United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019 *No. 34*

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RASKIN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 25, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMIE RASKIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

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

You sent Your prophet Isaiah to Your people when they were in need of hope and vision. May Isaiah's prophetic words guide us still.

Send Your spirit upon this Nation and this Congress, that we may be open to hearing Your word and actively seek the salvation You alone can bring.

Make of us, and the Members of this people's House, a people of compassion and holiness. In pursuing the avenues of justice for all, may we be a sign to the community of nations.

The issues of this coming week promise to be contentious. Send Your spirit of amity and understanding, that the proceedings of the legislative sessions might be a model of good governance.

Lord, bless the Members of the people's House today and all days, and may all that is done 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.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in disappointment that, once again, the Federal Government is nearing another debt limit. Our national debt is a record $22 trillion.

I blame both parties for this reckless and immoral burden that has been placed on our children. We do not have a taxing problem in Congress; we have a spending problem in Congress.

Both parties have lacked fiscal responsibility over the past four decades. Both parties have operated in deficits when they were in power.

Mr. Speaker, it will take both parties working together to control our spending. Our national debt is the single biggest challenge that faces our great country, and, surely, we can make it a bipartisan movement to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending while still funding our most important priorities of Social Security, Medicare, and our national defense.

PENN STATE'S THON 2019

(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, on February 15, thousands of students from my alma mater, Penn State University, participated in a 46-hour dance marathon called THON.

THON is the accumulation of a yearlong fundraising effort to raise money for the fight against childhood cancer. Since the first THON took place in the mid-1970s, students have raised more than $157 million.

All of the proceeds go to the Four Diamonds at Penn State University Children's Hospital. Four Diamonds ensures that families who are battling pediatric cancer are not faced with any costs, allowing them to fully focus on the needs of their child.

During the THON event, participants stand and dance 46 hours straight, without sleep. THON gives students the chance to stand in solidarity with those affected by this terrible disease.

Mr. Speaker, every year, THON is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world; and every year, I am in awe of the passion and thoughtfulness that

our Penn State students have for this great cause.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERS) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes 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.

PREVENTING ILLEGAL RADIO ABUSE THROUGH ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 583) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 583

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 ''Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act'' or the ''PIRATE Act''.

SEC. 2. PIRATE RADIO ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENTS.

Title V of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 511. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING; ENFORCEMENT SWEEPS; REPORTING.

''(a) INCREASED GENERAL PENALTY.—Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any pirate radio broadcasting shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000,000.

''(b) VIOLATION OF THIS ACT, RULES, OR REGULATIONS.—Any person who willfully and knowingly violates this Act or any rule, regulation, restriction, or condition made or imposed by the Commission under authority of this Act, or any rule, regulation, restriction, or condition made or imposed by any international radio or wire communications treaty or convention, or regulations annexed thereto, to which the United States is party, relating to pirate radio broadcasting shall, in addition to any other penalties provided by law, be subject to a fine of not more than $100,000 for each day during which such offense occurs, in accordance with the limit described in subsection (a).

''(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PIRATE Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report summarizing the implementation of this section and associated enforcement activities for the previous fiscal year, which may include the efforts by the Commission to enlist the cooperation of Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel (including United States attorneys and the United States Marshals Service) for service of process, collection of fines or forfeitures, seizures of equipment, and enforcement of orders.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT SWEEPS.—

''(1) ANNUAL SWEEPS.—Not less than once each year, the Commission shall assign appropriate enforcement personnel to focus specific and sustained attention on the elimination of pirate radio broadcasting within the top 5 radio markets identified as prevalent for such broadcasts. Such effort shall include identifying, locating, and taking enforcement actions designed to terminate such operations.

''(2) ADDITIONAL MONITORING.—Within 6 months after conducting the enforcement sweeps required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall conduct monitoring sweeps to ascertain whether the pirate radio broadcasting identified by enforcement sweeps is continuing to broadcast and whether additional pirate radio broadcasting is occurring.

''(3) NO EFFECT ON REMAINING ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Commission shall not decrease or diminish the regular enforcement efforts targeted to pirate radio broadcast stations for other times of the year.

''(e) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY.—The Commission may not preempt any State or local law prohibiting pirate radio broadcasting.

''(f) REVISION OF COMMISSION RULES REQUIRED.—The Commission shall revise its rules to require that, absent good cause, in any case alleging a violation of subsection (a) or (b), the Commission shall proceed directly to issue a notice of apparent liability without first issuing a notice of unlicensed operation.

''(g) PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING DATABASE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and semi-annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish a database in a clear and legible format of all licensed radio stations operating in the AM and FM bands. The database shall be easily accessible from the Commission home page through a direct link. The database shall include the following information:

''(A) Each licensed station, listed by the assigned frequency, channel number, or Commission call letters.

''(B) All entities that have received a notice of unlicensed operation, notice of apparent liability, or forfeiture order issued by the Commission.

''(2) CLEAR IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission shall clearly identify in the database—

''(A) each licensed station as a station licensed by the Commission; and

''(B) each entity described in paragraph (1)(B) as operating without a Commission license or authorization.

''(h) DEFINITION OF PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING.—In this section, the term 'pirate radio broadcasting' means the transmission of communications on spectrum frequencies between 535 and 1705 kilohertz, inclusive, or 87.7 and 108 megahertz, inclusive, without a license issued by the Commission, but does not include unlicensed operations in compliance with part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 583, the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act, or PIRATE Act, a bill sponsored by myself and Mr. BILIRAKIS. This measure is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that passed the House last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, first, a heartfelt thank you to everyone who has worked on this measure. I thank Representative BILIRAKIS for agreeing to lead this effort with me in this Congress. I thank our former colleague, Congressman Leonard Lance, for all his work on this bill in the past. And I thank the New York State broadcasters for their dedication.

For years, I, along with many Members of the New York and New Jersey delegations, have voiced our concern that pirate radio operators are a threat to Americans' public health and safety. Yet these lawbreakers are as prevalent as ever, and their actions have been met with few consequences. This legislation responds directly to that threat.

The FCC has taken some positive steps to remedy this issue, but more needs to be done.

In short, the PIRATE Act would increase penalties and restrictions on pirate radio.

Whether a radio frequency is being used by first responders coordinating to save lives, or parents who want to keep obscenity and bigotry away from their children, for example, our communities are better served when broadcasters respect the rule of law.

Previous drafts of the PIRATE Act included provisions creating liability for those who facilitate illegal pirate radio operation. These provisions were removed as being duplicative with existing law. For example, under current law, the FCC can hold a property owner liable for allowing a pirate radio operator access or other assistance.

Cutting these provisions should not be taken as limiting the Commission's authority to assess fines against those who assist illegal pirate operations. On the contrary, the consequences established in this act would also apply in these contexts.

The text of the bill before us today includes changes that were requested in the Senate last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 583 from the 50 State broadcast associations.

JANUARY 18, 2019.

50 State Broadcasters Associations Urge Passage of the Bipartisan PIRATE Act

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADERS MCCARTHY, MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER: The undersigned broadcasters associations representing local, over-the-air broadcast stations in all 50 States, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico urge your swift consideration and passage of the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement (PIRATE) Act (H.R. 583). The PIRATE Act would provide the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) with critical new enforcement measures to combat pirate radio operations. Last Congress, substantially similar bipartisan legislation (H.R. 5709, 115th) passed the House of Representatives unanimously.

For years unauthorized pirate radio stations have harmed communities across the country by undermining the Emergency Alert System, interfering with airport communications, posing direct health risks and interfering with licensed stations' abilities to serve their listeners. The time has come to take significant steps to resolve this vexing problem.

The PIRATE Act gives the FCC additional tools to address the growing pirate radio problem. It provides the authority to levy increased fines up to $100,000 per violation and $2,000,000 in total. The PIRATE Act streamlines the enforcement process and requires the FCC to conduct pirate radio enforcement sweeps in cities with a concentration of pirate radio stations. It recognizes the importance of FCC coordination with federal, state and local law enforcement authorities. Finally, the PIRATE Act would create a database of all licensed radio stations operating in the AM and FM bands as well as those entities that have been subject to enforcement actions for illegal operation.

We are reaching the point where illegal pirate stations undermine the legitimacy and purpose of the FCC's licensing system to the detriment of listeners in communities across the country. The PIRATE Act will help the FCC restore integrity to the system. For these reasons, local broadcasters across our great nation fully support the bipartisan PIRATE Act and urge its swift passage without changes.

Respectfully,

Sharon Tinsley, Alabama Broadcasters Association; Cathy Hiebert, Alaska Broadcasters Association; Christopher Kline, Arizona Broadcasters Association; Luke Story, Arkansas Broadcasters Association; Joe Berry, California Broadcasters Association; Justin Sasso, Colorado Broadcasters Association; Michael Patrick Ryan, Connecticut Broadcasters Association; C. Patrick Roberts, Florida Association of Broadcasters; Bob Houghton, Georgia Association of Broadcasters; Jamie Hartnett, Hawaii Association of Broadcasters; Connie Searles, Idaho State Broadcasters Association; Dennis Lyle, Illinois Broadcasters Association.

Dave Arland, Indiana Broadcasters Association; Sue Toma, Iowa Broadcasters Association; Kent Cornish, Kansas Association of Broadcasters; Chris Winkle, Kentucky Broadcasters Association; Polly Prince Johnson, Louisiana Association of Broadcasters; Suzanne Goucher, Maine Association of Broadcasters; Lisa Reynolds, Maryland/D.C./Delaware (MDCD) Broadcasters Association; Jordan Walton, Massachusetts Broadcasters Association; Karole L. White, Michigan Association of Broadcasters; Wendy Paulson, Minnesota Broadcasters Association; Margaret Perkins, Mississippi Association of Broadcasters; Mark Gordon, Missouri Broadcasters Association.

Dewey Bruce, Montana Broadcasters Association; Jim Timm, Nebraska Broadcasters Association; Mitch Fox, Nevada Broadcasters Association; Tracy Caruso, New Hampshire Association of Broadcasters; Paul Rotella, New Jersey Broadcasters Association; Paula Maes, New Mexico Broadcasters Association; David Donovan, New York State Broadcasters Association; Lisa Reynolds, North Carolina Association of Broadcasters; Beth Helfrich, North Dakota Broadcasters Association; Christine Merritt, Ohio Association of Broadcasters; Vance Harrison, Oklahoma Association of Broadcasters; John Tamerlano, Oregon Association of Broadcasters.

Joe Conti, Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters; Jose A. Ribas Dominicci, Radio Broadcasters Association of Puerto Rico; Lori Needham, Rhode Island Broadcasters Association; Margaret Wallace, South Carolina Broadcasters Association; Steve Willard, South Dakota Broadcasters Association; Whit Adamson, Tennessee Association of Broadcasters; Oscar Rodriguez, Texas Association of Broadcasters; Michele Zabriskie, Utah Broadcasters Association; Wendy Mays, Vermont Association of Broadcasters; Doug Easter, Virginia Association of Broadcasters; Keith Shipman, Washington State Association of Broadcasters; Michele Crist, West Virginia Broadcasters Association; Michelle Vetterkind, Wisconsin Broadcasters Association; Laura Grott, Wyoming Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 583 is a bipartisan, commonsense advance in the laws that support our first responders and protect our communities. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so it can be taken up in the Senate and signed into law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 583, the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act, the PIRATE Act, introduced by my friends Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS for their bipartisan efforts to combat illegal pirate radio operations.

This bill gives the Federal Communications Commission, along with State and local law enforcement, more tools to go after pirate radio operators. Without the ability to effectively go after illegal transmitters, the FCC and other entities cannot protect the over 240 million Americans who rely on radio broadcasting for vital news and entertainment.

Furthermore, stopping bad actors from pirating our airwaves improves public safety by preventing unlawful broadcasts from interfering with first responders' lifesaving communications and public safety officials' transmission of critical information in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the PIRATE Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members who choose to speak. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 583, the PIRATE Act, led by Chairman TONKO and Representative BILIRAKIS.

The bipartisan bill takes an important step to protect the vital public safety announcements, news, and educational benefits local broadcasters serve to their communities.

When illegal pirate radio operators interfere with important public safety communications, it can be detrimental to the public. These illegal pirate operators also interfere with critical aviation frequencies, potentially putting lives at risk.

Legitimate, licensed broadcasters who provide the foundation of our Nation's Emergency Alert System must be protected from this type of harmful interference.

H.R. 583 would give the FCC stronger tools to continue their enforcement sweeps and fine violators in order to better protect Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership on this bipartisan legislation, and I urge its passage today.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, again, for all the reasons that I have stated here today on the PIRATE Act, I believe that this bill is essential to pass today, and I ask the House to pass H.R. 583.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, to close, I believe that this measure, H.R. 583, moves us forward in a way that better protects public health and safety. It has the endorsement of many in the field, including 50 State broadcast associations.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues to support H.R. 583, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 583, the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement (PIRATE) Act, introduced by Reps. PAUL TONKO and GUS BILIRAKIS. I want to thank Rep. CHRIS COLLINS of New York and former Rep. Leonard Lance of New Jersey for leading on this last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I've been around radio for most of my life. From working as a teenage janitor at my dad's radio station to spending more than 20 years as a radio station owner myself; in fact, I'm still a licensed amateur radio operator today. But you don't need that much experience to understand that protecting our public airwaves from illegal pirate radio interference is important for consumers and broadcasters alike.

The PIRATE Act gives the FCC additional tools to address the growing pirate radio problem and increases the penalties for bad actors. These illegal broadcasts deprive Americans of important programming provided by legitimate broadcast license-holders serving the public interest. And they can disrupt important public safety communications, including our nation's Emergency Alert System and critical aviation frequencies. In many cases, these pirate radio stations broadcast vile and vulgar content, which also harms consumers. By preventing illegal pirate radio operations, consumers are protected, and airwaves are kept free for legitimate broadcasts and public safety announcements.

Last Congress, this House passed the PIRATE Act by voice vote. I'd like to thank our former colleague Leonard Lance, who first authored this legislation last Congress, and my colleagues Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS for bringing this important bill to strengthen our public safety communications back to the House floor today. I urge its quick passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 583.

