nova Southeastern University, in addition to finding time to mentor many young men and women who have come through our office.

The CHLI Stephen Vermillion award is much-deserved, and South Florida has been well-served by having Maytee at the helm of our office.

Felicidades, Doctora Sanz.

ALARMING SURGE OF HATE GROUP AFFILIATION

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, there has been an alarming surge of hate group affiliation over the past year. Even more alarming is the reality that people who belong to these groups have been able to obtain security clearances. The intersection of hate groups and access to our country's secrets is something that I did not expect to exist, and I am determined to make sure that this does not continue.

Federal agencies should be required to report on how many clearance holders and applicants are associated with hate groups, and what is the status of their approval. The American people deserve to know if our government has decided that those who espouse a hateful ideology have access to our Nation's secrets.

I have introduced legislation to provide answers and to hopefully prohibit those associated with hate groups and who possess hateful ideology from having access to our most sensitive information.

I urge my colleagues to consider this legislation, and to, hopefully, see it on the House floor.

WORLD YOUTH SKILLS 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, Sunday was World Youth Skills Day. The United Nations General Assembly started this initiative to raise awareness about the importance of investing in youth skills development.

Young people are almost three times more likely to be unemployed than adults. Young people around the world are exposed to lower-quality jobs, greater labor market inequalities, and a longer school-to-work transition period.

That is why I am pleased the House unanimously approved my Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act last year, and it has seen action in the Senate as well.

Too often, we have seen students pushed down the college-for-all pathway that just doesn't work for some students. CTE has established itself as a path that many students choose in pursuit of industry certification and hands-on skills they can use right out of high school, in skill-based education programs, or in college.

By modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs, we will be able

to connect more educators with industry stakeholders and close the skills gap.

CTE is an important part of youth skills development, not only in the United States, but in nations around the world.

INDICTMENT OF 12 RUSSIAN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Special Counsel Robert Mueller handed down the most significant hacking indictment targeting a foreign power in history. Director Mueller alleges that 12 Russian military officers were responsible for breaking into political organizations, stealing sensitive documents, and disseminating them to undermine faith in American democracy. Friday's indictment will further shape the norms of responsible state behavior in cyberspace, and demonstrates our commitment to holding malicious actors accountable.

Yet, today, Mr. Speaker, not 3 days later, President Trump said he didn't see any reason to think that Russia carried out the election meddling.

Well, the President set it up as whether you believe U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies or Russia. However, this isn't a matter of belief, this is matter of fact; and the facts say the Russian government hacked us.

I hope that the President will finally acknowledge this, and I pray that my Republican colleagues will hold him accountable if he doesn't. And I thank Director Mueller for his ongoing work.

NATIONAL JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, almost 820,000 Minnesotans live with arthritis every day. When you think about arthritis, you likely think of it affecting only folks in their older years. But many of those Minnesotans coping with arthritis are actually children.

Nationwide, 300,000 children suffer from juvenile arthritis, which makes it harder to do all the things that are essential to being a kid: Running, playing, enjoying the outdoors, and a chance to be themselves. Families with children coping with this condition face very unique challenges.

We have made a lot of progress, Mr. Speaker, in the fight against juvenile arthritis, but there is still a lot of work to be done. July is National Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Month, an opportunity to recognize, to refocus, and redouble our efforts to find a cure.

□ 1915

RUSSIANS ARE NOT OUR FRIENDS

(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, now that the Manchurian President has come back from meeting with his holders in Helsinki, we need to look at what is going on here.

We were scolded today in another country by the President of the United States telling us how: Well, Russia has made mistakes. Well, we have made mistakes, too.

When has a President ever done that? And all my colleagues do is sit over there and don't say a word.

Let this have been some other President, it would be holy water in here.

He attacks women all the time—NANCY PELOSI, MAXINE WATERS, ELIZABETH WARREN, Megyn Kelly, Hillary Clinton, you name it. But then stands there next to the person that had everything to do with our elections being rigged or held up, and he stands there and says: Well, he said he didn't do it.

What is going on here? Is there any backbone?

The President of the United States doesn't have a backbone. What did I see today?

It used to be being called a communist was the worst thing you could call someone. Now they are our friends?

Wake up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TAX REFORM

(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 in recognition of the great news that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act continues to deliver for the people and small businesses of the Fifth District of South Carolina.

It has been almost 7 months since tax reform, and our economy is booming. People have a renewed hope and sense of security in their futures again.

Firsthand, I see small businesses in my district expanding and creating more jobs. New hires are at the highest level in 17 years. Small-business optimism is the highest in decades. Consumer confidence is at its highest in 2 decades.

I have directly heard from families who are seeing more hard-earned dollars remaining in their pockets. Because of our pro-growth policies, our economy, our families, and our businesses in my district and across the Nation will have strong futures.

Thanks to tax reform, South Carolinians and Americans are better off now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DERRICK "BO" TAYLOR

(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 Derrick "Bo" Taylor, who attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Bo was devoted to his two sons, Gregory and Kyle, and his girlfriend, Denise Cohen.

Bo worked for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for 29 years, where he rose to the rank of lieutenant.

Bo and Denise dated for several years and attended the Route 91 festival together, where, tragically, they both died.

Bo is remembered by his friends and family as being very well liked and respected, and a leader. He was dedicated to everyone in his life and was known as a true friend.

I would like to extend my condolences to Bo Taylor's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

IN RECOGNITION OF LYNDA DuRANT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent in my district, Mrs. Lynda DuRant, who saved her husband's life by bravely and correctly administering CPR in an emergency situation.

An educator in the Effingham County public school system, Mrs. DuRant used her CPR training to save her husband John's life when he suffered a significant cardiac event. The doctors said later that her immediate and proper use of CPR was crucial to his survival.

CPR has only a 10.6 percent success rate, because it is often performed incorrectly.

With early June being National CPR and AED Awareness Week, I encourage everyone to become certified in administering CPR.

Like Mrs. DuRant, you never know when you will be called upon in an emergency to save a life.

Thank you, Mrs. DuRant, for your brave action and for reminding us of the importance of this critical skill.

ESSENCE OF BETRAYAL

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today President Trump went to a foreign country and criticized his own country, the United States of America, while bowing and scraping to a foreign dictator, Putin.

Americans must ask this obvious question, and it is: Why does President Trump refuse to criticize Vladimir Putin about anything?

It must be because Putin knows something about President Trump that President Trump doesn't want the rest of us to know. If that is true, then President Trump has put his own well-being and interests above those of the Nation.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of betrayal. His actions have betrayed the confidence and the trust of the American people and could be called treasonous.

Sadly, Trump's supporters must look at themselves and think whether or not they were sold out by the dog whistle "Make America Great Again." They must now realize that the President has subjected himself to domination by the leader of the international white nationalist movement, Vladimir Putin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the USA has approximately 121 sites around the country that are storing nuclear waste in approximately 39 States. They are in temporary facilities, temporary storage that could be subject to all sorts of problems, whether it be terrorist attack or other issues with nature.

I had the chance recently to visit Yucca Mountain, the facility in Nevada that would be the repository for nuclear waste, if it could be approved and put in place.

I was impressed with what I saw for many key issues. Seismic activity is very low in the area, if any. We have an issue where it could be a very hardened site for attack. It would be very difficult to attack it. And the issues with groundwater are nil, since groundwater is so deep in the Nevada desert, well below the areas proposed.

We need to do something about this situation with nuclear waste being stored temporarily the way it is or with moving forward with a project like Yucca Mountain, which is the only one approved in the United States currently under the law.

Mr. Speaker, further delay means further peril for the way this stuff is being stored currently. We need to move forward on this.

TRUMP-PUTIN MEETING

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn President Trump's unpatriotic performance and feckless

groveling to Russian dictator Vladimir Putin at today's summit in Helsinki.

President Trump, no, no, no. Putin's Russia is not a competitor of the United States. His Russia is a fierce enemy of liberty in the United States and globally. Putin seeks every chance to undermine democratic institutions. He illegally invaded Ukraine and gunned down and poisoned freedom fighters like Boris Nemtsov.

Our European allies are not our foes, Mr. President. They are our trusted friends.

How can President Trump ignore the piercing sacrifice of bloodshed for liberty by thousands, hundreds of thousands of our countrymen and millions of our allies?

As one of America's rich sons, he chose to dodge the draft when his number came up, and I haven't been able to find any veteran from his family.

So I remind my colleagues of Patrick Henry's admonition: Give me liberty or give me death.

With our Constitution as our anchor, this legislative branch, Article I, must rise to meet its constitutional obligations to preserve liberty at all costs, placing country over party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAN CARSON

(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 Dan Carson from Norwich, New York, who started an adaptive baseball program for individuals with physical and intellectual challenges.

Seven years ago, Dan Carson started the Baseball Buddies game at the Norwich Little League field behind the middle school, and now it has grown into a huge community event.

The program recently hosted its annual game, where about 25 past or present players from the Norwich Purple Tornados were paired with special needs students. For these kids, the game is about more than baseball. The players and buddies form lifelong friendships and learn valuable lessons from each other.

Most students with special needs do not have the opportunity to participate in team sports in high school, but this game is an exception.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Dan for all his work that he has done to create a place where, regardless of ability, children can participate in the great American pastime. I know I speak for everyone when I say, "Play ball."

TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time tonight. It is my hope tonight that we will have a discussion in our country and in this historic Chamber on trade policy. I am delighted that two of my good colleagues have joined me to carry on this discussion.

A key tenet of international economic policy for the Trump administration has been to improve U.S. bilateral and multilateral trade arrangements with an eye toward enforcing reciprocity with our trading partners as it relates to tariff levels and the elimination of nontariff barriers. The goal: to simply achieve more market access for American goods and services.

Mr. Trump recognized this, campaigned on free and fair trade, and routinely emphasizes the importance of reciprocity between trading partners. He has stated that he prefers bilateral arrangements over multilateral arrangements by indicating that he did not want to pursue the Transpacific Partnership or the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, one with Asia partners and one with the EU.

While it is true that bilateral treaties are easier to negotiate and acquire, select multilateral arrangements can achieve broad geopolitical and geo-economic strategic objectives.

In the case of TPP, it could, potentially, significantly leverage the economic clout of China in Southeast Asia and obviously link longstanding free trade partners across the transatlantic region with the TTIP.

President Trump has also initiated the effort to improve the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, among the United States, Mexico, and Canada. He has called this agreement one of the worst ever, but has offered concrete ways to improve it and modernize it for current conditions in Mexico, Canada, and the United States. No doubt, these are, in fact, significantly different than back in 1992 when the NAFTA agreement was arranged.

This work continues in earnest, and I am pleased that the administration has made significant strides in improving NAFTA between Canada and Mexico over the past year, something that I think is very important in my home State of Arkansas, where Mexico and Canada are absolutely the largest trading partners that our companies and farmers have in my home State.

President Trump's objectives of changing the mercantilistic trade policies of China have proven more challenging. Tonight, we will talk about the President's strategy, because we want the United States to have an opportunity in China. We want a more open China trading process. We want more goods and services made in America sold in China.

But over the last 3 decades, China has developed into one of the world's largest and fastest growing economies,

but also one of the world's largest protectionist economies, putting up barriers to American goods and services in both tariff matters and in nontariff ways.

□ 1930

We are going to talk about that tonight, and I would like to start by talking about that with my friend from Ohio. What is interesting is that this strategy of getting at a more open China, ending a more mercantilistic trading policy with China has taken a couple courses of action: one, the President has imposed section 301 under the Trade Act of 1974, going after China's intellectual property theft in the U.S., their ability to compel U.S. companies or companies from the European Union to give up their intellectual property in order to do business in China, clearly a violation. And so the President has proposed a 301 investigation and tariffs related to that.

