

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