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.

POISON CENTER NETWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 501) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and enhance the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 501

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 ''Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF POISON CONTROL CENTERS NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

Section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–71) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1271. ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER AND ENHANCED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide coordination and assistance to poison control centers for—

''(1) the development, establishment, implementation, and maintenance of a nationwide toll-free phone number; and

''(2) the enhancement of communications capabilities, which may include text capabilities.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary may consult with nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control to determine the best and most effective means of achieving the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—In assisting with public health emergencies, responses, or preparedness, nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the work of poison control centers or the use of their resources by the Secretary or other governmental agencies.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $700,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.''.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONWIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION.

Section 1272 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–72) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1272. NATIONWIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION AND THEIR PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) carry out, and expand upon, a national public awareness campaign to educate the public and health care providers about—

''(A) poisoning, toxic exposure, and drug misuse prevention; and

''(B) the availability of poison control center resources in local communities; and

''(2) as part of such campaign, highlight the nationwide toll-free number and enhanced communications capabilities supported under section 1271.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out and expanding upon the national campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary may consult with nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control response for the purpose of determining the best and most effective methods for achieving public awareness.

''(c) CONTRACT WITH ENTITY.—The Secretary may carry out subsection (a) by entering into contracts with one or more public or private entities, including nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control and national media firms, for the development and implementation of the awareness campaign under subsection (a), which may include—

''(1) the development and distribution of poisoning and toxic exposure prevention, poison control center, and public health emergency awareness and response materials;

''(2) television, radio, internet, and newspaper public service announcements; and

''(3) other means and activities to provide for public and professional awareness and education.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) establish baseline measures and benchmarks to quantitatively evaluate the impact of the nationwide public awareness campaign carried out under this section; and

''(2) on a biennial basis, prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an evaluation of the nationwide public awareness campaign.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $800,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.''.

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE POISON CONTROL CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1273 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–73) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1273. MAINTENANCE OF THE POISON CONTROL CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall award grants to poison control centers accredited under subsection (c) (or granted a waiver under subsection (d)) and nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control for the purposes of—

''(1) preventing, and providing treatment recommendations for, poisonings and toxic exposures including opioid and drug misuse;

''(2) assisting with public health emergencies, responses, and preparedness; and

''(3) complying with the operational requirements needed to sustain the accreditation of the center under subsection (c).

''(b) ADDITIONAL USES OF FUNDS.—In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), a poison center or professional organization awarded a grant under such subsection may also use amounts received under such grant—

''(1) to research, establish, implement, and evaluate best practices in the United States for poisoning prevention, poison control center outreach, opioid and drug misuse information and response, and public health emergency, response, and preparedness programs;

''(2) to research, develop, implement, revise, and communicate standard patient management guidelines for commonly encountered toxic exposures;

''(3) to improve national toxic exposure and opioid misuse surveillance by enhancing cooperative activities between poison control centers in the United States and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other governmental agencies;

''(4) to research, improve, and enhance the communications and response capability and capacity of the Nation's network of poison control centers to facilitate increased access to the centers through the integration and modernization of the current poison control centers communications and data system, including enhancing the network's telephony, internet, data, and social networking technologies;

''(5) to develop, support, and enhance technology and capabilities of nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control to collect national poisoning, toxic occurrence, and related public health data;

''(6) to develop initiatives to foster the enhanced public health utilization of national poison data collected by such organizations;

''(7) to support and expand the toxicologic expertise within poison control centers; and

''(8) to improve the capacity of poison control centers to answer high volumes of contacts and internet communications, and to sustain and enhance the poison control center's network capability to respond during times of national crisis or other public health emergencies.

''(c) ACCREDITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary may award a grant to a poison control center under subsection (a) only if—

''(1) the center has been accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization in the field of poison control, and the Secretary has approved the organization as having in effect standards for accreditation that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning; or

''(2) the center has been accredited by a State government, and the Secretary has approved the State government as having in effect standards for accreditation that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning.

''(d) WAIVER OF ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the accreditation requirements of subsection (c) with respect to a nonaccredited poison control center that applies for a grant under this section if such center can reasonably demonstrate that the center will obtain such an accreditation within a reasonable period of time as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(2) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a waiver under paragraph (1).

''(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not, after the date of enactment of the Poison

Control Network Enhancement Act of 2019, grant to a poison control center waivers or renewals that total more than 5 years.

''(e) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available to a poison control center under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, or local funds provided for such center.

''(f) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—A poison control center, in utilizing the proceeds of a grant under this section, shall maintain the annual recurring expenditures of the center for its activities at a level that is not less than 80 percent of the average level of such recurring expenditures maintained by the center for the preceding 3 fiscal years for which a grant is received.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $28,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024. The Secretary may utilize an amount not to exceed 6 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence for each fiscal year for coordination, dissemination, technical assistance, program evaluation, data activities, and other program administration functions, which are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for carrying out the program under this section.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. 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. 501.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act.

This bill, which I have coauthored with the gentlewoman from Indiana, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, reauthorizes for an additional 5 years the national network of poison control centers, known as PCCs, which play a critical role in the fight to end the opioid crisis.

Our country's 55 poison centers are staffed by trained toxicologists, pharmacists, physicians, and nurses who are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year to provide real-time lifesaving assistance via a national toll-free number, which is 1–800–222–1222. Some 330 million people are served by these critical centers, while handling 2.6 million cases.

In 2017, someone called a poison center roughly every 12 seconds in our country. More than 90 percent of those calls were due to poison exposure in someone's home, and more than half of all cases involved children under the age of 12. That is why speedy access to poison centers is such an invaluable resource, especially for parents.

Poison centers also save hundreds of millions in Federal dollars by helping to avoid the unnecessary use of medical services and shortening the length of time a person spends in the hospital, if hospitalization due to poisoning is necessary.

It is clear that these centers are a smart public health investment, but they are also an integral part of our response to the opioid epidemic.

Since 2011, poison centers handled nearly 200 cases per day involving opioid misuse. Data from poison centers helped to detect trends in the epidemic, and experts helped educate Americans about the crisis in ways that could potentially save the lives of their loved ones.

The Upstate New York Poison Center, for instance, used the New York State Fair to educate New Yorkers about proper use of naloxone, the overdose reversal drug. This bill would make sure that activities like this can continue.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of coauthoring the last poison center reauthorization signed into law in 2014, and I am pleased to have worked on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROOKS for partnering with me on this legislation, as well as Congresswoman DEGETTE and Congresswoman HERRERA BEUTLER for being original cosponsors. Let me also thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for their assistance in bringing this bill to the floor today.

As I mentioned earlier, in Westchester County, New York, much of which I represent, 124 people died due to opioids in 2016. In the Bronx, part of which I also represent, more New Yorkers died of overdoses than in any other borough in New York City.

We must do more to end this epidemic, and I am pleased to see this legislation moving forward as part of that effort.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2019, introduced by Representatives BROOKS and ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Committee on Energy and Commerce colleagues for their bipartisan work on this important initiative.

This legislation will reauthorize the national toll-free number, public awareness campaign, and grant program that supports the Nation's 55 poison centers.

These centers are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to provide free and confidential assistance with emergencies and other information to help prevent poisoning. As of January 2019, poison control centers have managed over 4,000 opioid exposure cases alone.

At a time when our Nation is still fighting to overcome an opioid crisis, these centers are on the front lines, helping to save individuals who overdose. Furthermore, these centers collect real-time data, enhancing public health surveillance and aiding in the detection of public health emergencies.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act.

This important bill, introduced by Reps. ELIOT ENGEL, SUSAN BROOKS, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, and DIANA DEGETTE, reauthorizes the national network of Poison Control Centers.

The nation's network of poison control centers offers free, confidential, and expert medical advice and often serves as the primary resource for poisoning information. These centers help reduce Emergency Room visits through in-home treatment and their lifesaving assistance helps prevent unnecessary poisoning deaths and injuries.

Poison control centers are also essential to combating the opioid crisis because not only are these centers often the first resource people seek after an opioid overdose occurs, but they also collect real time data to alert impacted communities about opioid abuse and misuse.

Last Congress, Rep. BROOKS led similar legislation, which passed this House by voice vote and was then included in the House-passed version of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, our broad legislative package to combat the opioid crisis. Unfortunately, after negotiations with the Senate, this language was not included in the final package that was signed into law.

Therefore, I'd like to commend Rep. ENGEL and Rep. BROOKS for their continued leadership on this bipartisan legislation in helping to bring this bill to the floor today, and I urge passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 501.

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.

□ 1645

STRENGTHENING THE HEALTH CARE FRAUD PREVENTION TASK FORCE ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 525) to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a public-private partnership for purposes of identifying health care waste, fraud, and abuse.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 525

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 ''Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH CARE WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE DETECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1128C(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FOR WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE DETECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Under the program described in paragraph (1), there is established a public-private partnership (in this paragraph referred to as the 'partnership') of health plans, Federal and State agencies, law enforcement agencies, health care anti-fraud organizations, and any other entity determined appropriate by the Secretary (in this paragraph referred to as 'partners') for purposes of detecting and preventing health care waste, fraud, and abuse.

''(B) CONTRACT WITH TRUSTED THIRD PARTY.—In carrying out the partnership, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with a trusted third party for purposes of carrying out the duties of the partnership described in subparagraph (C).

''(C) DUTIES OF PARTNERSHIP.—The partnership shall—

''(i) provide technical and operational support to facilitate data sharing between partners in the partnership;

''(ii) analyze data so shared to identify fraudulent and aberrant billing patterns;

''(iii) conduct aggregate analyses of health care data so shared across Federal, State, and private health plans for purposes of detecting fraud, waste, and abuse schemes;

''(iv) identify outlier trends and potential vulnerabilities of partners in the partnership with respect to such schemes;

''(v) refer specific cases of potential unlawful conduct to appropriate governmental entities;

''(vi) convene, not less than annually, meetings with partners in the partnership for purposes of providing updates on the partnership's work and facilitating information sharing between the partners;

''(vii) enter into data sharing and data use agreements with partners in the partnership in such a manner so as to ensure the partnership has access to data necessary to identify waste, fraud, and abuse while maintaining the confidentiality and integrity of such data;

''(viii) provide partners in the partnership with plan-specific, confidential feedback on any aberrant billing patterns or potential fraud identified by the partnership with respect to such partner;

''(ix) establish a process by which entities described in subparagraph (A) may enter the partnership and requirements such entities must meet to enter the partnership;

''(x) provide appropriate training, outreach, and education to partners based on the results of data analyses described in clauses (ii) and (iii); and

''(xi) perform such other duties as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(D) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT ANALYSIS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, the trusted third party with a contract in effect under subparagraph (B) shall perform an analysis of aberrant or fraudulent billing patterns and trends with respect to providers and suppliers of substance use disorder treatments from data shared with the partnership.

''(E) EXECUTIVE BOARD.—

''(i) EXECUTIVE BOARD COMPOSITION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an executive board of the partnership comprised of representatives of the Federal Government and representatives of the private sector selected by the Secretary.

''(II) CHAIRS.—The executive board shall be co-chaired by one Federal Government official and one representative from the private sector.

''(ii) MEETINGS.—The executive board of the partnership shall meet at least once per year.

''(iii) EXECUTIVE BOARD DUTIES.—The duties of the executive board shall include the following:

''(I) Providing strategic direction for the partnership, including membership criteria and a mission statement.

''(II) Communicating with the leadership of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice and the various private health sector associations.

''(F) REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2021, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available on the public website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services a report containing—

''(i) a review of activities conducted by the partnership over the 2-year period ending on the date of the submission of such report, including any progress to any objectives established by the partnership;

''(ii) any savings voluntarily reported by health plans participating in the partnership attributable to the partnership during such period;

''(iii) any savings to the Federal Government attributable to the partnership during such period;

''(iv) any other outcomes attributable to the partnership, as determined by the Secretary, during such period; and

''(v) a strategic plan for the 2-year period beginning on the day after the date of the submission of such report, including a description of any emerging fraud and abuse schemes, trends, or practices that the partnership intends to study during such period.

''(G) FUNDING.—The partnership shall be funded by amounts otherwise made available to the Secretary for carrying out the program described in paragraph (1).

''(H) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—To the extent consistent with this subsection, all functions, personnel, assets, liabilities, and administrative actions applicable on the date before the date of the enactment of this paragraph to the National Fraud Prevention Partnership established on September 17, 2012, by charter of the Secretary shall be transferred to the partnership established under subparagraph (A) as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph.

''(I) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the partnership established by subparagraph (A).

''(J) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement the partnership established by subparagraph (A) by program instruction or otherwise.

''(K) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'trusted third party' means an entity that—

''(i) demonstrates the capability to carry out the duties of the partnership described in subparagraph (C);

''(ii) complies with such conflict of interest standards determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

''(iii) meets such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe.''.

(b) POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of the partnership (as described in section 1128C(a)(6) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a)) establishing a system to conduct real-time data analysis to proactively identify ongoing as well as emergent fraud trends for the entities participating in the partnership and provide such entities with real-time feedback on potentially fraudulent claims. Such report shall include the estimated cost of and any potential barriers to the partnership establishing such a system.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. 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. 525.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 525, the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019. This bipartisan bill would authorize the Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership, and improve and expand the task force's ability to fight waste, fraud, and abuse throughout our healthcare system.

The Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership is a public-private partnership between the Department of Health and Human Services, insurance companies, Federal and State law enforcement agencies, and State healthcare agencies. The partnership aims to improve the detection and prevention of healthcare fraud by facilitating the exchange of data and information between the public and private sectors on fraud trends and successful antifraud practices.

The legislation we are considering today would authorize the partnership, require the partnership to report regularly to Congress, and give the agency new tools to enhance and expand its capabilities.

We must continue to work on a bipartisan basis to enhance our fraud detection capabilities.