He has also imposed tariffs under the 1962 act for national security purposes across the board on steel and aluminum—all countries, all products. And that is very challenging, Mr. Speaker, because, if the real issue is getting at China, the world's largest subsidizer and dumper of steel and aluminum, this may not be the most successful strategy to accomplish. That could, in fact, be a distraction from our ultimate objective in opening China.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), my friend, so that we can have his perspective on tariffs and trade and how we can improve and be more successful in getting the outcomes that we want.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress 2 years ago, I spent 15 years building manufacturing companies. I have been personally on the receiving end of bad trade policy and bad trade practices. So, in 2016, when President—then candidate, now President—Trump talked about making America great again by dealing with bad trade deals and bad trade practices, frankly, he energized me and many other people in my industry, in the manufacturing sector, and, indeed, all across the country because America has lived with bad consequences of bad trade deals.

In fact, America has built its history on trade. Truly, economic liberty is as much a part of America's history as religious liberty and other forms of liberty. We were the world's largest trading country. We are a great trading power in every way you can measure it. We do have trade deficits with some countries, but we have to pay attention to the right metrics.

So when we talk about bad trade practices and bad trade policies, we talk about, to use an analogy, watching basketball. Think how the sport would change if there were no fouls called and no one could shoot free throws. These are the kinds of things that happened with the WTO. Eventually, after, sometimes, years of filing a

complaint, the WTO will adjudicate a subsidy practice by China on steel, for example, and then they will say: Hey, you have to stop.

Well, the moment a complaint is filed, the Chinese company just dumps faster because they know that it is going to be turned off. The trouble is there is no consequence for this bad conduct.

So what I had hoped we would be doing is we would be using our great relationships around the world to unite our allies, our best trading partners, frankly, people who are also the victims of these bad trade practices and bad trade policies, to take action against those bad practices so that we can define what is a foul and what is the effective free throw. What are the consequences?

I believe that the President's goals are being poorly served by some of his advisers and I hope that the President will change course, because what we are doing has resulted in failure in every type of war studied, from Sun Tzu through World War II, through more modern wars.

When you multiply your enemies, you are not winning, and we are doing that with the practices that some of the administration is implementing, things that implement uniform tariffs, things that distort the very definition of a national security issue to call German luxury autos a national security issue.

We have tools in the kit bag that could be very effective, tools like sanctions. When we engage in warfare, when we engage with enemies of our country that are strategic enemies, we have sanctions in place against Russia, sanctions in place against Iran, and sanctions in place against North Korea.

The beauty of sanctions is they can be targeted not just as a country or a sector; they can be targeted to companies and even individuals. We can use these things to restrict the flow, and we can define what is illicit finance.

We can use these tools that the world uses already against bad actors and, frankly, some of the worst actors in the world to unite our allies and to define a better way for trade going forward.

So we shouldn't confuse this with a critique of the objective. The objective is, indeed, noble and necessary. Past trade practices, past Presidential policies have left America on the short end. True, as Milton Friedman said:

If countries want to subsidize the cost of a good, let them. They are just lowering the cost for our consumers.

But we can't simply be a nation of consumers. We need people to put capital at risk in America to thrive, and for our great industries, whether it is agriculture or manufacturing or technology, for the intellectual property to flourish here. We have the best markets for goods, services, intellectual property, capital, and we need to make sure that we defend that.

I applaud President Trump for being passionate about putting America first

in these practices, but I do believe that we need to look at the tactics that have been employed by many who have advised him and say, "Is this multiplying our enemies?" And, in fact, it is.

I hope we can move forward in a better way and we can serve this great country by restoring trade to its right and proper place as a vibrant part of our economy. Exports drive our economy, but imports can benefit our economy. Trade is exactly that.

Trade is something of value for both parties. Both profit when trade is there. A zero-sum understanding is not the right way to look at trade. We benefit and so do others; and it is okay that they benefit, because then they are able to buy more from us in trade.

The practices that are in place today give us a chance to assess the progress, and I think it is vital that we do that. It is vital that we keep this economy doing the great things that it has under President Trump's leadership, under congressional leadership.

We were told that the new normal was a 1.5 percent growth rate, that we couldn't grow at the high rate. With regulatory relief and tax reform, our economy is growing higher than 3 percent, and we certainly don't want to do anything that would derail that momentum.

I am encouraged by Mr. HILL's dialogue tonight, and I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak. I know we have other colleagues who would like to as well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio. He is a valued member of the House Financial Services Committee, and his decades of work in private business and in manufacturing is ideal for this discussion. He knows about intermediate goods manufacturing and how a lot of those parts are made domestically, but some parts, critical parts, might be made abroad. Nonetheless, they allow us to create a competitive manufactured good here in the United States, employ Americans, and then potentially sell that domestically or export it to, yet again, another country. I appreciate his manufacturing expertise.

We are also joined tonight by my friend from Illinois, a distinguished member of the House Ways and Means Committee, DARIN LAHOOD, who comes from America's heartland of agriculture and can speak to the issue of how do we achieve this outcome that we want: more open markets, fairer and reciprocal trade, but how do we do that in a way that minimizes the impact on American consumers and our agricultural producers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), my friend.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, FRENCH HILL, for organizing tonight's Special Order on trade. I want to associate my thoughts tonight with the comments made by Congressman DAVIDSON and also with Congressman FRENCH HILL.

Mr. Speaker, I would just start off and say that it is imperative that we,

as Members of Congress, come together to stress to the President and his administration the importance of free trade.

When I look back over the last year and a half of his administration, I applaud the President and his leadership in working with us to roll back regulation, have reasonable regulation in place, and also once-in-a-lifetime tax reform that he was able to get passed, along with this Congress, two accomplishments that have jump-started our stagnant economy, and we are seeing the results.

However, I think we do ourselves a real disservice to the work that we have already done on this economy by engaging in a trade war. I think we go backwards in terms of the economic progress that we are making to get in a long-term trade war.

Mr. DAVIDSON referenced it a little, but it is frustrating and disappointing to see several staff members with the President who are unelected and unconfirmed who are trade protectionists. They have the ear of the President when it comes to implementing trade policy, and that is, again, frustrating. These protectionists are failing to take the time and recognize the long-term costs of the recent tariff actions and our current position as it comes to renegotiating NAFTA and other trade agreements on our economy.

I have said this many times before when I think back to the election. Our President wasn't elected by people on the East Coast or the West Coast. It was people in the Midwest, people from rural America, people from the South who helped elect him. And, unfortunately, these are the folks who are left the worst off by these trade policies that are being put in place currently by the administration.

As we move forward in this Congress, we need to carefully examine how much authority the legislative branch has ceded over time to the executive branch. I credit my colleague, WARREN DAVIDSON, for introducing a piece of legislation that I am a cosponsor of that would help take back a little of that authority under our Constitution, to have more input from Congress on that. We need to talk more about that, managing our trade policies to determine how best to restore our constitutional authority. Our other colleague, Congressman GALLAGHER of Wisconsin, has also introduced a piece of legislation that also does the same thing.

We have no choice or alternative with the current world that we live in. We live in a globalized world with supply chains set and marketplaces and customers continuing to grow, but we need to be engaged. Given that 95 percent of the world's customers live outside of the United States, we tend to forget that we represent about 4.5 percent of the world's population.

There is no doubt that we produce the best goods; we produce the best products; we have the best workers. But you have got to have markets. You

have got to have customers around the world for those products to go to support free and fair trade.

I think about Illinois. Illinois is the sixth largest State in the country. Ag is the number one industry in the State of Illinois. It is the number one in my district. When I think about Illinois, for example, global trade supports over 1,700,000 jobs in Illinois. Ensuring that our manufacturers and farmers have access to markets around the world to sell their goods is vital to their ability to remain competitive and our economic success.

The district that I represent, Illinois' 18th Congressional District, spans central and west central Illinois. We are proud to be home to some of the world's most respected manufacturers, including companies like John Deere, Caterpillar, and CNH.

We are also home to some of the world's most fertile farmland. We have the eighth largest district in the country in terms of corn and soybean production in the country. About 40 percent of the corn and soybeans grown in my district go somewhere else around the world. They get put on barges on the Illinois and Mississippi River, go down that river through New Orleans, through the Gulf, through the new Panama Canal, and go anywhere around the world.

But when you put up tariffs and barriers, you restrict those farmers from getting their goods all across the world. Unfortunately, these days, manufacturing and agriculture communities like mine across the country face uncertainty and dark days ahead. That is because of our current trade policy.

While I applaud the President's intent to go after bad actors in the global marketplace, his approach and the resulting retaliation has put our American workers and products in jeopardy, with no end in sight. The administration's reckless and frequent use of tariffs, some premised on national security, which I think is a fallacy, threaten to spark an all-out trade war in this country and around the world.

We have already seen retaliation on American-made products from some of our closest allies like Canada, Mexico, and the EU. In addition, China, which consumes a third of the world's soybeans, has also followed suit.

In Illinois, total State exports threatened by new tariffs have reached over \$3.8 million. Instead of tariffs, which are simply taxes passed on to consumers, our approach to address unfair trading practices should be targeted to minimize collateral damage and should include specific and clear end goals, which we have not seen.

Bottom line, we must pursue targeted trade enforcement policies that minimize harm to American farmers, our rural communities, and our manufacturers.

□ 1945

We know that our agriculture industry is typically first and hardest hit by

any trade retaliation. To make things worse, our farmers are already at a disadvantage compared to other foreign competitors given the lack of free trade agreements that the U.S. has compared to other countries, especially in the Asian markets. It was referenced earlier that TPP which, of course, is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, is going on without us.

I look back at this administration. There was a lot of talk when they came in about bilateral trade agreements. We are 19 months into this administration, and we don't have one—not one—bilateral trade agreement. There was a lot of talk about putting those in place.

Part of the reason we have not had that is they have run from us because of our position and what we have asked for in those bilateral trade agreements.

The loss of marketplace due to tariffs will be extremely hard to regain and may not be possible to regain at all.

The administration's go at it alone approach is clearly not as effective as with working with our allies to negotiate a solution to global oversupply and technology theft perpetrated by countries like China, and there is no doubt they have done that. The forced technology transfers and the stealing of our technology should be addressed. But there are better ways to do that in a strategic and a precise way, partnering with our allies to do that, but we can't do that going at it alone, and we can't do it premised on national security.

Lastly, let me just say that we have heard a lot about surpluses. We have heard a lot about trade deficits. It seems like the administration is fixated on trade deficits.

I will tell you, in agriculture we have a trade surplus with every country in the world. Think about the collateral damage that is going to be done to those farmers and those ag products by engaging in a trade war. We do need to address the trade deficit, but it is a complicated, nuanced issue that we ought to address.

There are lots of things we can do to change that instead of the path we are heading down right now.

At the end of the day, our farmers want trade, not aid. In a free market system, it shouldn't be based on subsidies or aid. So we need to, again, continue to work with this administration on our proper oversight, taking back some of our constitutional authority to make sure that we are getting the message across that we need to have free and open trade that is going to benefit our farmers, our manufacturers, and working people all across this country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. LAHOOD from Illinois, for his expertise in agriculture and these markets. I think it is very important to have his example.

I might react by saying the gentleman was talking about the power of working together. I was reflecting that if we were working together to lever-

age the challenges of China, we are about 15 percent of two-way trade with China. The European Union is about 15 percent or so of trade with China. Japan is another seven. Clearly working together on some of these issues that we have in common would give us more leverage.

Let me just outline four key objectives I think of U.S. trade policy with China that I believe would be shared by those two other groups that I mentioned, the European Union and Japan.