I support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 525, Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, the Committee on Ways and Means agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letter on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 525.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. NEAL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD E. NEAL,
Chairman, Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Energy and Commerce and agreeing to discharge H.R. 525, Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019 from further consideration, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will ensure our letters on H.R. 525 are entered into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 525, the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, introduced by the Energy and Commerce Committee Republican Leader WALDEN and Chairman PALLONE.

This legislation will codify the Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership, which is currently operated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and is a voluntary public-private partnership between the Federal Government, State agencies, law enforcement, private health insurance plans, and healthcare antifraud associations.

The partnership was established by the Obama administration and the Trump administration recommended codifying it, solidifying the bipartisan nature of revealing and halting scams that cut across public and private payers.

H.R. 525 will ensure the continued operation of this important partnership to detect and prevent healthcare fraud through public-private information sharing, streamlining analytical tools and data, and providing a forum for government and industry experts to exchange successful antifraud practices.

This bill before us today is the product of bipartisan cooperation, as well as engagement with the Department of Health and Human Services and industry stakeholders.

Originally introduced in the 115th Congress, this legislation worked its way through the Committee on Energy and Commerce in a transparent manner and currently enjoys the support of the chairmen and republican leaders of both the Committee of Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in our healthcare system, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 525, the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act.

This bipartisan bill—which I introduced with Chairman FRANK PALLONE, and which is supported by Ways and Means Chairman RICHARD NEAL and Republican Leader KEVIN BRADY—is a commonsense, bipartisan bill to improve the integrity of our nation's health care system.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) currently operates the Health Care Fraud Prevention Partnership—a voluntary collaboration between the federal government, state agencies, law enforcement, private health insurance plans, and anti-fraud associations. Together, this group works to detect and prevent fraud that threatens to undermine our nation's health care system. This program was created by the Obama Administration, and the Trump Administration has recommended codifying it into law. The bill before us today does just that.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the House passed this legislation by voice vote but unfortunately, we were unable to get this bill through the Senate and to the President's desk before the end of the Congress.

In fact, the House Energy and Commerce Committee had 148 bills pass the House last Congress, and 93 percent of them received bipartisan votes. I'd like to thank Chairman PALLONE for continuing in that bipartisan spirit by helping to bring this bill back to the floor today.

I urge passage of H.R. 525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 525.

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.

INNOVATORS TO ENTREPRENEURS ACT OF 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 539) to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 539

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 ''Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Science Foundation Innovation Corps Program (hereinafter referred to as ''I-Corps''), created administratively by the Foundation in 2011 and statutorily authorized in the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act, has succeeded in increasing the commercialization of Government-funded research.

(2) I-Corps provides valuable entrepreneurial education to graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and other researchers, providing formal training for scientists and engineers to pursue careers in business, an increasingly common path for advanced degree holders.

(3) The I-Corps Teams program is successful in part due to its focus on providing the specific types of education and mentoring entrepreneurs need based on the early stage of their companies, however the program does not provide similar support to them at later stages.

(4) The success of I-Corps in the very early stages of the innovation continuum should be expanded upon by offering additional entrepreneurship training to small businesses as they advance toward commercialization.

(5) The excellent training made available to grantees of participating agencies through the I-Corps Program should be made available to all Federal grantees as well as other businesses willing to pay the cost of attending such training.

(6) The success of the I-Corps Program at promoting entrepreneurship within research institutions and encouraging research commercialization has been due in part to the National Science Foundation's efforts to date on building a national network of science entrepreneurs, including convening stakeholders, promoting national I-Corps courses, cataloguing best practices and encourage sharing between sites and institutions, and developing a mentor network.

(7) As the I-Corps Program continues to grow and expand, the National Science Foundation should maintain its focus on networking and information sharing to ensure that innovators across the country can learn from their peers and remain competitive.

SEC. 3. EXPANDED PARTICIPATION IN I-CORPS.

Section 601(c)(2) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–8(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS.—

''(i) ELIGIBILITY.—The Director, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, as determined by the Director, which may include Federal agencies, I-Corps regional nodes, universities, and public and private entities engaged in technology transfer or commercialization of technologies, shall provide an option for participation in an I-Corps Teams course by—

''(I) Small Business Innovation Research Program grantees; and

''(II) other entities, as determined appropriate by the Director.

''(ii) COST OF PARTICIPATION.—The cost of participation by a Small Business Innovation Research Program grantee in such course may be provided—

''(I) through I-Corps Teams grants;

''(II) through funds awarded to grantees under the Small Business Innovation Research Program or the Small Business Technology Transfer Program;

''(III) by the grantor Federal agency of the grantee using funds set aside for the Small Business Innovation Research Program under section 9(f)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(1));

''(IV) by the grantor Federal agency of the grantee using funds set aside for the Small Business Technology Transfer Program under section 9(n)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)); or

''(V) by the participating teams.''.

SEC. 4. I-CORPS COURSE FOR COMMERCIALIZATION-READY PARTICIPANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the I-Corps program described in section 601(c) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–8(c)), the Director shall develop an I-Corps course offered by I-Corps regional nodes to support commercialization-ready participants. Such course shall include skills such as attracting investors, scaling up a company, and building a brand.

(b) ENGAGEMENT WITH RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS.—In developing the course under subsection (a), the Director may consult with the heads of such Federal agencies, universities, and public and private entities as the Director determines to be appropriate.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—The course developed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) support participants that have completed an I-Corps Teams course;

(2) support participants that have made the decision to take an innovation to market.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing an evaluation of the I-Corps program described in section 601(c) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–8(c)). Such evaluation shall include an assessment of the effects of I-Corps on—

(1) the commercialization of Federally funded research and development;

(2) the higher education system; and

(3) regional economies and the national economy.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Out of amounts otherwise authorized for the National Science Foundation, there is authorized to be appropriated a total of $5,000,000 for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to carry out the activities described in section 4 and the amendment made by section 3.

(b) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 539, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to put before the House today H.R. 539.

The House passed a nearly identical bill, H.R. 5086, in the 115th Congress and, unfortunately, that is as far as the bill got. Hopefully, we can get more movement on it this time around, get it through the Senate, and to the President's desk for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act is a bill I introduced to spur entrepreneurship and turn American innovation into American jobs. This bill expands the National Science Foundation's highly successful Innovation Corps, or I-Corps program, a program I am proud to have championed since its inception in 2011.

I-Corps teaches scientists and engineers, including many women and underrepresented minorities, how to turn their federally-funded laboratory research into successful products and services.

The program has educated more than 1,300 teams, representing 271 universities in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It has been linked to almost 650 startup companies that have raised almost $300 million in follow-on funding.

In the 114th Congress, I led the effort that authorized I-Corps and expanded its reach to other agencies, including the National Institutes of Health, NASA, and the Department of Energy.

The Federal Government invests billions of dollars in research and development annually, both at government facilities, such as national labs, and at universities and research institutions. I-Corps is a modest investment that leads to a higher return on our research spending by significantly increasing rates of commercialization, economic activity, and job creation.

Our economy is driven by the ingenuity of our scientists and engineers, developing innovations today that become tomorrow's great products. And yet, still only a small minority of federally-funded research with commercial potential ever makes it to the marketplace. The I-Corps program helps to change that.

This bill expands I-Corps to meet some pressing needs.

First, it helps more people participate in the program. Right now, unless you are a grantee of NSF or another agency with an I-Corps program, the training can be difficult to access. This bill will give recipients of small business grants from any Federal agency the flexibility to pay for I-Corps with their grant funds, and will also allow other entrepreneurs to apply and pay out-of-pocket to participate.

Second, the bill directs NSF to establish a new course as part of the I-Corps program to teach scientist-entrepreneurs how to start and grow a company. While the current I-Corps course does a great job of helping scientists and engineers determine who their customers are and whether their innovation is suitable for commercialization, it offers only limited guidance on what to do after a scientist makes the decision to become an entrepreneur.

Skills like how to write a business plan, hire a team, and attract investment are taught in business schools, but not in Ph.D. programs. NSF recognized this need and has already begun a pilot program to test curriculum for this new course. This bill will make sure the new course is fully developed and made available around the country.

Finally, this bill requires a GAO assessment of the I-Corps program, its first comprehensive, independent evaluation since it was created. Although the program's success to date speaks for itself, it is important to continuously improve it by developing metrics to measure its performance and ensure that Federal funds are well spent.

This bill has been endorsed by a wide range of stakeholders, including the ''father of modern entrepreneurship,'' who developed the curriculum that I-Corps is based on, Steve Blank; the former NSF program officer, who founded the program, Dr. Errol Arkilic; and several directors of I-Corps Nodes around the country.

This bill is also endorsed by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the National Venture Capital Association, the Association of American Universities; the Council on Governmental Relations; and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

I thank my cosponsors, DANIEL WEBSTER of Florida, ANTHONY GONZALEZ of Ohio, Science, Space, and Technology Committee Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ranking Member FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma. I also thank Senators COONS and YOUNG, who are cosponsors of the Senate companion to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that helping our scientists, engineers, and academics not only advance our knowledge and understanding of the world, but also create jobs and products that fuel our economy, is a goal we all can share.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019.

H.R. 539 extends the outreach of the National Science Foundation's Innovation Corps program, also known as I-Corps.

I-Corps trains and prepares scientists and engineers to take their research from the lab and turn it into commercial products and services.

Research labs are making breakthroughs in new fields like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and bioengineering. These breakthroughs will continue to transform our lives and the world we live in.

But many scientists and engineers are not trained for commercializing these discoveries and did not go to business school or take any business development classes. I-Corps gives researchers the tools to maximize the taxpayer investment in basic research and spur innovation.

H.R. 539 expands the eligible pool for I-Corps courses and allows a portion of Federal small business grants be used to cover I-Corps training expenses.

The bill also allows any private citizen to apply to participate and pay out-of-pocket.

Finally, H.R. 539 authorizes a new I-Corps boot-camp course that teaches valuable skills, like structuring a company, attracting investors, and hiring staff.

In my district, Oklahoma State University has a successful support system for business startups, both on and off campus. I-Corps is a key part of that system, helping students and faculty learn how to commercialize their ideas and build a business.

□ 1700

H.R. 539 will help programs like the one at OSU grow and become self-sustaining.

I want to thank Representative DAN LIPINSKI and Representative DAN WEBSTER for their work on this legislation. I also want to thank my friend and our new chairwoman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for her work in advancing this bipartisan bill.

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today to support and ask my House colleagues to pass H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act.

I would like to issue a special thanks to my friend DAN LIPINSKI, who introduced this legislation, and he continues to serve as a champion for the time-proven I-Corps program.

The Innovation Core program was created by the National Science Foundation in 2011 to teach scientists and engineers how to turn their laboratory innovations into successful commercial products and services. I know engineers are lacking in that area. I am one. I think I invented, before I was 21 years old, about three or four, maybe five, things which were really awesome; but nobody bought them except me, and it wasn't good.

So this program assists scientists and engineers in the development of their academic research and equips them to bring research into a private market where jobs can be created and money can be won through that. We witnessed the wonderful success of this program in my home State of Florida, the University of Central Florida.

H.R. 539 expands the I-Corps program to create a new course in commercial-ready companies. Individuals who have completed an existing I-Corps course would be eligible for this new course which will help them create, market, and, eventually, expand their private-sector company.

This bill breaks down the barriers experienced by current scientists when attempting to bring their product to market. Through marketing, hiring, organizing, and attracting investors, these participants can have a better shot at not only success, but also increasing, dramatically, their business.

Additionally, H.R. 539 expands the number of groups eligible to apply to the I-Corps program and offers new options on how to initially pay for the course.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee for their work on this bill, and I encourage all my House colleagues to join together to pass this commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019.

I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI, Chairwoman JOHNSON, Ranking Member LUCAS, and Mr. WEBSTER for all the hard work they have put into this important legislation.

Entrepreneurship is hard; it is risky; it is the road less traveled; it is an all-encompassing journey that tests every ounce of strength and skill that those bold enough to pursue it have to offer; and its successful practice is essential to the future prosperity of our Nation.

The bill we are considering today takes the breakthrough lessons of customer development first codified by Steve Blank, whose teachings are engrained in the conscience of many business school students—but less of our Ph.D. students—and forms the basis of the NSF I-Corps program, a program that has already proven its worth at turning breakthrough scientific research into successful commercial enterprise.

Since this program was created in 2011, more than 600 startups have been formed through the various I-Corps sites, including in my home State of Ohio at the University of Akron, The Ohio State University, and the University of Toledo.

As just one example, University of Akron I-Corps startup Fontus Blue provides decisionmaking software that helps water treatment plants to produce consistently excellent drinking water. The software is used by plants in 24 cities across the U.S., Canada, and Brazil.

The bill before us today expands upon the success of the current program by opening up access to small business innovation research grantees and also private individuals. Additionally, this bill allows small business innovation research grants and the small business technology transfer grants to be used to access I-Corps training.

Finally, this bill would require I-Corps to develop a course for commercialization-ready teams to help them learn the skills needed to attract investors, build a brand, and scale a business.

As we confront the economic challenges of the 21st century, it will be our innovators and entrepreneurs who will create solutions to these seemingly intractable problems by channeling the entrepreneurial spirit and force of will that has driven our country to its greatest economic heights.

The Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act safeguards our economy by empowering future generations of entrepreneurs in all corners of our country to turn their wildest dreams into our collective achievements.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his dedicated and diligent work over this decade on this subject matter. I think we will all be better off for it. I know those folks who utilize the program and will have greater opportunities to utilize the program will benefit all of us as a society.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank full committee Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for cosponsoring. I want to thank Ranking Member LUCAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WEBSTER for cosponsoring—Mr. WEBSTER as the lead Republican cosponsor on this bill now and in the previous Congress.

Mr. WEBSTER talked about being an engineer. I was an engineer and then an academic; although, I wasn't an academic as an engineer. I was a political scientist. But I understand that a lot of scientists, engineers, political scientists have a lot of great ideas, a lot of great research.

We as taxpayers put a lot of money into this research. There are a lot of

great ideas that come out of it, the possibility for great innovations.

I will always remember when I first met with Steve Blank and saw him teaching the course that was the basis for I-Corps out of Stanford University. I thought this made complete sense to me, to be able to teach scientists and engineers, teach them how to be entrepreneurs, teach them how to develop ideas into new products, new services, and, hopefully, new American jobs.

The I-Corps program has been one of the most successful programs that I have seen during my time in Washington, D.C. This bill will help to advance that, and in doing so, help advance American innovation. I think that is a goal that we can all embrace.

So I ask my colleagues to support this bill, and, hopefully, we will work on it and get it through the Senate and to the President's desk, because I think this will be a great victory for our country.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019. I thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation and look forward to working with him to see it through to the President's desk.

Each dollar the U.S. invests in research grants at our universities is a dollar toward the birth of potentially game-changing discoveries and innovation. Innovation is the lifeblood of our economy. The job creation and economic security gains created by scientific advances can only be enjoyed if we fully support the innovation ecosystem from discovery to commercialization. Finding ways to maximize the benefits of federally funded research is critical to U.S. competitiveness in the global market.

H.R. 539 does just that. This bill creates a link between two of our most important programs that focus on creating a sustainable path from laboratory to market for valuable scientific research. This bill expands participation in the Innovation Corps Program to Small Business Innovation Program grantees. Started at the National Science Foundation, the Innovation Corps program, or I-Corps, helps prepare scientists and engineers to think beyond the university lab and gives them the skills to identify products with commercial potential and to be successful entrepreneurs. The Small Business Innovation Program and Small Business Technology Transfer Program, known as SBIR and STTR, are valuable programs that provide competitive research and development grants and contracts to innovative small businesses.

H.R. 539 also seeks make available specialized I-Corps courses in all aspects of preparing a product to go to market. This is a vital component which can help identify market failures and premature business formation. Unfortunately, too many innovative ideas do not make it to the commercialization phase. This bill will help increase those odds.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 539.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 539.

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. LIPINSKI. 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.

SUPPORTING VETERANS IN STEM CAREERS ACT

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 425) to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 425

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 ''Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the National Science Foundation.

(3) STEM.—The term ''STEM'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621 note).

(4) VETERAN.—The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING VETERANS IN STEM EDUCATION AND COMPUTER SCIENCE.

(a) SUPPORTING VETERAN INVOLVEMENT IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND STEM EDUCATION.—The Director shall, through the research and education activities of the Foundation, encourage veterans to study and pursue careers in STEM and computer science, in coordination with other Federal agencies that serve veterans.

(b) VETERAN OUTREACH PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan for how the Foundation can enhance its outreach efforts to veterans. Such plan shall—

(1) report on the Foundation's existing outreach activities;

(2) identify the best method for the Foundation to leverage existing authorities and programs to facilitate and support veterans in STEM careers and studies, including teaching programs; and

(3) include options for how the Foundation could track veteran participation in research and education programs of the Foundation, and describe any barriers to collecting such information.

(c) NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD INDICATORS REPORT.—The National Science Board shall provide in its annual report on indicators of the state of science and engineering in the United States any available and relevant data on veterans in science and engineering careers or education programs.

(d) ROBERT NOYCE TEACHER SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM UPDATE.—Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) higher education programs that serve or support veterans.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(F)—

(A) by striking ''and students'' and inserting '', students''; and

(B) by inserting '', and veterans'' before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting ''and veterans'' before the period at the end; and

(4) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting ''and veterans'' before the period at the end.

(e) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS AND MASTER TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS UPDATE.—Section 10A(d) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(F)—

(A) by striking ''and individuals'' and inserting '', individuals''; and

(B) by inserting '', and veterans'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(B), by inserting ''and veterans'' before the period at the end.

(f) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS UPDATE.—Section 5(a) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and students who are veterans'' after ''these fields''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) creating opportunities for veterans to transition to careers in computer and network security; and''.

(g) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH UPDATE.—Section 5(c)(6)(C) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(c)(6)(C)) is amended by inserting ''or veterans'' after ''disciplines''.

(h) VETERANS AND MILITARY FAMILIES STEM EDUCATION INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an interagency working group to coordinate Federal programs and policies for transitioning and training veterans and military spouses for STEM careers.

(2) DUTIES OF INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) coordinate any Federal agency STEM outreach activities and programs for veterans and military spouses; and

(B) develop and facilitate the implementation by participating agencies of a strategic plan, which shall—

(i) specify and prioritize short- and long-term objectives;

(ii) specify the common metrics that will be used by Federal agencies to assess progress toward achieving such objectives;

(iii) identify barriers veterans face in reentering the workforce, including a lack of formal STEM education, career guidance, and the process of transferring military credits and skills to college credits;

(iv) identify barriers military spouses face in establishing careers in STEM fields;

(v) describe the approaches that each participating agency will take to address administratively the barriers described in clauses (iii) and (iv); and

(vi) identify any barriers that require Federal or State legislative or regulatory changes in order to be addressed.

(3) DUTIES OF OSTP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall encourage and monitor the efforts of the Federal agencies participating in the interagency working group to ensure that the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B) is developed and executed effectively and that the objectives of such strategic plan are met.

(4) REPORT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and

(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

(5) SUNSET.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date that it is established.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 425, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act.

I want to thank Mr. DUNN and Mr. LAMB for introducing this important legislation.

Now, more than ever, U.S. global competitiveness depends on our ability to grow and sustain a STEM-capable workforce poised to meet the needs of the private sector. With an economy that is rapidly evolving and increasingly reliant on big data automation and advanced technologies, the workforce is struggling to keep up.

Although STEM careers offer good pay and job security, companies across all sectors report having difficulty recruiting workers with the skills that they need.

The good news is veterans and transitioning servicemembers represent a group of highly trained individuals with STEM knowledge base and skill sets employers need. The question is how to get more veterans to produce STEM degrees and join the STEM workforce.

H.R. 425 addresses this question by supporting research to identify and lower barriers for veterans transitioning from military to civilian work environments. The bill directs the National Science Foundation to develop a comprehensive plan for outreach to veterans with the goal of increasing veteran participation in the agency STEM education and research programs.

It also requires NSF, in its biennial Science and Engineering Indicators report, to publish available data on veterans in STEM studies and careers.

Further, the bill adds veterans as a target demographic for outreach under several existing NSF programs, including the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program.

Finally, H.R. 425 creates an interagency committee on veterans in STEM and directs the creation of a strategic plan for transitioning and training veterans and military spouses into STEM careers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 425 will help us cement our global leadership by ensuring more veterans with the STEM skills we need are able to translate their talent into STEM careers. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. NEAL DUNN and Congressman CONOR LAMB for their work to support our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 425 will help veterans put their training and experience in military service to new and important uses and help America stay competitive in research and innovation on a global scale.

In the last decade alone, jobs requiring some level of STEM expertise have grown by more than 30 percent, including jobs that do not require a bachelor's degree.

Nearly 7 million jobs are unfulfilled in the United States due to a shortage of skilled workers, many in STEM and related fields.

In my State of Oklahoma, our universities estimate we have 2,000 open engineering jobs. At the same time, veterans and transitioning servicemembers represent a valuable, skilled talent pool from which to meet this critical need.

H.R. 425 will improve outreach to veterans through the National Science Foundation's programs to support and train STEM workers. We can serve our veterans and help them translate their experience into meaningful STEM work.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB).

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support veterans in STEM careers.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, Dr. DUNN, for his leadership in helping connect veterans to these good jobs.

Veterans are working today. Most Americans are working today. The unemployment rate is low. And yet everywhere I go, I meet businesspeople who tell me that they can't find the right workers for the right jobs at the right time. If we could fix this, we would stop being held back by the shortage of workforce that we face, and, most importantly, our families would not be held back by lower paychecks.

But these new jobs in cybersecurity, in medical technology, in advanced manufacturing, they are hard jobs and they require training.

□ 1715

We need to make the training available to people where they live at a cost that they can actually afford. We have no time to waste.

Our businesses are competing on a global stage against countries that will use the full machinery of their governments to make sure their workforces are ready. We need to meet their efforts with an even greater one.

Luckily, we already have a workforce that will go anywhere and do anything. When it comes to hard work, these folks are fearless. That is the veteran population here in the United States.

Marine officers are trained that if we are given an order to move that mountain over there, no sooner is the order completed than we are leading 100 marines down the road with shovels.

I still have great faith in the ability of 100 marines with shovels, but what we really need today are hundreds of thousands of veterans who can 3D print those shovels, put them in the hands of robots, program them to go down the road, and defend the entire network from foreign intrusion.

These are the jobs of today and tomorrow. These are the jobs that will support our families. Most importantly, these are the jobs that will grow the new middle class.

We want to make sure veterans get these jobs. To do that, we are going to use this bill to turn to the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation was born in the aftermath of World War II to make sure that we led the world in science and math, and the most important advancements. We knew that if we did that, we could make our country safe, healthy, and strong.

If we are going to continue that mission in the new generation, we will need veterans to lead the way.

We do have a global competition on our hands, Mr. Speaker, and I know we can win it if we have the veterans with us. This bill will help them, and I urge all my colleagues to come together to pass it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), one of the great proponents of veterans and a great proponent of moving us forward in the scientific perspective in this Congress.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, for yielding to me.

H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act, is about helping expand veterans' job and education opportunities in the sciences. The bill directs the National Science Foundation to develop a veterans outreach plan and publish data on veterans' participation in mathematics, science, and technology in its annual ''Science and Engineering Indicators'' report.

The bill also updates the NSF Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program, its fellowship programs, and the cyber grant programs to include outreach to veterans.

Additionally, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy is tasked with overseeing an interagency working group to examine how to increase veteran participation in the STEM career fields, including addressing any barriers for both servicemembers and their spouses.

In the next 5 years, between 1 million and 1.5 million members of the Armed Forces will separate from the military, according to the Department of Defense. Many of these veterans will be seeking new careers, and by a great margin, veterans cite finding employment as their number-one need when separating from Active-Duty service.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, occupations in STEM fields are projected to grow to more than 9 million jobs by 2022. Research shows that many military veterans already have skills and training that align with STEM careers, particularly in the area of information technology.

However, it also shows that veterans face many barriers as they reenter the workforce, including a lack of formal certified STEM education, career guidance, and the difficult task of transferring military credits to civilian college credits.

Our Nation's veterans deserve every opportunity to transition to a rewarding and successful civilian life. This bill will help all servicemembers continue to serve our Nation in new ways by fulfilling 21st century jobs and keeping America on the cutting edge of innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LAMB, a fellow member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and a Marine Corps veteran, for cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation. And I salute my fellow veterans on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who joined me in introducing this bill.

Last year, the House passed this legislation by an overwhelming margin, but we did not make it across the finish line in the Senate. This year, we have a bipartisan companion bill in the Senate, introduced by my home State Senator MARCO RUBIO and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now is the time to get this done to help our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and the Senate to act on it and send H.R. 425 to the President's desk.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I note that I think the gentleman from Florida, Dr. DUNN, very eloquently summed it up just moments ago. Veterans deserve every opportunity to transition back and to utilize those skills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. DUNN for introducing this bill again, and we will work hard to see this through to the end.

I thank Mr. LAMB for his comments. It is certainly something that I have experienced, which is employers needing to find more workers. The men and women who are coming out of our armed services have those skills that are needed. We just need to give them a little more help to get them connected. This bill does that.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act. I commend Mr. DUNN and Mr. LAMB for their leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. As Chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee I am committed to supporting a strong STEM workforce. In light of increasing global competition, we must do more to ensure workers are equipped with the STEM skills and knowledge employers need.

Veterans are a highly trained and highly motivated group. They have the skills, the determination, and the know-how to thrive in high-paying, secure STEM careers. H.R. 425 directs the National Science Foundation and the Office of Science and Technology Policy to leverage existing data and programs to better support veterans in their transition to the STEM workforce. We need all hands on deck if we are to maintain our standing as the global leader in innovation. H.R. 425 is a good step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 425.

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.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 276) to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 276

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 ''Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Classified school employees provide valuable service in the United States.

(2) Classified school employees provide essential services, such as transportation, facilities maintenance and operations, food service, safety, and health care.

(3) Classified school employees play a vital role in providing for the welfare and safety of students.

(4) Classified school employees strive for excellence in all areas of service to the education community.

(5) Exemplary classified school employees should be recognized for their outstanding contributions to quality education in the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.—The term ''classified school employee'' means an employee of a State or of any political subdivision of a State, or an employee of a nonprofit entity, who works in any grade from prekindergarten through high school in any of the following occupational specialties:

(A) Paraprofessional, including paraeducator services.

(B) Clerical and administrative services.

(C) Transportation services.

(D) Food and nutrition services.

(E) Custodial and maintenance services.

(F) Security services.

(G) Health and student services.

(H) Technical services.

(I) Skilled trades.

(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The terms used in this Act have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 4. RECOGNITION PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education shall establish a national recognition program to be known as the ''Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award Program'' or the ''award program''. The purpose of the award program shall be to recognize and promote the commitment and excellence exhibited by classified school employees who provide exemplary service to students in prekindergarten through high school.

(b) AWARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to May 31 of each year (beginning with the second calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary shall select a classified school employee to receive the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award for the year.

(2) NON-MONETARY VALUE.—The award and recognition provided under this Act shall have no monetary value.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) NOMINATION PROCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of each year (beginning with the first calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary shall solicit nominations of classified school employees from the occupational specialties described in section 3(1) from the Governor of each State.

(B) NOMINATION SUBMISSIONS.—In order for individuals in a State to be eligible to receive recognition under this section, the

Governor of the State shall consider nominations submitted by the following:

(i) Local educational agencies.

(ii) School administrators.

(iii) Professional associations.

(iv) Labor organizations.

(v) Educational service agencies.

(vi) Nonprofit entities.

(vii) Parents and students.

(viii) Any other group determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) DEMONSTRATION.—Each Governor of a State who desires individuals in the State to receive recognition under this section shall submit the nominations described in paragraph (1) to the Secretary in such manner as may be required by the Secretary. Each such nomination shall contain, at a minimum, demonstrations of excellence in the following areas:

(A) Work performance.

(B) School and community involvement.

(C) Leadership and commitment.