Ensure China fully complies with its obligations as a member of the WTO, including the beneficial agreements on government procurement, information technology, environmental goods agreement, and a trade and services agreement. These are things, Mr. Speaker, that we have worked on bilaterally and multilaterally since China entered the WTO in 2001, an admission I think now that many people question, was China really ready to join the World Trade Organization in 2001?

That is number one.

Number two, that we fully protect U.S. intellectual property rights and establish ways and means to cease government-directed cyber theft of U.S. trade secrets and intellectual property both for commercial and national security reasons.

I am reminded that Ambassador Winston Lord, the U.S. Ambassador to Beijing in 1989, when he was briefing President Bush 41 in preparation of his first foreign trip. President Bush's first foreign trip in February of 1989 was to China where he had served as our representative back in the 1970s. Ambassador Lord wrote that memo to the President and said:

You have got to talk about religious freedom, human rights. You have got to talk about Taiwan. You have got to talk about Tibet. And you have got to talk about theft of intellectual property.

This was in February, 1989, Mr. Speaker, and we are still debating that issue today, unresolved. I would say that the European Union shares that view.

Now, here is the amusing point. Ambassador Lord and the State Department team, when they sent that memo to President Bush 41, said that it was in its eighth printing, and they were sorry that the author wasn't getting any royalties for it. Meaning, we have been talking about this since we established diplomatic relations with China back in 1979, and we have been fighting this intellectual property theft.

Number three, seek changes in China's extensive industrial policies which protect domestic sectors and firms, particularly China's state-owned industries. China's objective is for these state-owned enterprises to be global competitors compatible with other trading partners, but they are not. They are state-owned. They are state-subsidized.

Finally, fourth, promote changes to industrial policies that provide open

and reciprocal treatment for American exporters of goods and services by reducing nontariff barriers and making China's tariff level comparable with U.S. tariffs.

I think those four things, Mr. Speaker, is what all of us agree on tonight, and I think they would benefit the European Union as well. But I think my friends have made a good case that if we were to partner with the E.U. and with Japan, we would have a lot more economic clout in delivering on that negotiating posture.

I would ask my friend from Ohio, does he share that view? What are his thoughts about what are alternative strategies maybe in the steel and aluminum area?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL.

I want to agree with the importance of bringing allies to the table to address those practices.

There are four, and there are several others that we would probably agree on. In a way, I think the thing that our President respects about China is they put China first. They have used all the resources of their nation really since 1989, since Deng Xiaoping transformed China's economy to a more market-oriented economy.

They are not a market-oriented economy. That was one of the things they committed to do as part of joining the World Trade Organization. They are a command-driven economy in many respects. They have made great progress since 1989 to being market oriented. Frankly, since 2008, they have gone the other way in some of their practices.

If you look at the revolutionary idea, though, the idea that lives can be changed by trade and capitalism, China under Deng Xiaoping, at the peak, they were using communism with Communist principles, and he introduced to them communism with Chinese principles, which was essentially capitalism as long as we can stay in charge.

It is a corrupt, subsidized form of capitalism, but at its peak, it was lifting 1 million Chinese people a month out of dollar-a-day poverty.

Trade was a key part of this, inflows of foreign direct investment to reach this massive market. Today General Motors sells more cars in China than they sell in the United States of America.

This is a better path than the one I expected. When I graduated from high school in 1988, Mr. Gorbachev had not torn down the Berlin Wall. By the end of 1989 when I was there, unfortunately bad things had happened in Tiananmen Square in China, but, thankfully, great things happened at the Berlin Wall. I was fortunate to be able to see people there. I met a man who was from East Germany in his first hours of freedom who said: Is it like this everywhere?

We were in the Ku'damm district—kind of like Times Square is in New

York—in Berlin. I thought he meant how big the city was. But what he really meant was the stores were open at night, and there is fresh milk, as he said. He was astonished that regular people, even foreigners, could go in, and the shelves had stock.

This is the idea of economic liberty. This has produced abundance wherever it has been tried. Where the other ideas, the redistribution that Mao tried every version of Marxist Communist ideology that he could think of, and they all failed. They produced scarcity, poverty, and depravity. By engaging in the world, China transformed their economy. That is something to respect. I think the President admires the way that they put China first.

But the reality is in putting China first, they have engaged all the resources of the country to where in 2014 we saw that President Obama had to take action against hackers. In fact, they were indicted. But did President Obama cut off all relations and trade with China? He did not. He engaged in diplomacy with China.

I think it is great that we engage with Russia. Perhaps even Russia will see a market-oriented economy. They started out that way in the 1990s. But they also proved that deficits do matter. This is something that the whole West wrestles with, and it is another thing that we could unite in agreeing with.

I hope we can also get to ways we can unite here, because, as Mr. LAHOOD mentioned, the Global Trade Accountability Act is not an adversarial bill. It doesn't even go retroactive to the actions that have occurred in the past. It does get Congress engaged. It gets Congress engaged because the same benefits of cooperation, the same benefits of multiplying our allies instead of multiplying our enemies, could happen here in Congress where we multiply the people working on the problem.

We want to join our President in taking action against bad actors and in making our trade policy better than it has been even with the Canadians—they have bad trade practices that we can improve. Even with the Europeans; they have bad trade practices that we can improve upon.

Great friends work through problems and I feel like that is the reality that we have with our friends. Here in Congress, the President has great friends. I would consider the three of us some of his great friends, not adversaries, in the goal we are concerned, I think, about the means of getting to that, and the Global Trade Accountability Act would simply say that Congress works with the President who leads the negotiations similar to the REINS Act. Where Congress can come alongside and say we do it, what would that mean? Well, that would mean that the President is more engaged. But it's really the President's advisors. Men like Peter Navarro, instead of refusing to come talk to Ways and Means, would engage with our chairman,

would engage with our committee dealing with trade, and would, in fact, develop a plan instead of criticize their own failure to plan after the fact.

How do we know this?

This is an example. We have a uniform tariff policy that probably never should have been implemented, that has got a chance for exclusions. We have over 20,000 companies that want exclusions right now. Commerce is doing them not sector by sector, but company by company; not commodity by commodity, but company by company.

There are only six people working on this massive task. Were there to be required engagement, I believe there would have been a better plan in that collaborative approach, and perhaps a different course of action.

I look forward to seeing other ways that you all might think that we could collaborate and make the great cause of making our trade agreements better and more productive.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio.

It is quite clear that in Article I the Congress exclusively in an enumerated power has the power of regulating commerce between foreign nations and, of course, we know setting duties, levies, and taxes as an Article I power. I think you make an important component, just like Congress partnered with the executive branch on how to rightsize certain overregulation in our economy from the previous administration or how Congress collaborated with the Treasury Department in designing tax reforms to make America more competitive to have people bring business back to the U.S., not be double taxed on foreign earnings. In both of those examples, as you note, we collaborated, the executive branch and the legislative branch.

So I do think that also would strengthen the sequencing of our strategy to get at the heart of what I think our key challenges are which revolve around access into China.

I ask my friend, Mr. LAHOOD, does he have thoughts on this line of discussion?

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL.

The gentleman laid out four different objectives which I think are very pertinent. The gentleman mentioned state-owned enterprises. I think about that in China, and I think about how in many ways they have cheated the system and done things, but this is a problem that has been going on for a long time.

One of the requirements with any trade agreement is you have to have enforcement. I don't think we have had proper enforcement like we need when it comes to a number of these initiatives we have had over a series of 20, 25 years. But enforcement is important.

That means law enforcement. It means getting the Department of Justice involved holding bad actors accountable. But I think you have more

ability to do that and more leverage if you partner with the E.U., you partner with Japan, you partner with our other allies to do that. We simply haven't done that.

I think, again, going at it alone is not the right approach to take.

Are there things we ought to be working on to change?

Of course. There are rules we should change. We should engage on a number of these issues. We should hold a number of the bad actors accountable. But disengaging, putting up tariffs, and putting up barriers are the frustrating parts to me because I have not seen what is the ultimate goal with this strategy.

What is the endgame?

How do we land this plane eventually?

That is what is frustrating to me. What I try to explain to my farmers and my manufacturers in the district is: How does this all end?

I have worked with the White House on a number of issues and been a strong ally with them, but there is clearly a division in the White House. You have the protectionist wing and you have the free-trader wing.

□ 2000

There are many good people who have talked about the importance of free trade—Secretary Perdue, Ambassador Branstad to China, Secretary Mnuchin, Larry Kudlow—people who support the free enterprise system, support trade. Gary Cohn was in that group.

On the other side, you have the more protectionist wing. Again, from them, we have not seen how this all ends, giving us some confidence this is going to work out. That is the frustrating part, again, for our constituency and my farmers and manufacturers moving forward.

We have talked a lot about China and what they have engaged in and what they have done, whether, again, it is forced technology transfers. In a lot of ways, what they do with American companies that come over there or foreign companies is a form of extortion: Give us your technology, make us a part of it, and then we will let you come into the country.

Well, we ought to be stronger in going after them. There are mechanisms and ways, and there are success stories in doing that. But we pulled out of TPP, and that is something the President ran on.

But what has happened since we pulled out of TPP? All those other countries have gravitated towards China, Southeast Asia. They have gravitated towards them without us. So we are left out, being on our own. I don't think that is good, long term, when we need marketplaces and we need customers to engage with.

Being isolated is not the right approach to take on this. We need to, again, engage the White House and particularly try to understand the path we

are on and the end game here moving forward.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Illinois mentioned enforcement. I was looking in the archives this week when I was thinking about China, and I found an article that I wrote back in 1996 as a private citizen about the Clinton administration's China policy.

The paragraph on China and trade reads like this:

China, as a world power, for her part, must recognize that bilateral and multilateral treaties are to be enforced. Lack of compliance with international treaty obligations must produce a known and delivered set of sanctions by the world community. China must clearly understand the consequences of noncompliance.

I would argue so strongly about the gentleman's point that have we—when I say “we,” I mean the United States, in the past two decades, the European Union as an entity and others—have we done a good job at enforcing those norms and those treaty provisions and those basic tenets of being a WTO member aggressively and collectively against China? I would argue we have a mixed record at best. But I think the gentleman makes a very good point about enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we have made great progress towards that end in uniting on trying to take a difference course of action. Just recently, we passed updated export controls and CFIUS regulation to try to give more tools to the kit bag.

Who is going to execute this? The executive branch. But the legislative branch passed the law, the House, the Senate. We are working to get the final package to agree on language—not just against China, but anybody who would steal our intellectual property, anybody who would take targeted action to harm our economy or put their citizens in a position to do that harm—and also try to strike the balance.

Here is the thing. We can have perfect security for America's intellectual property by exporting zero of it, but we can't do that. What we have to do is find a balance that says: We want you to innovate in the United States of America; we want the ideas to continue to originate here; we want the capital to be invested here to create those great ideas; but we do want to have some concern.

You mentioned the Clinton administration. One of the first actions Bill Clinton took as President was to move release authority for sensitive information from the Department of Defense into the Department of Commerce.

And what happened?

Swiftly, Hughes worked with China to be able to help send them launch vehicles off of one rocket. One rocket went up into the air, multiple low-Earth orbit satellites went around, precisely positioned in orbit around the Earth. The down side is that is the exact same technology that can be

used to send warheads to multiple cities after one launch vehicle penetrates U.S. airspace. This is dangerous technology in the wrong hands.

So we have to find a way to review those things and keep America safe, but we also have to find a way to have the ideas and the intellectual property initiate here.

We can't shut down all these in the name of national security. We certainly don't want to shut down the production of luxury automobiles. But we might want to restrict the trade there.

China is actually targeting our entrepreneurs. We have some of the best education in the world, and the world comes here to become well-educated. Over 50 percent of our graduate and postgraduate students are not native-born Americans.