(D) Local support.

(E) Enhancement of classified school employees' image in the community and schools.

(3) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall develop uniform national guidelines for evaluating nominations submitted under paragraph (2) in order to select the most deserving nominees based on the demonstrations made in the areas described in such paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, despite being under the weather, I decided to come down here to thank my colleague and the dean of our delegation, Congresswoman DINA TITUS, for leading this bipartisan effort.

This legislation would establish the Classified School Employee of the Year RISE Award Program to recognize the achievements and contributions of classified school employees to student education in schools across the country.

Classified school employees are critical members of the education workforce, making up one out of every three public school employees who assist students in our Nation's public schools. Classified school employees provide essential services, such as transportation, facilities maintenance and operations, food service, safety, and healthcare.

It is past time that the U.S. Department of Education recognize the tireless efforts of our Nation's outstanding classified school employees. The stature of the Secretary of Education in recognizing the RISE Award will provide national leadership and partnership to encourage broad participation in the development, selection, and recognition process.

Classified school employees across the country do extraordinary and inspirational things in their schools and communities to promote quality education, foster positive learning environments, and ensure student success. The RISE Award will recognize the contributions of classified school employees to student success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 276. I thank my colleagues across the aisle, the gentlewoman from Nevada, and also all those who are original cosponsors in support of this bill.

It is not uncommon for a school employee to make a lasting impression on a student or even on entire generations of students. Front office attendants, school custodians, school safety personnel, food service workers, and others all interface directly with countless students every day. Many of these school employees make lifelong impacts on the students who they serve.

Ask any student and they will probably tell you about a particular school employee who may not have been their teacher, but, nevertheless, imparted crucial life lessons upon them or inspired joy and confidence in students who struggled to find either. Schools are made better by these leaders, and students benefit from their kindness, thoughtfulness, compassion, and respect that they show to others around them.

Mr. Speaker, these employees truly go above and beyond the call of duty to serve American students, and their steadfast devotion deserves our appreciation and recognition.

H.R. 276, the Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act, will direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award, otherwise known as the RISE Award. The RISE Award will be presented each year to a classified school employee in a nonteaching position in recognition of their invaluable contribution to the lives of students at the schools that they serve.

The award will be nonmonetary and will go to employees who demonstrate excellent work performance, school and community involvement, leadership, and commitment, and who exemplify the very best of what it means to be a classified school employee.

H.R. 276 is just one small way to honor the men and women in our communities who demonstrate to students what it means to be outstanding citizens and civic leaders. Their tireless efforts deserve our recognition and thanks. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), the lead sponsor of H.R. 276.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her support of this bill that creates the RISE Award.

I would like to address the bill before you by telling you the story of Ms. Virginia Mills. Ms. Mills started her career as a security guard at William E. Orr Middle School in District One in Las Vegas over two decades ago.

Almost immediately upon getting to the school, she saw that children were going to school without backpacks on their shoulders to carry their books and equipment. She saw athletes trying out for the basketball team without having the proper shoes on their feet. She saw children who didn't have enough clothes to make it through the whole week without changing.

So in her very first month on the job, taking old items from her own daughter's closet, she started a clothes closet for middle school students in need. She first enlisted the help of friends, then teachers, and then community members. Eventually, the closet grew to include school supplies and even food for children to take home on the weekends, when they might otherwise go hungry.

Ms. Mills has watched these students grow over the years to become assemblymen and -women in the legislature, business leaders, and community organizers. She said: ''Giving a helping hand to these students has inspired them to become better adults . . . . They now understand the importance of paying it forward.''

Virginia Mills has improved the lives of so many middle school students in my district, and she has filled a gap that too many young people are in danger of falling into. And she wanted me to tell you that she didn't do it alone.

There are countless people in our schools, including security guards who do more than keep students safe; they keep them motivated. There are bus drivers who provide more than just a ride; they offer friendship. There are counselors and nurses and cafeteria workers who strive tirelessly behind the scenes to ensure the success of our students in our schools. Yet, too often, their contributions go unrecognized.

That is why I introduced this bipartisan legislation to celebrate the critical role that school staff plays in helping our students learn and enabling our teachers to teach.

□ 1730

The contributions of these vital school employees can't really be measured, but they can and should be recognized.

It is in our children's interest and certainly in our national interest for the Department of Education to

present these RISE Awards to people like Virginia Mills who have made such a profound impact on our Nation's youth. So for those who work so hard to help our students become the best versions of themselves, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the story that was shared about the woman working in that school district. I think we all probably have those stories as we think fondly back on our school experiences, whether it was elementary or high school, about individuals who weren't necessarily teachers but were still very influential in making an impression and setting a great example to be followed in so many different ways. That is why I am so pleased to be able to support this piece of legislation.

I have had the privilege and honor to be in our schools that are recognized as the Blue Ribbon Schools and Schools to Watch, and those are wonderful. They are wonderful not just because of what has been accomplished for those kids, but they do become an inspiration to other schools to strive for and to achieve.

What this piece of legislation does, Mr. Speaker, is to take that down to the staff level, because we know that the most valuable resource and asset that we have in our schools are people—not necessarily the classroom or anything that is physical like that, but it is the teachers, the faculty, and the staff. Being able to recognize the staff who work so hard each and every day there who are not necessarily teachers is a great opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I certainly am very excited about supporting this piece of legislation, H.R. 276. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to thank Representative TITUS for her leadership in bringing forth this bipartisan piece of legislation.

When it comes to delivering the promise of a great public school for every child, it is a team effort. Classified employees keep the lights on, students fed, and learning environments safe and welcoming.

This past year, we have seen unprecedented activism from teachers and school staff demanding better support for public schools across the country. While the media often speaks first about the contributions and working conditions for classroom teachers, it is important to recognize that behind every teacher is an army of classified school employees.

Passing this bill to recognize the contributions of classified school employees is an important first step, but I urge this body to do more. We must come together and continue to work across the aisle to invest in public education. We must invest in the staff who support our public schools and in students who count on public schools to reach their academic potential.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that swift passage of H.R. 276 is just the beginning, and I look forward to future action in this Chamber in support of public schools. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 276.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. 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.

MSPB TEMPORARY TERM EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1235) to provide that the term of office of certain members of the Merit Systems Protection Board shall be extended by a period of 1 year, to limit such members from concurrently holding positions within the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1235

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 ''MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act''.

SEC. 2. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD MEMBERS: TERM EXTENSION AND LIMITATION ON SERVICE.

The term of office of any member of the Merit Systems Protection Board appointed under section 1202 of title 5, United States Code, serving as such a member on the date of enactment of this Act shall be extended for a period of one year beyond the date the member's service would otherwise end under subsection (c) of such section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank House leadership for bringing H.R. 1235, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act, so quickly to the floor at the request of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Chairman CUMMINGS and I introduced this bill to prevent a potential crisis at the Merit Systems Protection Board, a vacant Board without any members. Acting Chairman Mark Robbins is and has been the sole member on the Board since January 2017. His holdover term expires at the end of this month, the 28th of February, and it cannot be extended without legislation. We planned to address this issue through regular order, but circumstances arose that prevented us from doing so.

The subcommittee I am going to chair originally scheduled a hearing to examine the problem on February 14, but the hearing was postponed to the end of this month to allow all Members to attend the funerals of our colleagues John Dingell and Walter Jones.

We hoped that the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee would take action to address the problem during its business meeting on February 20. Although the Senate committee was able to approve two nominees for the Board, Chairman JOHNSON indicated he would withhold those nominations from the Senate floor pending the naming of a third nominee by the White House.

The Senate committee was also reportedly working on language to extend Mr. Robbins' holdover term for another year, but no legislation was considered at the markup, thus our action today.

Given these events, it appears less and less likely that the Senate will be able to confirm new Board members before time runs out this Thursday. That is why the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman CUMMINGS and I, introduced this stopgap measure, H.R. 1235, to ensure some work by the MSPB will continue. The legislation will provide a one-time, 1-year extension for Mr. Robbins' term to give the Senate more time to confirm the additional Board members.

This version of the bill before us eliminates the provision prohibiting dual appointments because Mr. Robbins assured us he would continue to recuse himself from working on matters related to OPM and that he would recuse himself from OPM matters that related to votes he had taken at MSPB if this bill is enacted.

This amendment is in response to many of the concerns raised by our Republican friends.

We urgently need to pass this bill because we need to ensure that MSPB can continue its operations. If Mr. Robbins' term expires without new members confirmed, it will be the first time in the agency's history that the Board has no members at all. We will be entering uncharted new territory, and not good territory.

If there is no principal officer to lead the agency, not only is it unclear

which agency functions may continue and which ones must be suspended, but, also, whether the entire agency must shut down completely. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to risk that shutdown.

There is a lot at stake here. MSPB protects whistleblowers from retaliation, veterans from job discrimination, and Federal employees from prohibited personnel practices. The agency ensures that the Federal civil service is nonpartisan and complies with the merit system principles.

Since 2017, MSPB has been operating under certain constraints without a quorum on the Board. This has prevented the Board from hearing final appeals of agency adverse actions.

The absence of a quorum has also prevented the Board from issuing special studies of the civil service and reviews of OPM rules and regulations, as is required. This has resulted in a backlog, Mr. Speaker, of 2,000 final appeals which will take more than 3 years to process and eight Merit Systems studies pending issuance by the Board.

The current situation is certainly less than ideal, but let's not make it worse by doing nothing and creating a complete vacancy on the Board.

This would cause decisions made by Mr. Robbins, by the way, to be voided, exacerbating the backlog, and any new Board members who are finally confirmed would have to start again from square one.

We should not and cannot allow that to happen. Addressing the problem should be a bipartisan concern, and I believe it is. We cannot let politics prevent MSPB from doing its job.

The bill in front of us is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees, the National Treasury Employees Union, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the Government Accountability Project, Public Citizen, Project on Government Oversight, the Make It Safe Coalition, the Senior Executives Association, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from those organizations and a coalition of other stakeholders.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees. AFL-CIO (AFGE), I am writing to urge support for the ''Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) Temporary Term Extension Act,'' introduced by Congressman Elijah Cummings (D-MD). This legislation would allow the term of the current and only MSPB member to be extended and avoid having a vacant Board.

An employee may appeal an adverse action to the MSPB, a third-party agency that hears and adjudicates civil service appeals. MSPB administrative judges (AJs) hear the matter in an adversarial setting and decide the case in accordance with established legal precedents. If dissatisfied with the AJ's decision. either the agency or the employee may appeal the decision to the full three Member MSPB. Currently, the Board does not have a quorum. Mark Robbins is the only member on the Board and his term expires on February 28, 2019. Robbins' original term ended in March 2018, and he is currently serving under a maximum one-year statutory extension.

When Robbins' term expires, the Board will have no Presidentially-appointed members. The ''MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act.'' would allow for Robbins to extend his term for one additional year and avoid having an MSPB with no members. AFGE believes that the MSPB serves an important role in upholding the Merit Systems Principles and the rights of federal employees. Therefore, AFGE strongly urges you to support the ''MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act.'' to allow a temporary carryover of the current and only member of the MSPB. Thank you.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,
National President.

NTEU, THE NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION,
Washington, DC, February 19, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS: On behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), representing over 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, 1 write to applaud your efforts to support the important work performed by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSBP or Board) and ensure that it can continue. We believe that your bill, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act, is the appropriate response to address the impending loss of leadership at the Board.

As you know, Mark Robbins is the Acting Chairman and the only Member left on the Board. His original term expired last year and his holdover year will expire on February 28, 2019. Given the uncertainty regarding the operations of the Board once Mr. Robbins' term ends, we appreciate that your bill would temporarily allow Mr. Robbins to remain on the Board for a short period of time while the President's nominees for the MSPB undergo Senate consideration. We also appreciate that the bill stipulates that the individual who would be allowed to extend their term would be unable to hold another position in the government at the same time.

NTEU fully supports your carefully crafted temporary extension bill and we appreciate your efforts to safeguard the employee protections envisioned in the Civil Service Reform Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON
National President.

———

February 25, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

Hon, JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK MEADOWS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS, RANKING MEMBER JORDAN, CHAIRMAN CONNOLLY, AND RANKING MEMBER MEADOWS: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, who all strongly value and support our nation's professional nonpartisan civil service, we write to express our concerns about the future of the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) and convey our support for H.R. 1235.

As you know, the Board has already operated under unprecedented circumstances, lacking a quorum for nearly two full years. The result has been a backlog of nearly 2,000 cases and a delay in justice for federal employees, whistleblowers, veterans, and federal annuitants with matters before the Board, as well as a lack of closure for agencies in personnel matters. Moreover, due to the lack of quorum the Board has been unable to issue official reports or studies to Congress and the President during a critical time in which there is growing appreciation for the imperative of modernizing our civil service.

On February 13 the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee advanced two of the President's MSPB nominees, yet they are still awaiting floor action pending nomination of a third Board member by the President. Should the Senate be unable to approve the Board nominees and restore a quorum, effective March 1 the Board would be without any Senate-confirmed leadership for the first time in its history, due to the expiration of acting chairman Mark Robbins' holdover period.

In order to ensure that the Board can continue operations at the most basic levels, including the critical role in issuing stays in whistleblower cases, passage of legislation to extend the holdover period for the Board is imperative. We strongly urge passage of H.R. 1235 to prevent the current crisis with the Board from doing permanent damage to the merit system and the civil service.

Thank you for your consideration of our perspective on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

FAA Managers Association (FAAMA), Federal Managers Association (FMA), Government Accountability Project (GAP), Tom Devine, Liberty Coalition, National Council of Social Security Management Associations (NCSSMA), National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE), National Taxpayers Union, National Whistleblower Center, Professional Managers Association (PMA), Project on Government Oversight (POGO), Public Citizen, Senior Executives Association (SEA), Taxpayer Protection Alliance, Union of Concerned Scientists, Whistleblowers of America.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1235, a commonsense stopgap measure to prevent serious injury to hardworking civil servants who expect the Merit Systems Protection Board to function.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 1235, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that I personally am committed to ensuring the successful operation of the Merit Systems Protection Board, also known as MSPB. In fact, last Congress, I introduced H.R. 6391, the MSPB Reauthorization Act of 2018. My bill would have reauthorized the Board and made other vital reforms. The Committee on Oversight

and Government Reform reported the bill favorably, but without a single vote from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We all know an effective and functional MSPB is important to the health of our Federal workforce. MSPB's primary responsibility is to adjudicate appeals of Federal personnel actions. MSPB also plays a vital role in Federal whistleblower protections.

To be effective and issue decisions, MSPB needs at least a two-member quorum, but the Board has not had a quorum for over 2 years. In January 2017, Mark Robbins, as my friend mentioned, become the sole remaining member of MSPB.

Last year, Mr. Robbins' 7-year term came to an end, and he was granted a 1-year extension as authorized by law, but that extension ends this week. Starting Friday, the MSPB will be without a single Board member.

My colleagues claim this bill is an emergency measure to prevent the MSPB from extending this crisis of leadership, but I disagree. The real problem is the lack of a quorum.

Without a quorum for the last 2 years, a backlog of undecided appeals has grown to over 1,700 cases. Mr. Robbins cannot fix that problem on his own. His continued tenure will not resolve those cases.

In December, the President selected Mr. Robbins to serve as the general counsel at the Office of Personnel Management, so for the last 10 weeks, he has served in both capacities at OPM and MSPB. Mr. Robbins is planning to serve at OPM in his full capacity beginning this Friday.

Mr. Robbins has stayed at MSPB as long as he has out of a sense of duty to MSPB and its mission. I trust that my colleagues do not intend to use this bill to coerce Mr. Robbins to stay any longer than he wants to.

□ 1745

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding Mr. Robbins for his dedication to MSPB, the Federal workforce, the President, and our country. I also urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senate's confirmation of President Trump's nominees.

We owe it to our Federal workers to give MSPB a quorum so the board can do the important job that Congress gave it to do.

In the future, I certainly hope we can work together to provide certainty to Federal workers and whistleblowers by making MSPB operational once again.

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

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

Briefly, in responding to my friend: I agree with him. I think we need a full board. Our problem is the Senate. They didn't get around to acting in a timely fashion, and so we are faced with this.

I think it is also important to note that, although a quorum is necessary for most work of MSPB, it isn't necessary for all of it.

So Mr. Robbins, in a caretaker, interim position, can still do some of the work of the board, including issuing stays, reviewing some of the work, and helping to avoid adding to the backlog.

He can't substitute himself fully, obviously, for a quorum in the board. My colleague is quite right about that.

What we are trying to do here is not to compel him or coerce him to stay against his wishes; it is to try to buy some time and have the board at least do some of its basic functions so that we don't come to a complete standstill. That would not be necessary, frankly, had the Senate acted.

I think my friend is right in suggesting that is the ultimate answer, and I would join him in calling on the Senate to act as swiftly as possible. But I think we have no choice but to act on this bill now.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage 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 Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1235, 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: ''To provide that the term of office of certain members of the Merit Systems Protection Board shall be extended by a period of 1 year, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 539, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 276, by the yeas and nays; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

INNOVATORS TO ENTREPRENEURS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 539) to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes, 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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 18, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—385

Adams	Cole	Gallego
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Garcia (IL)
Allen	Comer	Garcia (TX)
Allred	Conaway	Gianforte
Amodei	Connolly	Gibbs
Armstrong	Cook	Golden
Arrington	Cooper	Gonzalez (OH)
Axne	Correa	Gonzalez (TX)
Bacon	Courtney	Gooden
Baird	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Balderson	Craig	Granger
Banks	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Barr	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Barragán	Crist	Graves (MO)
Bass	Crow	Green (TN)
Beatty	Cuellar	Green (TX)
Bera	Cummings	Grijalva
Bergman	Cunningham	Guest
Beyer	Curtis	Guthrie
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Haaland
Bishop (UT)	Davidson (OH)	Hagedorn
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Harder (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bost	Dean	Hartzler
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Hastings
	DeLauro	Hayes
Brady	DelBene	Heck
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Hice (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Higgins (LA)
Buchanan	DeSaulnier	Higgins (NY)
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Hill (AR)
Budd	Deutch	Hill (CA)
Burchett	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Burgess	Dingell	Holding
Bustos	Doggett	Hollingsworth
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Horsford
Byrne		Houlahan
Calvert	Duffy	Hoyer
Carbajal	Duncan	Hudson
Cárdenas	Dunn	Huffman
Carson (IN)	Emmer	Huizenga
Carter (GA)	Engel	Hunter
Carter (TX)	Escobar	Hurd (TX)
Cartwright	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Case	Espaillat	Jayapal
Casten (IL)	Estes	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Evans	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Finkenauer	Johnson (LA)
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Cheney	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Chu, Judy	Fletcher	Johnson (TX)
Cicilline	Flores	Jordan
Cisneros	Fortenberry	Joyce (OH)
Clark (MA)	Foster	Joyce (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kaptur
Clay	Fulcher	Keating
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kelly (IL)
Cloud	Gaetz	Kelly (MS)
Clyburn	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)

Kennedy	Napolitano	Simpson
Khanna	Neal	Sires
Kildee	Neguse	Slotkin
Kilmer	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Kim	Norcross	Smith (NE)
Kind	Norman	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Nunes	Smucker
Kinzinger	O'Halleran	Soto
Kirkpatrick	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Krishnamoorthi	Olson	Spano
Kuster (NH)	Omar	Speier
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Stanton
LaHood	Pallone	Stauber
LaMalfa	Palmer	Stefanik
Lamb	Panetta	Steil
Lamborn	Pappas	Stevens
Langevin	Pascrell	Stewart
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Stivers
Larson (CT)	Pence	Suozzi
Latta	Perlmutter	Takano
Lawrence	Perry	Taylor
Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lee (NV)	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Lesko	Phillips	Thornberry
Levin (CA)	Pingree	Timmons
Levin (MI)	Porter	Tipton
Lewis	Posey	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Pressley	Tlaib
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Tonko
Loebsack	Quigley	Torres (CA)
Lofgren	Raskin	Torres Small (NM)
Long	Ratcliffe	Trahan
Loudermilk	Reed	Turner
Lowenthal	Reschenthaler	Underwood
Lucas	Rice (NY)	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Van Drew
Luján	Riggleman	Vargas
Luria	Roby	Veasey
Lynch	Rodgers (WA)	Vela
Malinowski	Roe, David P.	Velázquez
Maloney, Carolyn B.	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Marchant	Rose (NY)	Walberg
Marshall	Rose, John W.	Walden
Mast	Rouda	Walker
McAdams	Rouzer	Walorski
McBath	Roybal-Allard	Waltz
McCarthy	Ruiz	Wasserman Schultz
McCaul	Ruppersberger	Waters
McCollum	Rutherford	Watkins
McEachin	Ryan	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Sánchez	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Sarbanes	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Scalise	Welch
McNerney	Scanlon	Wenstrup
Meadows	Schakowsky	Westerman
Meeks	Schiff	Wexton
Meng	Schneider	Wild
Meuser	Schrier	Williams
Miller	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Mitchell	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Mooney (WV)	Scott, David	Womack
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Moulton	Serrano	Wright
Mucarsel-Powell	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Mullin	Shalala	Young
Murphy	Sherman	Zeldin
Nadler	Sherrill	
	Shimkus	

NAYS—18

Amash	Foxx (NC)	Massie
Biggs	Gohmert	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Rice (SC)
Buck	Griffith	Roy
Cline	Grothman	Steube
Ferguson	Hern, Kevin	Yoho

NOT VOTING—28

Abraham	Frankel	Pocan
Babin	Gomez	Rooney (FL)
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Schrader
Brindisi	Katko	Smith (WA)
Brooks (IN)	King (IA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cohen	Lawson (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Costa	Lowey	Trone
Davis, Danny K.	Matsui	
DeFazio	Morelle	

□ 1900

Messrs. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, FERGUSON, RICE of South Carolina, GOSAR, STEUBE, BUCK, GRIFFITH, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. HICE of Georgia and PALMER changed their 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.

RESIGNATION AS CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I am resigning my position as Clerk of the House effective midnight on February 25, 2019. Thank you for the honor of renominating me to serve in the position of Clerk of the House in the 116th Congress.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

THANKING KAREN L. HAAS FOR HER SERVICE AS CLERK OF THE HOUSE, AND WELCOMING CLERK-DESIGNATE CHERYL L. JOHNSON

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank and congratulate Karen Haas, and say how very appreciative this House is for the extraordinary service that has been given to us for many years, and to the people of this country, by Karen Haas.

Karen, thank you so much.

She has been the Clerk of the House for a very long time. She was the Clerk of the House in the 109th and 110th Congresses as well.

Throughout her tenure, she served with distinction, working hard to ensure that the Office of the Clerk always acted in a nonpartisan, bipartisan way, which brought credit on this House and great service to every Member.

Thank you for that, Karen.

Many of us serving in the House have known her even longer, going back to her service on the staff of former Speaker Hastert and former Republican Leader Bob Michel.

I might say of the latter, Bob Michel was one of the finest human beings I have ever known and one of the best Members that I have ever served with. Karen was proud to serve with him, and he, I know, was so fond of Karen and her service to him and to the House.

Now, I may not be totally objective. Karen is a native Marylander. Karen is also a graduate of the University of Maryland, so Karen and I share a lot in common. We live in Maryland; we graduated from Maryland; and we love this House.

I offer her the thanks of the House, its Members, and our staff, as she steps down from this position. I am not sure where Karen is going, but I guarantee you, our loss will be somebody else's gain, because she has the kind of talent, commitment, energy, and faithfulness that will make a real difference wherever she goes.

I also congratulate Cheryl Johnson for becoming the 36th Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, Cheryl returns to the House where she served for 20 years with the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as the Committee on House Administration.

She will bring an extraordinary amount of experience to her job as the Clerk of the House. I know she will do an outstanding job, and I welcome her back to this House, which she has served so ably before.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Terrapin from Maryland, for yielding.

I want to say, first, we are going to miss Karen Haas. Karen Haas served this body so well, as the majority leader talked about, and in such a fair way, treating all Members with the dignity and respect that they all deserve as we all carry out the work of the people's House.

When you think about the different roles that she has played, serving this Chamber, this body, for decades in a number of different roles, but, of course, most notably to all of us, twice as Clerk of the House. She was actually here once before, left, realized just how much fun it is to be in this House and work for this great body, and came back.

We thank you for coming back again and for your great service during these times.

So much work goes into the operations of the House. The things that we do on a daily basis, whether it is a Member filing a bill, when you go down to drop your bill in the hopper, it is Karen and the entire team that she has put together at the Office of the Clerk that receives the bills, that processes the bills.

When we all vote for and sometimes against the Journal, it is the Clerk that puts together the Journal of the House to make sure that the things that we do are properly recorded throughout time for people to go review.

It is an important job. But it is the work that she has done that we all see on a daily basis that we are going to miss.

As Cheryl Johnson takes her place, best of luck to you as well. We wish you all the best, but we are going to miss Karen.

We wish you the best in your next endeavor. You can come visit us from time to time.

Karen, thank you so much for the work that you have done on behalf of not just us as Members of Congress, but on behalf of all the American people who count on this institution to function properly, for helping us make sure that it is done in a proper, efficient, fair, and impartial way. Best of luck to you, Karen.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the whip for his comments, and I certainly share his views. I am now pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I rise to congratulate Karen Haas, who after five terms as Clerk of the House, is retiring.

I would like to remind all Members in this body that fewer than 11,000 people have ever had the privilege to serve in this House. It is even fewer for a Clerk.

Karen was our 34th Clerk and only the second woman to hold that position. We thank you for that leadership. When we think about the role of the House Clerk, you think of roll calls and recorded votes. But the Office of the Clerk is really about continuity. Without the Clerk, Congress could not fulfill its obligation to the American people and move in a smooth manner, which many people don't see the challenge.

Few individuals are more committed to preserving the continuity than Karen. She has done that as Clerk and as a trusted staff member and floor assistant. Always, she has been a friend and counselor to Members, regardless of what side of the aisle you sat on.

Karen Haas also equipped and modernized this House for the 21st century. Oftentimes, you won't see that because it is behind the scenes, but it makes the legislative process more accessible to the people it serves.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to Karen for her dedication, her team's professionalism, and her steady hand on the tiller. Her service reminds us of an important fact: The people's House is only as good as its people.

You rose to the occasion. On behalf of a very grateful House, and a grateful Nation, we say thank you, Karen.

And to Cheryl, we wish you the best.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader for recognition and calling us together to salute two great women in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the great honor of swearing in Cheryl Lynn Johnson as the 36th Clerk of the House of Representatives. This is a very distinguished and prestigious role.

Mr. MCCARTHY, I was pleased to appoint the first African American woman Clerk of the House, Lorraine Miller, when I was Speaker before, and now I am happy to be appointing the second.

We are privileged to be joined by Cheryl's parents, the Reverend Charlie Davis and Cynthia Davis of New Orleans, who are with us in the Chamber. Thank you for being with us.

We are also pleased to welcome Cheryl's husband, Clarence Ellison, and her son, Bradford, to this Chamber today as well. Welcome to you, and thank you.

I join our colleagues, the distinguished Democratic leader, the Republican leader, and distinguished Republican whip in saluting House Clerk Karen Haas for her many years of distinguished service to this institution.

Anyone who knows her is proud of her service. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I thank you, Karen, for the great integrity and dedication for which you have served the people's House. Thank you so much.

She has been magnificent.

Cheryl Johnson embodies public service and has dedicated her career to strengthening many of the most important institutions of our democracy, including our own.

Indeed, today is a homecoming, as Leader HOYER has mentioned, as Cheryl returns to the House of Representatives where she worked with distinction and honor for Chairman Lacy Clay, Sr.—I emphasize senior—of the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials; and the House Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service Subcommittee on Investigations.

Our country is stronger for her work on the then-Committee on Education and the Workforce to secure justice and progress for our children and advance fairness and respect for our workers.