We allow, frankly, most of the world to come here to get educated. Unfortunately, we don't retain enough of that talent. So we send many of those people out of here with those skills that can be put to work in our marketplace.

But in the process, Chinese capital sometimes and, frankly, other foreign nationals are getting into venture capital. They are on our campuses. They are recruiting our talented people. They also are looking to buy our innovative ideas for dual use, but sometimes only to advance their own technology.

The challenge today is that China has had this mixed blend of aggressive behavior towards us. They have also seen the benefits of trade. They have seen the benefits of the flow of goods, services, capital, and, in some cases, people, and they have brought those to bear to benefit their own economy.

Today, nearly a third of initial public offerings are taking place in China. This is a challenge. And I would say we are better off finding a way to compete in the marketplace than as I thought I would as a soldier, which I never thought I would go to China without body armor and a rucksack full of ammo and night vision goggles and whatnot. I would rather trade with them.

I hope we can stay on friendly terms with them. I hope we can get on friendly terms with Russia, when it is possible. As much as it depends on us, we should live at peace with everyone.

But we do have to trade. We do have to enforce the rules. We do need law and order. We have made many of these commitments, including commitments in the WTO. We should insist that China live up to their obligation and become a market-oriented economy.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the steel and aluminum tariffs across the board. I have raised that issue before I was joined by many Members of the Congress on that issue because I felt like it came out of the blue to Members of Congress engaged in trade policy, whether on the House Financial Services Committee or on the House Ways and Means Committee, and that it was sweeping in its nature.

It has produced the challenge you talked about that 20,000 American businesses are trying to seek an exclusion from that.

I have several in my district, Mr. Speaker, who make the steel belts and steel-belted radial tires who are hurting. These are companies in Arkansas that use a steel rod that is not made in America, Mr. Speaker, and that is spun into the steel belt that is sold to the tire manufacturing industry. They are being hurt by this kind of across-the-board steel and aluminum tariff.

If we are concerned about a good, healthy aluminum industry for national security purposes and a good, healthy steel industry for national security purposes, then we ought to go after, directly, the world's largest dumper of steel and aluminum, which is China and their state-owned enterprise sector with their subsidies, and not sweep up everyone engaged in that intermediate goods manufacturing in America, not penalize our partners in Europe who share that concern with us, who could help us go after that.

Ambassador Lighthizer made a comment. He said: Well, one of the key reasons for going across the board like that was the risk of transshipment risk, in other words, violating the rules of origin, passing Chinese subsidized or dumped steel through a third country into the U.S., like Mexico, for example, or Canada, for example, just to name two possibilities.

That got me thinking: Well, surely—back on my friend from Illinois' comment about enforcement—there is a more elegant way to tackle what is really a regulatory issue, a transshipment risk, rule of origin risk. Why don't we see what others are doing?

So I looked at Canada. Just in March of this year, Mr. Speaker, the Canadians put in place a whole new regulatory regime working with the Americans to block rules of origin changes or transshipments of Chinese steel or aluminum through Canada. And, likewise, we have worked with the EU; and the OECD has their own steel committee that works to, on a regular basis, block that kind of work.

So I just wonder, if we had consulted and worked together, perhaps we could have taken a more sophisticated route at stopping steel and aluminum dumping that is damaging our American industry. We do need a protective steel and aluminum industry in this country, no doubt.

We also have good friends like Canada, good allies who produce it, but that is not to say that we don't want to have a vibrant industry here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the national security issue and premising much of this on national security, I didn't serve in the military, but national security is not something that should be used lightly. So when I saw that being used by this administration, I went to the experts and talked to people

in our military. I think we saw early on that General Mattis was interviewed. He didn't think very highly that this was a national security risk.

Talk to any of our top brass in the military and I don't think you will find anybody that supports this. I don't think you have seen anybody in the administration from the military that has come out to support this as a national security threat, because it is not, in my view. I think it is a faulty premise to go forth on this. I think, eventually, when it gets to the WTO, I don't think it is going to stand up.

I think that, again, gets back to our credibility in going about this. We have got to be very careful when we put our prestige of the United States out there and rely on national security when you can't even find our own defense apparatus and our security folks out there who think this is a proper basis to do this.

So that concerns me, moving forward, and I think, again, puts us in a tough position, again, being more isolated and not having other like-minded allies to help us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, prior to being here, I worked in the manufacturing sector. I worked in metal stamping.

One of the challenges, as Mr. HILL highlighted, is the tariffs are only on the commodity. Frankly, they are blunt force. They are all steel, all aluminum.

The reality is some grades of steel, some grades of aluminum are commodity. Beverage cans, for example, are a commodity. We make it in the U.S.; they make it in Canada. Everywhere they consume lots of beverages, there is a significant ability to produce this grade of aluminum.

So the idea that we would target that isn't necessarily changing our market, but where it is, there are things like the grades of rod that your tire manufacturers are or a similar rod for welding wire. Welding wire is highly automated.

So we have got domestic welding wire manufacturers who already weren't the lowest cost provider. China, India, South Korea all heavily subsidize their welding wire manufacturers. Having domestic welding wire manufacturers probably is a national security issue.

We want the base rod to be made in the U.S. Some of those grades aren't. But soon, if we don't get exclusions to our domestic welding wire manufacturers, we won't have the manufacturer of welding wire either.

Meanwhile, their cost for the steel has gone up by 25 percent or more because of the tariffs and they are losing market share. They don't have a year or 2 to wait for the exclusions review. They are losing business now. And the size they are could kill their companies.

Some of these companies are big enough to just shift production off-

shore, as we have seen other people do, but some of the smaller companies don't have that option. They will live or die on whether or not they can get a government-mandated exclusion to a government-created problem that restricts their ability to buy the aluminum.

So we either have to put tariffs on the secondary goods—so you can see where this goes—and then they will put tariffs on the secondary goods, or we have to find a way where we say it is a national security issue for us to get this capability in the U.S. We want that capability, but we have to go about it the other way.

I believe passionately that it is the sanctions. As you alluded to your own articles in the sixties, you have to take sanctions action.

When you talk about how you deal with transshipments, we already deal with transshipments for national security purposes. And it is targeted.

The sanctions protocol offers a path forward. I hope we can engage on that. I hope we can pass the Global Trade Accountability Act to provide a check, and I hope that more of our colleagues will engage in this sort of discussion. I hope colleagues across the aisle can engage in it, not necessarily to be an attack on our President or our policies, but as a gateway to support economic liberty that has indeed made America the land of opportunity.

□ 2015

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time of my colleagues tonight on the floor. We have worked hard tonight to talk about how do we have a more constructive partnership between the executive branch and the legislative branch like we do in designing economic policy, tax policy, regulatory reform policy, like this excellent description that Mr. DAVIDSON gave of how we created a modernized CFIUS approach for reviewing investments into the United States.

We had full engagement with General Mattis at the Pentagon, Secretary Mnuchin at the Treasury Department, Secretary Ross at the Commerce Department, and the White House, with Senator CORNYN in the United States Senate, ANDY BARR, ROBERT PITTINGER here in the House working to create a collaborative approach regarding how to have a great national security policy for investment in the U.S.

I think we have all argued here tonight that, with our Article I engagement in the House Financial Services Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, we want to be a constructive partner on accomplishing the President's objective, which is fair and reciprocal trade, first and foremost, with China, and to finally break this cycle we have talked about tonight of inadequacy, of holding them to account, making progress, enforcing their rules of the road under WTO, all with a heart toward helping our consumers, having more choice, more free

trade, more opportunity to expand our economy, not contract, as we get into a downward spiral on a tariff-only strategy.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work successfully with this administration on a new and modern NAFTA and with a successful set of trading arrangements with our friends in Europe and in Asia.

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

HIGH STAKES ON THE HIGH COURT: JUSTICE HANGING IN THE BALANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am with great honor that I rise today to anchor this CBC Special Order hour. I would like to thank our Congressional Black Caucus chairman, Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana, for his leadership in this effort.

For the next hour, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the 78 million constituents we represent. Tonight's Special Order hour theme is High Stakes on the High Court: Justice Hanging in the Balance.

As one-fourth of the Democratic Caucus, we are emphatic in our opposition of Donald Trump's USA Supreme Court nominee, Brett Kavanaugh.

During the 2016 election, a then-candidate Trump, in his sole attempt to appeal to African American voters, asked: "What do you have to lose?"

Well, it turns out, my fellow Americans, we have so much to lose. In fact, we have lost already under Donald Trump.

Every time Donald Trump and the congressional Republicans undermine and sabotage healthcare, Black and Brown folks lose.

When congressional Republicans and Donald Trump give their billionaire donors and the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans such a massive tax cut and then raise taxes on low and middle class families, working class families, Black and Brown folks, lose.

When Donald Trump threatened temporary protected status, TPS, Black and Brown folks lost.

And with the recent announcement of Brett Kavanaugh as the President's

nominee, Black and Brown folks now have even more to lose.

The stakes have never been higher. For nearly eight decades, African Americans have arduously, through generations of sacrifice and protest, successfully fought to secure historic legal victories that have significantly bent the moral arc of the universe towards justice. Republicans want to destroy a generation of progress for civil rights, women's rights, LGBTQ rights, workers' rights, and healthcare.

Brett Kavanaugh's nomination solidifies the Republican agenda to roll back major social legislative victories that would impede our advancements in social justice. With the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh, we are looking at the most conservative Supreme Court in over 75 years. Everything we hold dear as American ideals—our freedom, our tolerance, our values and progress in improving the human condition in our Nation—are at risk.

We know Brett Kavanaugh has a record of ruling against affordable healthcare and women's rights, but what is even more troubling is how his record on racial issues have flown under the radar.

We cannot consider a Supreme Court Justice without analyzing their views on such issues as voting and workforce rights that will have an overwhelming effect on the life and liberty of all people of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the chairwoman of the judicial task force of the Congressional Black Caucus, whom it is now my honor and privilege to present and who has an extraordinary record of legal acumen and has been an outspoken advocate for criminal justice reform, social justice, and has been scrutinizing judicial nominations so that we can provide for the American people an analysis of what we have to lose.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York, and I particularly thank her for her very cogent remarks and wish to associate myself with those remarks in every sense of the word; and I say so to the good lady from the State of New York as the leader of the CBC task force on Federal court nominations, including the Supreme Court nomination, where I have had the opportunity to look deeply at the decisions of this nominee now serving on the court of appeals, as it turns out, for the District of Columbia, Brett Kavanaugh.

I think the gentlewoman's remarks are telling in their understanding of the extreme damage he would do—and I must add not only to African Americans, but to the rule of law as we have known it.

I rise to indicate that the Congressional Black Caucus stands in strong opposition to the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh, and we will be doing all we can to keep that nomination from proceeding to the floor of the Sen-

ate. We do have two members of the Congressional Black Caucus on the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, and we are working closely with them as well.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are not the only Members of Congress opposed to this nomination, but we represent those Americans who have been disproportionately dependent on a fair Supreme Court. African Americans have always been a minority group in our country. For that reason, from slavery on to the days of discrimination in the 19th and 20th centuries, the African American community has been particularly dependent on the courts of the United States to protect them from unequal treatment by the majority.

We have had every reason to know that, if we are in the hands of the partisan majority, given 400 years of history, we have no protection. African Americans are disproportionately dependent on an objective Supreme Court. Now, that doesn't mean a Supreme Court of our choosing, but a Supreme Court that is open to all points of view and capable of seeing beyond partisanship.

Brett Kavanaugh is not that nominee. We know so because he has perhaps the longest record of opinions of names submitted to Republicans for review.

The D.C. circuit, which is the federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which happens to be my district, has been a circuit where Kavanaugh has been very mindful of the Supreme Court. I say that because he has so often written in dissent from his own colleagues on a Republican Court that it has been as if he were trying to write his way onto the Supreme Court.

Remember Kavanaugh's background. He started his career as a political operative in the Bush administration, and he has brought that extreme partnership, as a political operative, straight into the D.C. circuit.

We are not asking the Senate for a nominee of the kind we would have chosen. That is not our demand. But because this is the most partisan Congress since the Civil War, I believe we are within our rights in asking for a Court that would be a stabilizing influence so the American people could see that not all is lost because there is an objective actor on the scene, and that actor is the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is that Court which has protected us, we who are African Americans, from unequal treatment ever since *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. That does not mean that African Americans have always won at the Supreme Court level, but they have always had reason to believe that there was a court of last resort that would be open to them.

We no longer would have that sense of openness to their views if Brett Kavanaugh becomes the nominee put

forward in this session. We have seen no evidence that he would adhere to equal protection of the laws.

I will cite some examples that illustrate where his views in his cases lead that he would not protect the long-held holding of the courts that no American can be arrested without probable cause, that he would not protect even the separation of powers, and that he would not uphold the rights of Americans to qualify for affordable healthcare.

All of those notions have a disproportionate effect on African Americans, though they affect every American in the United States.

Remember, Judge Kavanaugh would be appointed to a Court that already has a majority appointed by Republican Presidents. Yet, while sitting on the D.C. court of appeals, he has distinguished himself by seeking to overturn long-existing precedent, even when members of that court, also appointed by Republican Presidents, have disagreed with him.

Let me give an example in an area of criminal law.

We now see African Americans in the streets protesting overzealous law enforcement because African American men have been shot and killed and people go to the streets because, if you can't get justice to the courts, that is all they have.

□ 2030

Yet, Judge Kavanaugh has suggested that it is appropriate for the probable cause standard to be more "flexible." Why?

Virtually no police have indeed been indicted, even given the evidence of African Americans shot down in the streets. Why do we need to narrow the ancient probable cause requirement?

He has indicated that police searches without a warrant or individualized suspicion should be allowed. He has even praised narrowing the rights long ago afforded to all defendants against incriminatory statements against themselves. How deep does that go in American constitutional law? How dangerous would it be to have a justice who would question the right against self incrimination?

Judge Kavanaugh's extreme views also show no respect for the fundamental right of women to make decisions about their own bodies, even though, 45 years ago, the Supreme Court itself established the right to abortion. That is a controversial right in our country, but it has withstood the test of time.

Let me offer an indication from a recent decision by Brett Kavanaugh, which his own court had to overturn, that shows he has no respect for precedent. That is perhaps our chief issue with this nominee. Precedent must be respected or else we are all open to whatever Congress or the Court wants to do.

A young woman, immigrant, undocumented, sought an abortion. As it turns out, she had gone through the most

rigorous of requirements, those required by Texas, because that is where she entered the country. This matter came to the D.C. court of appeals, however.

Judge Kavanaugh found, with the time running—remember, if abortions are to be performed, they are to be performed, according to the Supreme Court, as early as possible—found that more time was needed because she needed a sponsor, something that the Supreme Court has never required, in order for that abortion to occur. The court overturned Judge Kavanaugh's opinion. Look how dangerous it would have been. She could have gone past the 12-week, the 15-week, the 20-week deadline, which the House has approved on occasion.

These are rights not to be tampered with, but he has already tampered with them on the court of appeals. This court, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia—and I won't go into all the cases—has shown that he is an executive-oriented justice. That is to say, whatever the President wants, the President gets. This is the court that looks at most administrative law decisions before they go anywhere else.

Kavanaugh tried to strike down the net neutrality rule. Now, that is controversial here in Congress. But the basis he used for the courts to do it, the majority said—remember, this is a majority which our Republican President has appointed—the majority noted that the dissent was, using their words, "misconceived" because Kavanaugh claimed a First Amendment protection for large internet service providers never found by any court, and certainly not the Supreme Court but found to be, again, by his Republican colleagues on the D.C. Circuit, to be "counterintuitive."

I cannot go through each and every one of Judge Kavanaugh's decisions here, but I must point to perhaps his most extreme opinion. In a decision on the Affordable Care Act, this is what a jurist in the United States of America said, and I quote:

"Under the Constitution, the President may decline to enforce a statute that regulates private individuals when the President deems the statute unconstitutional, even if a court has held or would hold the statute constitutional."

That is bold. It says that the President may choose to rise above the law and enforce a law even if found unconstitutional. The Congress of the United States should not be willing to go along with this. I cite a case on my side of an issue but surely you can see the implications for yours.

The President is supposed to make sure to "take care that the laws are faithfully executed." To faithfully execute that law, you would have to enforce whatever the Congress or the Courts had found.

Of course, most concerning for many is his view of the special counsel where he has opined that it may be unconstitutional, and there is every reason to

believe that he may well believe that Mueller's special counsel role should be struck down.

A Republican President is entitled to a Republican nominee. He is not entitled to a nominee whose opinions fly in the face of the law for the last 75 years.

Judge Brett Kavanaugh's long list of opinions mark an extreme departure from established American constitutional and other law. We ask that every effort be made to oppose a man who would ignore established precedent, even precedent that his own conservative colleagues agree with, and who, I believe, cannot uphold the law fairly to protect the rights of all American citizens.

We believe that the first to feel the effect of such a nominee would be the millions of Americans who are of African American ancestry whom the Congressional Black Caucus represents.

I thank my good friend, again, from New York, for permitting me to go on at length about some of the precedents I have discovered that I thought would be particularly troubling, not only to the African American community, but to the American people.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her scholarship, her legal acumen, and really providing a snapshot—because I am sure there are many more troubling decisions that you have uncovered—but giving us this snapshot into the breaking of norms that this nominee presents to the American people.

It is really important that we do everything within our power to educate and inform the public so that they can make an informed choice in terms of how they would like to proceed in appealing to the United States Congress, which has the authority for the nomination process. At this time, again, I would like to thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), who is my classmate and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for the time today to address this august body.

Let me first compliment the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a true legal scholar, a legal patriot, and a fighter for justice throughout her life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to issue this quote to you: "No President has ever consulted more widely or talked with more people from more backgrounds to seek input about a Supreme Court nomination."

Mr. Speaker, those were the first words spoken by Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh, introduced to the American people during President Trump's prime-time reality show announcement this past Monday night.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to voice my deep concerns regarding the President's nomination of Judge Kavanaugh

for a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States of America. It is more than a little disquieting that the first thing to come from a newly named Supreme Court nominee's mouth was a demonstrably false statement claiming that the search to replace retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy was one of the most far-reaching and thorough in the history of the republic.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that President Trump nominated Brett Kavanaugh from a preapproved list of prospective right-wing ideologue nominees prepared by the extremist Heritage Foundation, in consultation with the cultish right-wing Federalist Society, each of those nominees having been certified as having passed the Federalist Society, Heritage Foundation litmus test on overturning *Roe v. Wade* and striking down critical protections in our current healthcare system.

Just 10 days after Justice Kennedy announced his retirement, Judge Kavanaugh makes the absurd statement that no President has ever consulted more widely or talked with more people from more backgrounds to seek input about a Supreme Court nomination.

We have come to expect knowing false Trumpian statements from the President's employees, his doctor, communications directors, his press secretaries, but not from a nominee for the branch of government designated to be a check on his administration.

In just a few words, Judge Kavanaugh aligned himself with the likes of erstwhile press secretary Sean Spicer, who claimed that Trump's inauguration crowd was larger than Obama's. He put himself in the same league with the disgraced doctor who felt it necessary to tell the world the spurious claim that the President was the healthiest human being in world history.

That a distinguished Federal appellate judge felt the need to debase himself with obvious untruths just moments after his nomination to the highest court in the land was announced should cause each and every one of us to fear that a Justice Kavanaugh would willingly prostrate himself before a demanding President if called upon to do so.

Moreover, each and every one of us has good cause to believe that the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh is a blatant attempt by President Trump to dominate the judiciary.

□ 2045

A President with the power and the predisposition to place his heavy hand on the delicate scales of justice would inevitably lead our dear Nation to the precipice of a constitutional crisis. That is why it is of such concern to me that nominee Kavanaugh felt it necessary to flatter this insecure President during their prime time reality show at the White House last week.

In Washington, we talk a lot about the balance of powers, but at home, in

Georgia, we feel it. We feel the 5-4 *Shelby* decision striking down important parts of the Voting Rights Act. We feel *Roe v. Wade* guaranteeing women the right to choose. We feel *Citizens United*. And we feel *Brown v. Board of Education*. We recall the power of the courts to decide so much more than individual cases. We have seen its ability to change the course of history. When one considers the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, we know firsthand that the U.S. Supreme Court can turn the American Dream into the American nightmare.

Without digressing, I must point out that to conclude that a sycophantic debut is where Judge Kavanaugh's problems begin and end would be dangerously naive. The briefest of examinations of his record reveals numerous positions contrary to the values held by most Americans.

He has opposed EPA protections, workers' rights, consumer protections, and the right to choose. And his personal statements call to question his ability to be an independent check on the President, such as his declarations that investigations of presidents should be deferred while that president is in office, and his opinion that a sitting president is immune from criminal charges.

These statements should be particularly troubling for all Americans, as the Supreme Court may soon be called upon to consider whether President Trump can be subpoenaed to appear before a Federal grand jury, or whether a sitting president can be indicted. Our democracy will need an unbiased and principled Supreme Court functioning at its finest, with due respect for the rule of law, when that time comes, and a justice who has prejudged, as Judge Kavanaugh has, would jeopardize that responsibility.

To avoid any appearance of impropriety, the Senate should not consider a Supreme Court appointment from a president who is under the cloud of investigation for conspiracy to violate the law and the obstruction of that investigation. Judge Kavanaugh's statements clearly make him suspect, and his confirmation would undermine the credibility of the Nation's highest court and impugn that court's ability to protect public confidence in the rule of law.

With this cloud hanging over Judge Kavanaugh's nomination, it is necessary that the Senate refrain and keep with its tradition and follow the McConnell rule. Elections are less than 4 months away and we should allow the American people to speak at the ballot box before the Senate is asked to confirm a nominee for the highest court in the land. The delay would help ensure that Justice Kennedy's replacement is free from suspicion and bias and the inability to appreciate balance of powers concerns.

Judge Kavanaugh has gone beyond his clear proclivity for being an activist judge out of line with the rest of the

country. He has revealed himself to be beholden to another branch of government, which would imperil our Constitution's delicate balance of powers.

Americans deserve a United States Supreme Court justice who is up to the task of protecting the rule of law without fear or favor, and, unfortunately, Judge Kavanaugh's appointment is ill-considered, ill-timed, and should not move forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Fourth District of Georgia for sharing his analysis this evening. Indeed, he has raised some very important points that we need to consider and that I would like the American people to consider.

There is a McConnell rule. That rule held up the nomination of Merrick Garland for almost a year. The context which that was done was that apparently there were going to be elections down the road and the American people should speak.

Well, here we are less than 5 months out before there will be an election here in the United States of America. I think the people have an opportunity, and should use that opportunity through their franchise, to register their concerns about this nomination process.

Nearly 150 years ago, Black Americans were granted the right to vote. It will be another 100 years before people of color could freely vote in every State, county, and city in the United States of America. We have fought tooth and nail for the most sacred power in America—the power to vote—and now that power is being challenged with the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court.

In 2012, Judge Kavanaugh wrote an opinion that upheld South Carolina's restrictive voter ID laws, despite knowing they would disenfranchise voters and disproportionately harm people of color.