In the Congress, she earned the respect of all—Members and staff, Democrats and Republicans—for being a leader of compassion, courage, and commitment.

Cheryl returns to the House after more than a decade at the Smithsonian Institution. Her great dedication to that American treasure—which is the largest museum in the world—has ensured that it will remain a source of creativity, innovation, and research for generations to come.

Our Nation is particularly grateful for her extraordinary vision and persistence in helping transform the dream of the National Museum of African American History and Culture into a reality.

Cheryl has made a difference empowering millions of Americans and visitors from abroad to explore and be inspired by the beauty and richness of American culture and history.

Cheryl's strong leadership and deep love and respect for the institutions of our democracy will be vital in her role as House Clerk, strengthening and safeguarding the Congress in the tradition of Karen and the Congress, the first branch of government, Article I.

I thank Cheryl for her commitment to our institution and to our democracy; and with great, again, recognition and appreciation to Karen Haas for her service.

It is now my privilege to administer the oath of office to Cheryl Johnson.

ELECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 143

Resolved, That Cheryl L. Johnson of the State of Louisiana, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives, effective February 26, 2019.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Will the Clerk-designate please take the well and all Members please rise.

The Chair will now swear in the Clerk-designate of the House.

The Clerk-designate took the oath of office as follows:

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

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

WELCOMING CHERYL L. JOHNSON AS THE 36TH CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the newly installed Clerk of the U.S. House, Cheryl Lynn Johnson.

She is the 36th American to be elected to this critical position. The Clerk, as we know, serves as the legislative official in the House, a position that goes back to the first Clerk and to the first Congress in 1789. As was mentioned, she comes to us from the Smithsonian Institution where she served as the Director of Government Relations.

Among her many achievements, as was mentioned, Cheryl helped to make the National Museum of African American History and Culture a brilliant reality.

But this is not her first tour of duty on Capitol Hill. In fact, she previously spent almost two decades in service to this institution, and as was mentioned, her first position was serving on the

committee staff of my father, former Congressman Bill Clay.

She spent 10 years as the chief education and investigative counsel for the Committee on Education and the Workforce where she advanced reforms in elementary and secondary education, juvenile justice, child nutrition, labor issues, and employment and nutrition programs for seniors.

Prior to that, she served as staff director and counsel for the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials and then Subcommittee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

Ms. Johnson is a distinguished graduate of Howard University Law School and the University of Iowa. She is married to Clarence and has a son, Bradford.

I go back with Cheryl as a friend for 40 years. Our families are close. Growing up around this institution that we all love, I was fortunate to be in the company of and witness the examples set by many great public servants—Members and staff—who devoted themselves to representing their constituents in the true spirit of public service.

Cheryl Johnson exemplifies the highest standards of public service, honor, and integrity that will elevate the 116th Congress. I am pleased to welcome her as our new Clerk, and I am prouder still to call her my good friend. She will be an enormous resource for Members and staff, and I am proud to welcome her home.

Welcome back, Cheryl. Congratulations.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 276) to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school, 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 gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) 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 387, nays 19, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—387

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—19

Amash
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Davidson (OH)
Gohmert
Gosar
Grothman
Harris
Hice (GA)
Hunter
Massie
Mitchell
Olson
Perry
Rice (SC)
Roy
Weber (TX)
Yoho

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham
Babin
Beyer
Bilirakis
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Cohen
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
Frankel
Herrera Beutler
Horn, Kendra S.
Katko
King (IA)
Lawson (FL)
Lowey
Matsui
Morelle
Pocan
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Schrader
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Trone

□ 1930

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CLINE 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather in New York and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 88 regarding the ''Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019 (H.R. 539)'' and YEA on Roll Call No. 89 regarding the ''Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act (H.R. 276).''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on February 25, 2019 due to inclement weather preventing my scheduled air travel from Iowa to Washington, D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

YES on Roll Call No. 88, and YES on Roll Call No. 89.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 46, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–13) on the resolution (H. Res. 144) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1112, ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–14) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENACTING INTO LAW A BILL BY REFERENCE

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 483) to enact into law a bill by reference, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 483

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

SECTION 1. (a) H.R. 1029 of the 115th Congress, as passed by the Senate on June 28, 2018, is enacted into law.

(b) In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112 of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF MAINTENANCE FEE AUTHORITY.

(a) MAINTENANCE FEE.—Section 4(i)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''an aggregate amount of $27,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''an average amount of $31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023'';

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''$115,500 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$129,400 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''$184,800 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$207,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023'';

(3) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''$70,600 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$79,100 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''$122,100 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$136,800 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023''; and

(4) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''2017..'' and inserting ''2023.''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON OTHER FEES.—Section 4(i)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 and ending on September 30, 2025''; and

(2) by inserting after ''registration of a pesticide under this Act'' the following: ''or any other action covered under a table specified in section 33(b)(3),''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON TOLERANCE FEES.—Section 408(m)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)(3)) is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 3. REREGISTRATION AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUND.—Section 4(k)(2)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''the fund'' and inserting ''the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund'';

(2) by striking ''paragraph (3),'' in the first sentence and all that follows through the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting the following: ''paragraph (3), to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g), including the costs associated with any review under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) required as part of the registration review, to offset the costs associated with tracking and implementing registration review decisions, including registration review decisions designed to reduce risk, for the purposes specified in paragraphs (4) and (5), and to enhance the information systems capabilities to improve the tracking of pesticide registration decisions.'';

(3) in clause (i), by striking ''are allocated solely'' and all that follows through ''3(g);'' and inserting the following: ''are allocated solely for the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;''; and

(4) in clause (ii), by striking ''necessary to achieve'' and all that follows through ''3(g);'' and inserting the following: ''necessary to achieve the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;''.

(b) SET-ASIDE FOR REVIEW OF INERT INGREDIENTS AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—Section 4(k)(3)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(3)(A)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''The Administrator shall use'' and all that follows through ''personnel and resources—'' and inserting the following: ''For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use between ⅛ and ⅛ of the maintenance fees collected in such fiscal year to obtain sufficient personnel and resources—''.

(c) SET-ASIDE FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PRODUCTS CLAIMING EFFICACY AGAINST INVERTEBRATE PESTS OF SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC HEALTH OR ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to develop, receive comments with respect to, finalize, and implement the necessary rulemaking and guidance for product performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against the following invertebrate pests of significant public health or economic importance (in order of importance):

''(i) Bed bugs.

''(ii) Premise (including crawling insects, flying insects, and baits).

''(iii) Pests of pets (including pet pests controlled by spot-ons, collars, shampoos, powders, or dips).

''(iv) Fire ants.

''(C) DEADLINES FOR GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall develop, and publish guidance required by subparagraph (B), with respect to claims of efficacy against pests described in such subparagraph as follows:

''(i) With respect to bed bugs, issue final guidance not later than 30 days after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018.

''(ii) With respect to pests specified in clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

''(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2018; and

''(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than September 30, 2019.

''(iii) With respect to pests specified in clauses (iii) and (iv) of such subparagraph—

''(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2019; and

''(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than March 31, 2021.

''(D) REVISION.—The Administrator shall revise the guidance required by subparagraph (B) from time to time, but shall permit applicants and registrants sufficient time to obtain data that meet the requirements specified in such revised guidance.

''(E) DEADLINE FOR PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall, not later than September 30, 2021, issue regulations prescribing product performance data requirements for any pesticide intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any invertebrate pest of significant public health or economic importance specified in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (B).''.

(d) SET-ASIDE FOR GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—

''(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), with respect to laboratory inspections and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall make available to each laboratory inspected under such program in support of such registrations a preliminary summary of inspection observations not later than 60 days after the date on which such an inspection is completed.''; and

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking ''paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5)''.

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS FOR PESTICIDES.

Section 5(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''permit for a pesticide.'' and inserting ''permit for a pesticide. An application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b) shall conform with the requirements of that section.''; and

(2) by inserting ''(or in the case of an application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b), not later than the last day of the applicable timeframe for such application specified in such section)'' after ''all required supporting data''.

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF FEE AUTHORITY.—Section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PESTICIDE REGISTRATION''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or for any other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)'' after ''covered by this Act that is received by the Administrator on or after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003'';

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS'' and inserting ''COVERED APPLICATIONS''; and

(B) by striking ''pesticide registration application'' both places it appears and inserting ''covered application'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(ii) by striking ''October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(ii) by striking ''2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''2021''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''revised registration service fee schedules'' and inserting ''service fee schedules revised pursuant to this paragraph'';

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''covered pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered application''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that no waiver or fee reduction shall be provided in connection with a request for a letter of certification (commonly referred to as a Gold Seal letter)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(5) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''pesticide registration'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''.

(b) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FUND SET-ASIDES FOR WORKER PROTECTION, PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION.—Section 33(c)(3)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting '', PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION'' after ''WORKER PROTECTION'';

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following:'', with an emphasis on field-worker populations in the United States'';

(3) in clause (ii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(4) in clause (iii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(c) REFORMS TO REDUCE DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(e) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ''Such reforms shall include identifying opportunities for streamlining review processes for applications for a new active ingredient or a new use and providing prompt feedback to applicants during such review process.''.

(d) DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018''; and

(B) by inserting after ''covered pesticide registration actions'' the following: ''or for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3)'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) applications for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3).''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by striking ''a pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''a covered application''; and

(B) by striking ''covered pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''covered application''.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 33(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

''(i) the number of pesticides or pesticide cases reviewed and the number of registration review decisions completed, including—

''(I) the number of cases cancelled;

''(II) the number of cases requiring risk mitigation measures;

''(III) the number of cases removing risk mitigation measures;

''(IV) the number of cases with no risk mitigation needed; and

''(V) the number of cases in which risk mitigation has been fully implemented;'';

(B) in subparagraph (G)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking ''section 4(k)(4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4(k)''; and

(II) by striking ''that section'' and inserting ''such paragraphs'';

(ii) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi);

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) implementing enhancements to—

''(I) the electronic tracking of covered applications;

''(II) the electronic tracking of conditional registrations;

''(III) the endangered species database;

''(IV) the electronic review of labels submitted with covered applications; and

''(V) the electronic review and assessment of confidential statements of formula submitted with covered applications; and''; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (iii);

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(K) a review of the progress made in developing, updating, and implementing product performance test guidelines for pesticide products that are intended to control invertebrate pests of significant public health importance and, by regulation, prescribing product performance data requirements for such pesticide products registered under section 3;

''(L) a review of the progress made in the priority review and approval of new pesticides to control invertebrate public health pests that may transmit vector-borne disease for use in the United States, including each territory or possession of the United States, and United States military installations globally;

''(M) a review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

''(N) the number of approvals for active ingredients, new uses, and pesticide end use products granted in connection with the Design for the Environment program (or any successor program) of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

''(O) with respect to funds in the Pesticide Registration Fund reserved under subsection (c)(3), a review that includes—

''(i) a description of the amount and use of such funds—

''(I) to carry out activities relating to worker protection under clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(B);

''(II) to award partnership grants under clause (ii) of such subsection; and

''(III) to carry out the pesticide safety education program under clause (iii) of such subsection;

''(ii) an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the activities, grants, and program described in clause (i);

''(iii) a description of how stakeholders are engaged in the decision to fund such activities, grants, and program; and

''(iv) with respect to activities relating to worker protection carried out under subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, a summary of the analyses from stakeholders, including from worker community-based organizations, on the appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities.''.

(f) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 33(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2018.—During fiscal year 2018'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2024.—During fiscal year 2024''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2019.—During fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2025.—During fiscal year 2025''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—Effective September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2025.—Effective September 30, 2025''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''2017'' both places it appears and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 6. REVISION OF TABLES REGARDING COVERED PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND OTHER COVERED ACTIONS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

Paragraph (3) of section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) SCHEDULE OF COVERED APPLICATIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS AND THEIR REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.—Subject to paragraph (6), the schedule of registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees shall be as follows:

''TABLE 1. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R010	1	New Active Ingredient, Food use. (2)(3)	24	753,082
R020	2	New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	18	627,568
R040	3	New Active Ingredient, Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	462,502
R060	4	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor. (2)(3)	21	523,205
R070	5	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	436,004
R090	6	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690
R110	7	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor. (2)(3)	20	290,994
R120	8	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	14	242,495
R121	9	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	182,327
R122	10	Enriched isomer(s) of registered mixed-isomer active ingredient. (2)(3)	18	317,128
R123	11	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes agricultural and non-agricultural seeds; residues not expected in raw agricultural commodities. (2)(3)	18	471,861
R125	12	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R130	13	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2) (3)	21	191,444
R140	14	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling. (3) (4)	15	44,672
R150	15	First food use. (2)(3)	21	317,104
R155	16 (new)	First food use, Experimental Use Permit application; a.i. registered for non-food outdoor use. (3)(4)	21	264,253
R160	17	First food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	264,253
R170	18	Additional food use. (3) (4)	15	79,349
R175	19	Additional food uses covered within a crop group resulting from the conversion of existing approved crop group(s) to one or more revised crop groups. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R180	20	Additional food use; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R190	21	Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)	15	476,090
R200	22	Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)	10	396,742
R210	23	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	12	48,986
R220	24	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R230	25	Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3) (4)	15	31,713
R240	26	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	26,427
R250	27	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R251	28	Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)	8	19,838
R260	29	New use; non-food; indoor. (3) (4)	12	15,317
R270	30	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	9	12,764
R271	31	New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	9,725
R273	32	Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	50,445
R274	33	Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into raw agricultural commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	302,663

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

''TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R280	34	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)	21	319,072
R290	35	Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.	15	63,816
R291	36	Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.	15	382,886
R292	37	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	45,341
R293	38	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.	12	53,483
R294	39	Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.	12	320,894
R295	40	Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	66,124
R296	41	Establish tolerances for residues in rotational crops in response to a specific rotational crop petition; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	396,742
R297	42	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	272,037
R298	43	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	58,565
R299	44	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	285,261

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the revised use pattern(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the category. All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the amendment application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if an amendment application only proposes to register the amendment for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the base fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the category decision review time.