Voter ID laws are another thinly veiled attempt at preventing people of color from participating in elections. Kavanaugh's support of these laws show what side of history he is on.

This isn't the only questionable decision he has made regarding race relations. He has a long history of concerning decisions and writings.

In 1989, Kavanaugh published his first piece of legal writing challenging a Supreme Court ruling that barred prosecutors from excluding jurists based on race. Imagine that: 1989.

Kavanaugh also wrote a brief for the Center for Equal Opportunity, a conservative think tank that opposed affirmative action and opposed the issue in a number of different court cases.

Kavanaugh is also a firm supporter of the NSA, and its surveilling techniques that have been known to disproportionately target people of color.

The NAACP opposed Kavanaugh's nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court, and their concerns were only strengthened by his proven track record of only supporting the already wealthy and powerful.

In 2000, Kavanaugh was on the legal team that helped stop the Florida recount and secure the Bush Presidency.

Just last year, Kavanaugh wrote a dissenting opinion concerning whether a pregnant 17-year-old being held by immigration authorities was allowed to leave their custody to obtain an abortion.

We are not dealing with someone who is a mystery here. It is very clear where he stands in terms of turning back the hands of time. And, as my colleagues have already stated, his opinions have been so far to the right of even a Republican D.C. Circuit Court, that it is alarming that at a time when we need justice at the Supreme Court level that is blind, that will advance humankind, this is the nominee, the nominee that was put forth by the Heritage Foundation, the nominee that is a part of the Federalist society: very telling.

Well, let me just say this: In Texas, the court ruled in agreement that that teenager, who was seeking an abortion, was legally entitled to access it.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will just say a few remarks. As a Black woman, I know how critical the Supreme Court is to American liberty and freedom. It was the Supreme Court that ended segregation with *Brown v. Board of Education*, ended the process of poll taxes and voter suppression with *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, and has continued to stand up for American justice when Donald Trump and our Congress could not. The legacy of this great institution will crumble if we confirm Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressional Black Caucus and Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE for anchoring this important Special Order.

On the 150th Anniversary of the ratification of the 14th Amendment, a landmark moment for progress and equality, the President announced his nominee to fill a seat on the highest court in the land.

Unfortunately, however, the search for the next jurist to take a seat on the United States Supreme Court resembled a circus and I am concerned that the person selected, Brett Kavanaugh, will be antagonistic and hostile to the progress that the 14th Amendment has helped achieve.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I am appalled by the manner in which the President is pursuing this solemn obligation and concerned by the choice this process may yield.

The President has used the levers of his office to divide, rather than unite.

The Supreme Court is not just any court.

In our great Republic, it is the tribunal of last resort and routinely resolves constitutional questions of first impression.

The American people rely on it to interpret some of society's most difficult policy concerns, and to correct the excesses of the popularly-elected branches.

The nature of the Court requires justices, not ideologues, and individuals who have integrity and empathy.

This is why this task requires seriousness and solemnity, and not spectacle.

Instead, this process resembled a circus: contenders were selected based on their ability to pass a litmus test of a narrow perspective of conservatism which limits justice; a group of judges, similar in background, training and experience, curated by the hyper-conservative Federalist Society; and, a heavily-promoted, prime time television announcement, replete with different frontrunner candidates on different days.

Given this reality, Americans are rightly concerned that the President's jurist selection to one of this country's three coequal branches of government is being outsourced to the whims of a narrow ideological and partisan organization when, in actuality, a seat on the Supreme Court should be reserved for only the most profound jurists in the nation.

By great numbers, the American people support reform in any number of areas.

In a time of mass incarceration and overcrowded prisons, a poll conducted earlier this year by a Republican-leaning organization indicates that over three-quarters of the American people support significant criminal justice reform.

Americans are also skeptical of comments made by this President, advocating for the deprivation of due process rights for a variety of individuals, from refugees seeking safety within our borders, to those already here, charged with crimes.

Indeed, a poll commissioned by the Bucknell Institute for Public Policy within the last year reveals broad and deep support for due process rights.

In a time when our political parties appear polarized, 67 percent of Democrats, 77 percent of Republicans and 67 percent of Independents support due process for individuals who face serious criminal charges.

Last, the Supreme Court is also the tribunal that resolves major questions about the form and contours of our federal government, including sensitive questions like "can a sitting president pardon himself?" or "can a sitting president be indicted?"

In fact, for over the past year of this President's administration, the country has been forced to consider these questions as it learned that the Russians interfered with the 2016 presidential election and associates of the president may have abetted that endeavor.

Recent polls indicate that, by clear margins, the American people do not believe the President is above the law or that a president can pardon himself.

It is vital that this extremely influential position is filled by someone who subscribes to these core principles.

Brett Kavanaugh, however, has demonstrated a long-standing record of troubling opinions, including the beliefs that: the president is above the law and should never be criminally indicted; the Affordable Care Act should be dismantled; religious expression trumps individuals' right to health coverage for birth control; access to abortion should be diminished; and Obama-era environmental regulations should be rolled back.

The Supreme Court is also required to examine contemporary policies through the prism of our nation's long history.

In that regard, the ongoing struggle for civil rights cannot be subjugated as a priority of a nation seeking to bind the wounds of the slavery, the Civil War and its vestiges.

The next jurist will replace a Supreme Court justice who recognized the importance of affirmative action as a necessary means to help heal the scars of segregation and Jim Crow.

The next jurist will likely be required to further calibrate the balance of power between labor unions and their employing entities.

Given the importance of these and other issues, like voting rights, reproductive rights, the rights of the LGBTQ community, and countless others, scholars of the Supreme Court and others who believe the Court is the arbiter of fair justice are looking to this nomination and are looking for a jurist who will dispense justice which is not one-sided or tilts to the right, but rather fair justice.

As I stated before the nomination, I call upon the United States Senate to reject any nominee that is a well-documented ideologue and to nonetheless probatively, seriously, and deeply question whether and how this jurist could damage rights of minorities, women, children, and society's most vulnerable.

When confronted with a replacement to the Supreme Court's swing vote, this President has chosen an ideologue and a foot soldier of the Republican Party and the conservative movement.

Among other swing decisions, Justice Kennedy acted as the deciding vote in almost every reproductive health case since his confirmation, including casting the deciding vote to ensure abortion remained legal in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992.

The President has stated numerous times that he will appoint someone who will reverse *Roe v. Wade*, and many anti-choice groups have rallied behind Judge Kavanaugh's nomination.

In addition to women's rights and health care, other paramount issues are on the line, such as voting rights and affirmative action.

Bedrock civil rights principles such as *Brown v. Board of Education* could be at stake.

To be sure, Brett Kavanaugh has very good credentials but an undistinguished record as a jurist on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

But it is not his credentials or his pedigree that is worrisome.

Rather, throughout his entire career—as a deputy in the right-wing crusade against President Bill Clinton during the 1990s, as a political operative fighting against the statewide recount in Florida in 2000, paving the way for the Supreme Court's decision in *Bush v. Gore*, and as a conservative stalwart on the country's most important federal appellate court—Brett Kavanaugh has used his talents in the service of decidedly and uncompromisingly reactionary causes.

I urge the United States Senate to reject this nomination and send this President a message: select a nominee that will not politicize the Court and one who will protect the rights of minorities, women, children, and society's most vulnerable.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. It is an honor to speak in this historic room where Franklin D. Roosevelt stood right there, though back then it was a white marble podium at which he stood, and asked for a declaration of war after Pearl Harbor. He went on to join forces with a despicable man named Stalin, who killed millions upon millions of people, and he didn't hide it very well.

□ 2100

For those who knew how destructive Stalin had been, how truly evil he was, it was quite a blow for people to see Franklin Roosevelt as President of the United States, where we believe in freedom, sit and smile and pal around with one of the worst mass murderers in the history of the world named Stalin, starving millions upon millions in Ukraine.

I mean, for heaven's sake, in World War II, they didn't relieve Poland of oppression from Nazi Germany. They took over the oppression of Poland from Nazi Germany.

There were some, one remarkable General named Patton, who understood how dangerous the communist dictator was. But so many have been miseducated over the years, the last 40 years. I saw the beginnings of it in the 1970s when I was in school, how wonderful socialism was, how wonderful communism was. But that was just a very small minority, because most Americans understood—they had been properly educated growing up—how great our freedom is, how unusual it is, and that it doesn't last forever, that it takes constant defense.

Again, the comment by Benjamin Franklin, when asked: What you have given us? He said: "A republic, madam, if you can keep it," because it doesn't endure forever.

As I have met with people around the world, from Togo, Nigeria, all across the Middle East and Asia, even the little Maldives islands, remote islands in the Philippines, all the way across to America, around the world, it is amazing how many people see America as their only hope for having peace in this life.

Franklin Roosevelt felt like the threat of Nazi Germany justified his actions in joining forces with an evil, terrorist dictator, a mass murderer like Stalin. But he also joined forces with Winston Churchill, who also could see the rising threat of communism through Russia. But now, not so many see the threat anymore.

Yes, the President is over there in Helsinki today, talking to Vladimir Putin. In my conversation with him about over a year and a half ago, he certainly understood the threat that Russia is to us.

But so is misinformation about what is real, what is true. And I was listening to some of my colleagues before

me. I have been listening to people on the news talking about Judge Kavanaugh. Frankly, he was not my first choice out of those who the President could have chosen.

To say slavery would be coming back if he goes on the Supreme Court, I heard that. Actually, if he were to go to the Supreme Court, it appears pretty clear he would try to help the Court be slaves to the Constitution instead of their own shadows of penumbras that things need to be in the Constitution. Until it is amended, we have to go by what is there.

I have heard ongoing, constant claims that voters and votes will be denied, and I would have to agree that they will for all of those who attempt to vote illegally. That is what voter ID is about. My understanding was, after voter ID went into place, Alabama, Georgia, where I understood that statistics were kept, well, the numbers of voters went up dramatically for minorities. It didn't hurt minority voting. But what it certainly did do is ensure better integrity in the outcome of votes.

I recall hearing one night David Brinkley talking, I believe, to Tom Brokaw, and he was encouraged to tell about a story he heard Lyndon Johnson tell. He said, you know, back then, before Watergate, reporters were close, big buddies with the President, and he would come down sometimes and sit in the press room, plop his boots up on a desk, scratching his belly, and having a beer, and told a story, in essence, of when he ran for Congress.

He was out in the cemetery with his campaign manager before the election, late at night. They were writing down the names on the tombstones of people who would be voting in his election. They came to one that was just such a mess, moss and all kinds of crud on the tombstone. The campaign manager said, come on, Lyndon, let's just move to the next one. He grabbed his campaign manager and said, no, sir. This man has every bit as much a right to vote as anybody else in this cemetery.

Well, everybody laughed. Except if you read about what happened in Duval County during his election, you would begin to think that perhaps was a firsthand, true story.

Whether humorous or not, there are so many examples of fraudulent voting. I know people keep saying, oh, gee, there is no such thing. But that is garbage. There is plenty of fraud in votes in America.

Of course, as long as you can prevent people from having IDs like you have to have to get into the Department of Justice when Eric Holder was the Attorney General, when Loretta Lynch was Attorney General—currently, you couldn't get into the Democratic National Convention without a proper government ID.

Anyway, photo IDs are pretty routine. You have to have them to get cigarettes, alcohol. You have to have them to do much of anything, to cash a check.

Because of rulings by the Supreme Court, you have to make an accommodation for those who couldn't afford to pay for a photo ID. Then they can get them for free. So it just seems like a lot of scare tactics being used.

Donald Trump was not my first choice in the election, but one of the things I have noticed, if he loses on something, he is going to come back and try to make the people who caused the unnecessary and inappropriate loss wish they hadn't forced that loss, like in this situation, perhaps.

If the scare tactics about slavery coming back—and I know we will be hearing a lot of the Bork lines. We are already hearing some of the Bork lines that were lies about Judge Bork. Some of those, since they worked to lie about Judge Bork, they may work to lie about Kavanaugh, so we will probably be hearing some of those resurrected.

But I can't help but wonder if all these lies said about Kavanaugh were successful as they were about Bork, wow, I just wonder about the next person that President Trump might appoint. I can hear people walking out of this Chamber someday, saying maybe it seemed pretty clear we should have let Kavanaugh go through, because he really wasn't as bad as we said he was. But that will be an interesting time down the road.

I didn't plan to talk about Judge Kavanaugh, but he seems like a very decent man. Wow, the attacks on a decent family man, Catholic, caring man, it is just amazing how far things have come in America.

But I think it is important, with all the screams about Russia, to understand Russia and the former Soviet Union were, indeed, a grave threat to the United States.

McCarthy was partially right. He went much too far, and he got very abusive, but there was a threat. He just went too far, became too abusive, and we don't need that.

Let me parenthetically insert that there is nothing abusive about questioning a serial liar about how he became so good at serial lying. Infidelity is not particularly an issue, not relevant, really. It is relevant to security clearances, certainly, because that can make somebody vulnerable to being turned by foreign intelligence.

But for purposes of our hearings, like before the Judiciary Committee, credibility is always relevant. When a person has been a serial liar, that is relevant in whatever context he became a serial liar.

There is an article by Steven Allen dated June 23, 2018.

"Political leaders and journalists are deeply concerned about Russian meddling in U.S. elections. Took 'em long enough. The Russians have been meddling in U.S. elections for at least 70 years.

"In 1948, the Progressive Party"—there are some I know who are thinking the Democratic Party should change their name to Progressive

Party, and there are those advocating such things. They like to informally call themselves the progressives.

But, "In 1948, the Progressive Party, front for the Soviet-controlled Communist Party, ran former Vice President Henry Wallace as its Presidential candidate. Wallace arguably threw the election to President Truman by attacking him, undercutting Republicans' claims that Truman was 'soft' on the Russians."

This is a quote from October 21, 1956: "President Eisenhower today accused Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of meddling in the American election campaign," the United Press reported. Again, that is October 21, 1956.

"Bulganin had suggested that Democratic nominee Adlai Stevenson was more likely to get an agreement halting H-bomb tests. That, Eisenhower said, constituted 'interference by a foreign nation in our internal affairs . . . in the midst of a national election campaign.'

"Historian Bruce Dearstyne reported that the Russian Ambassador in 1960 invited Stevenson"—that is Adlai Stevenson—"to the Embassy, 'plied' him with 'drinks, caviar, and fruit,' and offered to back him if he would run for President again. Stevenson rejected the offer."

That was the Russian Ambassador in 1960, clearly attempting to interfere.

"Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier in 1960, bragged in his memoirs that, 'By waiting to release the U-2 pilot Gary Powers until after the American election, we kept Nixon from being able to claim that he could deal with the Russians; our ploy made a difference of at least half a million votes, which gave Kennedy the edge he needed.'"

So you got Nikita Khrushchev bragging that he got John F. Kennedy elected. I am not saying that. I am just reading what is historically available.

"In 1968, under orders from Moscow, the Soviet U.S. Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin offered to secretly fund Hubert Humphrey's Presidential campaign. The offer was made during a breakfast at Humphrey's home. Dobrynin wrote in his memoirs that Humphrey declined the offer, saying, 'It was more than enough for him to have Moscow's good wishes, which he highly appreciated.'"

That was the 1960s Democratic Party hero Hubert Humphrey.

"In 1976, Senator Henry 'Scoop' Jackson, a strong anti-Communist, ran for President. The Russians sent forged FBI letters to journalists claiming that Jackson was a closeted homosexual."

Of course, today, that would probably get him elected, but in 1976, not so helpful.

□ 2115

Also in 1976, the Russians had a spy among top Democratic Party activists, who participated in a 3-hour strategy session with Governor Jerry Brown of California and presidential candidate Jimmy Carter.

In 1984, The Heritage Foundation issued a report: "How Moscow Meddles in the West's Elections."

"Last year the Soviets tried to influence elections in West Germany and Britain," Heritage reported. "And this year, it is America's turn. For months, Moscow's statements and actions have been aimed at defeating Ronald Reagan." Methods included manipulation of the peace movement, threatening statements, and 'direct appeals' to voters including 'mass demonstrations.' Russian meddling was so frequent that the West German chancellor commented, 'One was used to this sort of thing.'

"As far as I can tell, the report exposing Russian meddling received no news coverage.

"Political scientists Lawrence Caldwell and Robert Levgold pointed out that the Russians had begun to focus on such tactics as looking for 'exploitable differences in the opposing camp' and appealing to the people 'over the heads of their government.'

"U.S. media during this time gave lots of exposure to Americans who bypassed the government to communicate directly with the Russians. For example, a 10-year-old girl from Maine, who wrote a pro-peace letter to Russian leader Yuri Andropov, was given her own Disney Channel program about politics, 'Samantha Smith Goes to Washington.'

"Among those seeking to work with the Russians was U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy, Democrat from Massachusetts, brother of martyred President John F. Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. According to a KGB memo,"—of course, this has been news years ago—"Kennedy passed along a plan for countering President Reagan by creating pro-Russia news coverage and bringing Soviet officials to the United States to 'appeal directly to the American people.'"

KGB Chief Viktor Chebrikov wrote, "The Senator underlined the importance that this initiative should be seen as coming from the American side."

"In a 2015 article, Politifact" which I can't give a lot of credence to, "quoted Ken Adelman, Reagan's deputy U.N. ambassador, explaining that the Reagan Administration ignored the Kennedy overture because 'We knew Senators were doing this sort of thing all the time.'

"Russian meddling declined after the Cold War, then resumed.

"Occupy Wall Street' protests,"—and this is important news—"Occupy Wall Street' protests, beginning in 2011, were heavily supported by the Russians, as noted in a report by U.S. intelligence agencies: 'RT's, Russia Today, Editor in Chief . . . characterized RT's coverage of the Occupy Wall Street movement as 'information warfare' that is aimed at promoting popular dissatisfaction with the U.S. government. RT created a Facebook app to connect Occupy Wall Street protesters

via social media,' and 'RT featured its own hosts in Occupy rallies.'"

Obviously in 2011 and 2012—this isn't in the article—but obviously the Russians were playing heavily in that election, and we had a President named Obama that could have done something to stop the Russians from trying to throw the election to the Obama campaign by harming the Republicans and helping the Occupy Wall Street movement, but the Obama administration did nothing of the sort.

Back to the article, it says, "At least since 2011, the Russians have funneled money to groups in the United States and Europe opposed to fracking, which threatens Russia's dominance in oil and gas."

And in fairness with regard to the Russian funding efforts to stop the fracking that has made the United States the biggest oil producer, those efforts weren't entirely Russian. Yes, our ability to produce more oil has directly harmed Russia, but it has also hurt the Middle East. And you can find that there were programs and videos funded by people in the Middle East to scare Americans to put them against fracking so that Russia and the Middle East could go back to being where most of the oil was coming from.

Anyway, this article says, "To do this," talking about opposing fracking, the Russians "use a network of front organizations that include corporations, law firms, and nonprofit groups, with some of the money getting into the United States through Bermuda.

"Facing criticism from Republicans over his soft-on-Putin policies, President Obama sought during his 2012 reelection campaign, to avoid confrontation with the Russians."

Of course, inserted parenthetically here, when he knew the Russians were helping his campaign and hurting Mitt Romney's campaign, then, of course, maybe that played into his decision not to try to stop the Russians meddling in the U.S. election.

"The Russians cooperated. In March 2012, Obama was heard on an open microphone telling Putin sidekick Dmitry Medvedev that he would 'have more flexibility' after the election but 'it's important for him to give me space.' Medvedev replied: 'I will transmit this information to Vladimir, and I stand with you.'"

So maybe that had something to do with the Obama administration not wanting to confront Russia about their meddling, because they were meddling on behalf of Obama.

In any event, the article says, "Time and time again, Russia meddled. It was, 'the experts' said, something we were used to, something that happened all the time, no big deal. Then, one day, Democrats need an excuse for losing an election. And everything changed."

So an interesting article there by Steven J. Allen, June 23.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather tragic that we had a hearing on Friday: I didn't

violate the rules of the House; many of my Democratic colleagues did. You are not supposed to interrupt, rudely interrupt another Member's time, constantly yelling, He needs to take his meds. That is a violation of the rule. I didn't call anybody on the rule violations.

But it is certainly not a violation of the House rules—and I hope my colleagues will understand—when a witness is sitting there lying through his teeth, it is permissible to call him exactly what he is: a liar; in Strzok's case, a serial liar.

I saw it during his closed-door testimony. Some of us talked about this guy, he looked so good, you know, he looked like he could pass any polygraph test. And then I find out, well, actually, he had a couple of deceptions indicated along the way, but apparently he had people inside the FBI helping keep him in his top position as one of the top leaders. So apparently he wasn't quite as good at lying as I thought he was.

But we have got to get back to being seekers of truth and not deniers of the opportunity to find it.

I mean, our whole civilization stands on the brink of an end when young people today in such big numbers think these activities of socialism, progressivism, communism, that those are good, healthy things.

There is only one way you can have socialism or communism: you have got to have dictatorial powers in the hands of either a dictator or a committee and there has got to be very little freedom. The government will let you have freedom, and they will take it away, with every right to do that.

This is such an anomaly we have here in the United States. People around the world, and I am not talking about the talking heads in the media and Europe, the EU, Britain, some of the other places, I am talking about people that live in these countries day to day all over the world, so many see us as their chance for some peace in this life.

Quoting before, but a man named Ebenezer in Togo, Africa, said: You know, our group here, we are Christians. We know where we go when we die, but our only chance of having peace in this life is if America is strong. Tell leaders in Washington, stop allowing America to get weaker and weaker.

Trump wants to see this country get strong. Some of them said how, as a Christian, could you support a guy like Trump, as he had been involved in infidelity in the past. I have people sling that my way. But the Bible addresses such a thing. You know, it talks about: When I was a child, I spoke as a child—that was the Apostle Paul—but when I became an adult, I put aside childish things.

And when Donald J. Trump was a Democrat and hung around Bill Clinton, he talked like Bill Clinton, he acted like Bill Clinton. So I forgive him.

I would like to do anything we can in this body to help make America stronger so those people, those souls crying out around the world for a strong America so they have a chance at peace will indeed have a chance at peace.

We have been given a gift. That is something scripture also addresses: "To whom much is given, of him much will be required."

We have got to do better than this, but there is nothing ever wrong with facing a liar and calling him a liar.

And the only thing worse than a serial liar at a hearing in the U.S. Capitol is when the serial liar that has damaged the country, hopefully not irreparably, but damaged it badly, tries to make himself a victim.

We have had enough of that. Let's get back to truth.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2157

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6147, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-830) on the resolution (H. Res. 996) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

April 11, 2018:

H.R. 1865. An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

April 13, 2018:

H.R. 4547. An Act to amend titles II, VILE, and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the representative payment program.

April 23, 2018:

H.R. 3445. An Act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3979. An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

May 7, 2018:

H.R. 4300. An Act to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and for other Purposes.

May 22, 2018:

H.R. 3210. An Act to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes.

June 1, 2018:

H.R. 3562. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4009. An Act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia.

June 15, 2018:

H.R. 3663. An Act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel "Woody" Williams VA Medical Center.

H.R. 4910. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

June 18, 2018:

H.R. 3249. An Act to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes.

June 21, 2018:

H.R. 1900. An Act to designate the Veterans Memorial and Museum in Columbus, Ohio, as the National Veterans Memorial and Museum, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2333. An Act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies.

H.R. 2772. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees.

H.R. 4743. An Act to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

June 22, 2018:

H.R. 1397. An Act to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes

H.R. 1719. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

July 7, 2018:

H.R. 931. An Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

H.R. 2229. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority

for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

April 13, 2018:

S. 772. An Act to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

April 30, 2018:

S. 167. An Act to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas.

May 9, 2018:

S. 447. An Act to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues.

May 21, 2018:

S.J. Res. 57. An Act 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".

May 24, 2018:

S. 2155. An Act to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

May 25, 2018:

S. 35. An Act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

May 30, 2018:

S. 204. An Act to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

June 1, 2018:

S. 1285. An Act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Klamath Tribes, and the Burns Paiute Tribes to lease or transfer certain lands.

June 5, 2018:

S. 292. An Act to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1282. An Act to redesignate certain clinics of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Montana.

June 6, 2018:

S. 2372. An Act to establish a permanent community care program for veterans, to establish a commission for the purpose of making recommendations regarding the modernization or realignment of facilities of the Veterans Health Administration, to improve construction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

June 25, 2018:

S. 1869. An Act to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

S. 2246. An Act to designate the health care center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Tallahassee, Florida, as the Sergeant Ernest I. "Boots" Thomas VA Clinic, and for other purposes.

July 7, 2018:

S. 1091. An Act to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family obligation.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delay due to weather.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 24 AND MAY 30, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jennifer A. Hemingway	5/25	5/29	France		2,657.00		(³)				2,657.00
	5/29	5/30	England		340.85		(³)				340.85
Committee total					2,997.85		(³)				2,997.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

MS. JENNIFER A. HEMINGWAY, June 29, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 24 AND MAY 31, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Turner	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		10,457.00				11,780.00
Hon. Gerry Connolly	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		9,932.00				11,255.00
Hon. Rob Bishop	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		10,758.00				12,081.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		2,808.00				4,131.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		11,013.00				12,336.00
Hon. Ted Poe	5/25	5/28	Poland		1,042.00		11,600.00				12,642.00
Hon. Rick Larsen	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		2,869.00				4,192.00
Hon. Linda Sánchez	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		9,710.00				11,033.00
Hon. González-Colón	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		9,858.00				11,181.00
Adam Howard	5/24	5/29	Poland		1,606.00		7,310.00				8,916.00
Ed Rice	5/24	5/29	Poland		1,606.00		10,115.00				11,721.00
Chad Gore	5/25	5/29	Poland		1,323.00		3,284.00				4,607.00
Jason Steinbaum	5/25	5/31	Poland		1,323.00		3,208.00				4,531.00
Committee total					17,484.00		94,183.00				111,667.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 25, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Hon. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, July 9, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BANGLADESH, SINGAPORE, AND BURMA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 28 AND JUNE 4, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Luke Murry	5/28	5/30	Bangladesh		395.89		213.66				609.55
	5/30	6/1	Burma		574.00		* 17,729.41				18,303.41
Jennifer Hendrixson-White	5/30	6/1	Burma		574.00		* 15,643.01				16,217.01
Luke Murry	6/1	6/3	Singapore		825.00						825.00
Jennifer Hendrixson-White	6/1	6/3	Singapore		825.00						825.00
Daniel Silverberg	5/31	6/3	Singapore		1,102.00		* 14,837.51				15,939.51
Wyndee Parker	5/31	6/3	Singapore		1,102.00		* 14,251.01				15,353.01
Committee total					5,397.89		62,674.60				68,072.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Transportation All-Inclusive

MR. LUKE MURRY, July 2, 2018.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO SOUTH AFRICA, DJIBOUTI, AND KENYA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 25 AND JUNE 3, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brett Horton	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Bart Reising	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Mary Rosado	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Cole Rojewski	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Chad Carlough	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Zach Howell	5/26	5/30	South Africa		1,254.78		15,733.41				
Brett Horton	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Bart Reising	5/31	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Shuwanza Goff	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00		15,706.03				
Mary Rosado	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Cole Rojewski	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Chad Carlough	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Zach Howell	5/30	5/31	Djibouti		372.00						
Brett Horton	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Bart Reising	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Shuwanza Goff	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Mary Rosado	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Cole Rojewski	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Chad Carlough	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Zach Howell	5/31	6/2	Kenya		730.00						
Committee total					15,242.68		110,106.49				125,349.17

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MR. J. BARTON REISING, June 27, 2018.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5601. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-398, "Student Fair Access to School Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5602. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-396, "Helicopter Landing Pad Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5603. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Technical Amendment; Removal of obsolete drawbridge operating regulations

[Docket No.: USCG-2018-0443] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 3, 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.

5604. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Altoona, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0129; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AEA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5605. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Pago Pago, American Samoa [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0082; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5606. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Seven Springs, PA, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Somerset, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0610; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5607. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Phillipsburg, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0755; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5608. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kenansville, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1238; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5609. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace, and Removal of Class E Airspace; Binghamton, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1061; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5610. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class B Airspace; San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0653; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWA-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5611. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0564; Product Identifier 2018-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-19315; AD 2018-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5612. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turbo-prop and Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9450; Product Identifier 2016-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-19317; AD 2018-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5613. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1247; Product Identifier 2017-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-19316; AD 2018-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5614. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1163; Product Identifier 2017-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-19260; AD 2018-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5615. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0104; Product Identifier 2017-CE-036-AD; Amendment 39-19311; AD 2018-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5616. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0501; Product Identifier 2018-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-19304; AD 2018-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5617. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0817; Product Identifier 2017-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-19314; AD 2018-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5618. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0904; Product Identifier 2017-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-19310; AD 2018-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5619. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0507; Product Identifier 2018-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-19308; AD 2018-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5620. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0074; Product Identifier 2017-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-19309; AD 2018-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5621. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1020; Product Identifier 2017-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-19306; AD 2018-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 3, 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.

5622. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0507] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 3, 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.

5623. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Air Traf-

fic Service (ATS) Route in the Vicinity of Newberry, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0222; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AGL-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5624. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Richmond, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1144; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5625. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31201; Amdt. No.: 540] received July 3, 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.

5626. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updates to Rulemaking and Waiver Procedures and Expansion of the Equivalent Level of Safety Option [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6761; Amdt. Nos.: 11-62, 404-6, 405-6, 420-8, 431-6, 435-4, 437-2, 460-2] (RIN: 2120-AK76) received July 3, 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.

5627. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification to Restricted Area R-5601F and Establishment of Restricted Area R-5601J; Fort Sill, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0470; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5628. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Vicinity of Lansing, MI and Pontiac, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0724; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5629. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Relief: Aviation Training Devices; Pilot Certification, Training, and Pilot Schools; and Other Provisions [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6142; Amdt. Nos.: 1-73, 60-6, 61-142, 63-41, 65-58, 91-351, 121-381, 135-140, 141-20] (RIN: 2120-AK28) received July 3, 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.

5630. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-2302; Flagstaff, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0520; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AWP-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5631. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Restricted Area R-2530, Sierra Army Depot, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0476; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AWP-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 3, 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.

5632. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31198; Amdt. No.: 3804] received July 3, 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.

5633. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31197; Amdt. No.: 3803] received July 3, 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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3460. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the "John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse"; with an amendment (Rept. 115-818). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5772. A bill to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the "J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse" (Rept. 115-819). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5846. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding the buyout practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 66. A bill to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prepare a plan on the preservation needs of Route 66, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 115-821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4446. A bill to amend the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act to extend the expiration date of the Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5415. A bill to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress;

with an amendment (Rept. 115-823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1376. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; (Rept. 115-824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2648. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-825, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3076. A bill to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act) to require agencies to accept electronic release forms, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5333. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3906. A bill to establish centers of excellence for innovative stormwater control infrastructure, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-828, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6385. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 996. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-830). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration, H.R. 3906 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 6377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide

alternative minimum funding rules for certain single-employer plans maintained by a community newspaper; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 6378. A bill to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, and Homeland Security, 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. MACARTHUR (for himself and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 6379. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until November 30, 2018; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 6380. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to subject crowdfunding vehicles to the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 6381. A bill to memorialize victims and survivors of the occupation of Guam, provide for additional development at the War in the Pacific National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 6382. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to report certain information to the Congress and to the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 6383. A bill to provide funds to enable counties to make competitive grants to qualified local units of government to address major community development and public infrastructure challenges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6384. A bill to impose sanctions relating to persons operating the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, 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. DUNN (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 6386. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with other appropriate entities, to develop and carry out a national science-based education campaign to increase public awareness regarding the use of technology in food and agriculture production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 6387. A bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by

holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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 Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reduction of the annuity for any Federal employee who is convicted of a felony that resulted in, or would have resulted in, removal from the civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 6389. A bill to enact certain laws relating to small business as title 57, United States Code, "Small Business"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 6390. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to study and identify best practices for closing the gender, race, and income gap in patenting rates for certain small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, 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. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 6391. A bill to reauthorize and modify the authority of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 6392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to hiring veterans who are receiving educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or Defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COOK, Mr. MAST, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H. Res. 993. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H. Res. 994. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges and that budgetary uncertainty impedes the Corps' ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national

security at risk; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Res. 995. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation now faces a more complex and grave set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II, and that the lack of full, on-time funding related to defense activities puts servicemen and servicewomen at risk, harms national security, and aids the adversaries of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 997. A resolution expressing support for dance as a form of valuable exercise and of artistic expression, and for the designation of July 28 as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H. Res. 998. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy's total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to "do more with less" as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent Congressional funding; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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 Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 6377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 6378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 6379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 6380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence . . . of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 6381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 6382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 6383.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 6385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 6386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 6387.

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 Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 6388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 6389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 6390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 6391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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.

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 6392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

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. 184: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 380: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 846: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 959: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 1027: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1201: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FASO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 1318: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1444: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1447: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1542: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 1676: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1825: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1876: Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 1911: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 2151: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2215: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2309: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. BUDD and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2388: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 2431: Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 2584: Ms. FOXX and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 2587: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 2635: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 2871: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 2913: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 2976: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 2996: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3113: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3128: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 3132: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 3415: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3444: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3592: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3666: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3671: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 3940: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 3984: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 4082: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4133: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 4186: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 4222: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 4229: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 4265: Mr. CURTIS.
 H.R. 4271: Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 4328: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4454: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4483: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 4518: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 4556: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 4603: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LANCE, Mr. VELA, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4819: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 4846: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4881: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. ROSS and Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 4898: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4953: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H.R. 5014: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 5085: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 5129: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 5161: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5162: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 5191: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5248: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 5331: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5385: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 5406: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5429: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5476: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 5551: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 5649: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 5671: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 5701: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 5753: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 5780: Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 5814: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5818: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 5856: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 5864: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BERGMAN.
 H.R. 5870: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 5871: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 5899: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 5922: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 5955: Mr. BARR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 5974: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 6014: Mr. SIRES, Mr. KILMER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 6016: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 6018: Ms. STEFANIK and Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 6031: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 6071: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 6079: Mr. FASO.
 H.R. 6085: Mr. GALLEG0 and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 6105: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 6108: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 6131: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6138: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 6159: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 6178: Mr. BLUM and Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 6219: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 6220: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H.R. 6246: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 6263: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 6275: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 6278: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 6288: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 6315: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 6318: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 6320: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 6330: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 6332: Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 6340: Ms. NORTON and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 6356: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.J. Res. 6: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 319: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H. Res. 757: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H. Res. 763: Mr. POLIS.
 H. Res. 826: Mr. KEATING.
 H. Res. 990: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.