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R300	45	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; no data review on acute toxicity, efficacy or CRP – only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,582
R301	46	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy (identical data citation and claims to cited product(s)), where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,897
R310	47	New end-use or manufacturing-use product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s); includes products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	7	7,301
R314	48	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	8	8,626
R319	49	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	12,626
R318	50 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	9	13,252
R321	51 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	11	17,252

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R315	52	New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: • animal safety and • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging. (2) (3)	9	9,820
R316	53 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	9	11,301
R317	54 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing 2 or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	15,301
R320	55	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)	12	13,226
R331	56	New product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product, or identical registered manufacturing-use product as an end use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	3	2,530
R332	57	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only; requires review in RD and science divisions. (2)(3)	24	283,215
R333	58	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Cite-all or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data. (2)(3)	10	19,838
R334	59	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of the active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Selective data citation. (2)(3)	11	23,100

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, ''pest(s) requiring efficacy'' are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

''TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R340	60	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements); includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for up to 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	4	4,988

''TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R341	61 (New)	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements), includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for greater than 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	6	5,988
R345	62	Amending on-animal products previously registered, with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: • animal safety and • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	7	8,820
R350	63	Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement). (2)(3)	9	13,226
R351	64	Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)	8	13,226
R352	65	Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2) (3)	8	13,226
R371	66	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit's time period). (3)	6	10,090

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, ''pest(s) requiring efficacy'' are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

''TABLE 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R124	67	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.	6	2,530
R272	68	Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.	3	2,530
R275	69	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
R370	70	Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.	18	198,250

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

''TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A380	71	New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	137,841
A390	72	New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	229,733

''TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A410	73	New Active Ingredient Non-food use.(2)(3)	21	229,733
A431	74	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; low-risk. (2)(3)	12	80,225

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A440	75	New Use, Indirect Food Use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	31,910
A441	76	Additional Indirect food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	114,870
A450	77	New use, Direct food use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	95,724
A451	78	Additional Direct food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	182,335
A500	79	New use, non-food. (4)(5)	12	31,910
A501	80	New use, non-food; 6 or more submitted in one application. (4)(5)	15	76,583

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

''TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A530	81	New product, identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data; or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,278
A531	82	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient: selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,824
A532	83	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted. (2)(3)	5	5,107
A540	84	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	5	5,107
A541	85 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	7	8,500
A542	86 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)	10	15,000
A550	87	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)	9	13,226
A560	88	New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)	6	12,596
A565	89 (new)	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of new generic data package; registered uses only; requires science review. (2)(3)	12	18,234
A570	90	Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)	4	3,831
A573	91 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	6	6,350
A574	92 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	9	11,000
A572	93	New Product or amendment requiring data review for risk assessment by Science Branch (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or use rate). (2)(3)(4)	9	13,226

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4)(a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98–10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) The applicant must identify the substantially similar product if opting to use cite-all or the selective method to support acute toxicity data requirements.

(6) Once a submission for a new product with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A540 or A541, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

(7) Once a submission for a label amendment with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A570 or A573, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

''TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A520	94	Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)	9	6,383
A521	95	Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD, per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 1.	4	4,726
A522	96	Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 2.	12	12,156
A537	97 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Direct food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	153,156
A538	98 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Indirect food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	95,724
A539	99 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	15	92,163
A529	100	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)	9	11,429
A523	101	Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).	9	12,156
A571	102	Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.	18	95,724
A533	103 (new)	Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)	4	2,482
A534	104 (new)	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	4	4,726
A535	105 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.	6	2,409
A536	106 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.	4	2,482

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B580	107	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)	20	51,053
B590	108	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	18	31,910
B600	109	New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)	13	19,146
B610	110	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)	10	12,764

''TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B611	111	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish permanent tolerance exemption. (3)	12	12,764
B612	112	New active ingredient; no change to a permanent tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	10	17,550
B613	113	New active ingredient; petition to convert a temporary tolerance or a temporary tolerance exemption to a permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	11	17,550
B620	114	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; non-food use including crop destruct. (3)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B630	115	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(4)	13	12,764
B631	116	New food use; petition to amend an established tolerance. (3)(4)	12	12,764
B640	117	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(4)	19	19,146
B643	118	New Food use; petition to amend an established tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	10	12,764
B642	119	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2)(4)	12	31,910
B644	120	New use, no change to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	8	12,764
B650	121	New use; non-food. (3)(4)	7	6,383
B645	122 (new)	New food use; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to amend or add a tolerance exemption. (4)	12	12,764
B646	123 (new)	New use; non-food use including crop destruct; Experimental Use Permit application. (4)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B652	124	New product; registered source of active ingredient; requires petition to amend established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	12,764
B660	125	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. For microbial pesticides, the active ingredient(s) must not be re-isolated. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B670	126	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	7	5,107
B671	127	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); requires a petition to amend an established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	17	12,764
B672	128	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); non-food use or food use requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B673	129	New product MUP/EP; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); citation of Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGAI) data previously reviewed and accepted by the Agency. Requires an Agency determination that the cited data supports the new product. (2)(3)	10	5,107
B674	130	New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B675	131	New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)	10	9,118

''TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B676	132	New product; more than one active ingredient where one active ingredient is an unregistered source; product chemistry data must be submitted; requires: 1) submission of product specific data, and 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B677	133	New end-use non-food animal product with submission of two or more target animal safety studies; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • public health pest efficacy and/or • animal safety studies and/or • child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	10	8,820

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B621	134	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	7	5,107
B622	135	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	11	12,764
B641	136	Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.	13	12,764
B680	137	Amendment; registered sources of active ingredient(s); no new use(s); no changes to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. Requires data submission. (2)(3)	5	5,107
B681	138	Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)	7	6,079
B683	139	Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)	6	5,107
B684	140	Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)	8	8,820
B685	141 (new)	Amendment; add a new biochemical unregistered source of active ingredient or a new microbial production site. Requires submission of analysis of samples data and source/production site-specific manufacturing process description. (3)	5	5,107

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B690	142	New active ingredient; food or non-food use. (2)(6)	7	2,554
B700	143	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use. (6)	7	1,278
B701	144	Extend or amend Experimental Use Permit. (6)	4	1,278
B710	145	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no change in an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. (3)(6)	4	1,278
B720	146	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (3)(6)	5	1,278
B721	147	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient. (3)(6)	7	2,676
B722	148	New use and/or amendment; petition to establish a tolerance or tolerance exemption. (4)(5)(6)	7	2,477
B730	149	Label amendment requiring data submission. (4)(6)	5	1,278

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(4) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(6) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B614	150	Pre-application; Conditional Ruling on rationales for addressing a data requirement in lieu of data; applicant-initiated; applies to one rationale at a time.	3	2,530

''TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B615	151	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
B682	152	Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.	3	2,432

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

''TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B740	153	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP (12); 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct (12); 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s). (4)(12)	6	95,724
B741	154 (new)	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); SAP Review. (12)	12	159,538
B750	155	Experimental Use Permit application; with a petition to establish a temporary or permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. Includes new food/feed use for a registered (3) PIP. (4)(12)	9	127,630
B770	156	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows; SAP review. (5)(12)	15	191,444
B771	157	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows. (12)	10	127,630
B772	158	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)	3	12,764
B773	159	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)	5	31,910
B780	160	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)	12	159,537
B790	161	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)	18	223,351
B800	162	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (12)	13	172,300
B810	163	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. SAP review. (5)(12)	19	236,114
B820	164	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)	15	204,208
B840	165	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)	21	268,022
B851	166	Registration application; new event of a previously registered PIP active ingredient(s); no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	127,630
B870	167	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product; new use; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (4) (12)	9	38,290

''TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B880	168	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (6) (7) (12)	9	31,910
B881	169	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review. (5)(6)(7)(12)	15	95,724
B882	170 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption; SAP Review. (8)(12)	15	191,444
B883	171	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (8) (12)	9	127,630
B884	172	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (8)(12)	12	159,537
B885	173	Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (9)(12)	6	31,910
B886	174 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review. (8) (12)	18	223,351
B890	175	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	63,816
B891	176	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption already established for the active ingredient(s); SAP review. (5)(12)	15	127,630
B900	177	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. (10)(11)(12)	6	12,764
B901	178	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. SAP review. (10) (11) (12)	12	76,578
B902	179	PIP Protocol review.	3	6,383
B903	180	Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.	6	63,816
B904	181	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).	9	127,630
B905	182 (new)	SAP Review.	6	63,816
B906	183 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients.	3	31,907
B907	184 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption.	3	12,764
B908	185 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.	3	44,671

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.
(2) New PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that has not been registered.
(3) Registered PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that is currently registered.
(4) Transfer registered PIP through conventional breeding for new food/feed use, such as from field corn to sweet corn.
(5) The scientific data involved in this category are complex. EPA often seeks technical advice from the Scientific Advisory Panel on risks that pesticides pose to wildlife, farm workers, pesticide applicators, non-target species, as well as insect resistance, and novel scientific issues surrounding new technologies. The scientists of the SAP neither make nor recommend policy decisions. They provide advice on the science used to make these decisions. Their advice is invaluable to the EPA as it strives to protect humans and the environment from risks posed by pesticides. Due to the time it takes to schedule and prepare for meetings with the SAP, additional time and costs are needed.
(6) Registered PIPs stacked through conventional breeding.
(7) Deployment of a registered PIP with a different IRM plan (e.g., seed blend).

(8) The negotiated acreage cap will depend upon EPA's determination of the potential environmental exposure, risk(s) to non-target organisms, and the risk of targeted pest developing resistance to the pesticidal substance. The uncertainty of these risks may reduce the allowable acreage, based upon the quantity and type of non-target organism data submitted and the lack of insect resistance management data, which is usually not required for seed-increase registrations. Registrants are encouraged to consult with EPA prior to submission of a registration application in this category.
(9) Application can be submitted prior to or concurrently with an application for commercial registration.
(10) For example, IRM plan modifications that are applicant-initiated.
(11) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged fees.
(12) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
I001	186	Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)	13	27,000
I002	187	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)	11	7,500
I003	188	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)	9	3,308
I004	189	Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)	6	11,025
I005	190	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)	6	5,513
I006	191	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)	3	3,308
I007	192	Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)	4	1,654
I008	193	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)	5	3,749
I009	194	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)	4	3,087
I010	195	Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRNs; no new data. (2)	6	1,654
I011	196 (new)	Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)	24	597,683
I012	197 (new)	Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)	21	415,241
I013	198 (new)	Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)	15	62,975
I014	199 (new)	Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)	15	25,168
I015	200 (new)	Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)	24	269,728
I016	201 (new)	Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)	13	55,776

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.
(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.
(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.
(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.
(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.
(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.
(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) If a new safener is submitted in the same package as a new active ingredient, and that new active ingredient is determined to be reduced risk, then the safener would get the same reduced timeframe as the new active ingredient.

''TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
M001	202	Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M002	203	Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M003	204	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of less than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	12	63,945
M004	205	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of greater than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	18	63,945
M005	206	New Product: Combination, Contains a combination of active ingredients from a registered and/or unregistered source; conventional, antimicrobial and/or biopesticide. Requires coordination with other regulatory divisions to conduct review of data, label and/or verify the validity of existing data as cited. Only existing uses for each active ingredient in the combination product. (6)(7)	9	22,050
M006	207	Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products). (8)	1	277
M007	208	Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii).	12	5,513
M008	209	Request to grant Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(vi) for a minor use, when a FIFRA Section 2(ll)(2) determination is required.	15	1,654
M009	210 (new)	Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.	4	2,363
M010	211 (new)	Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.	4	2,363
M011	212 (new)	Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes. (9)	4	3,648

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.
(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.
(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.
(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.
(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.
(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.
(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.
(8) Due to low fee and short time frame this category is not eligible for small business waivers. Gold seal applies to one registered product.
(9) This category includes amendments the sole purpose of which is to add DfE (or equivalent terms that do not use ''safe'' or derivatives of ''safe'') logos to a label. DfE is a voluntary program. A label bearing a DfE logo is not considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredients in the qualifying product must meet objective, scientific criteria established and widely publicized by EPA.''.

SEC. 7. AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD; CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending not earlier than October 1, 2021, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'')—

(1) shall carry out—

(A) the final rule of the Administrator entitled ''Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions'' (80 Fed. Reg. 67496 (November 2, 2015)); and

(B) the final rule of the Administrator entitled ''Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators'' (82 Fed. Reg. 952 (January 4, 2017)); and

(2) shall not revise or develop revisions to the rules described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Prior to October 1, 2021, the Administrator may propose, and after a notice and public comment period of not less than 90 days, promulgate revisions to the final rule described in subsection (a)(1)(A) addressing application exclusion zones under part 170 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, consistent with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.).

(c) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the use of the designated representative, including the effect of that use on the availability of pesticide application and hazard information and worker health and safety; and

(2) not later than October 1, 2021, make publically available a report describing the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations to prevent the misuse of pesticide application and hazard information, if that misuse is identified.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 962) the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LIVES LOST TO GUN VIOLENCE IN AURORA, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor the lives that we lost to gun violence in Aurora, Illinois, earlier this month.

This is, unfortunately, not the first time that we have mourned the unnecessary loss of life from gun violence. Eleven years ago, when I first took office, I inherited a community in mourning: 17 students were injured and 5 were killed in the Cole Hall mass shooting at Northern Illinois University. So I spent my first weeks and months in office doing what I could to help my community recover.

Now, 11 years later, on February 15, the call went out from Aurora, Illinois: Workplace shooting at Henry Pratt. Active gunman. Officers down.

More than 200 police units from across the western suburbs of Chicago responded to contain the situation. They were running toward the sound of gunfire, as they do countless times each day in our country.

Six officers were injured during that response, and, in the aftermath, we learned that we lost five members of our community:

Josh Pinkard, the plant manager at Henry Pratt, who, when fatally shot, sent a final text message to his wife, Terra, to say ''I love you'';

Trevor Wehner, on his first day at work at Pratt as an intern from Northern Illinois University;

Clayton Parks, Trevor's supervisor and also a graduate of NIU;

Vicente Juarez, a hardworking family man who lived with his wife, daughter, and grandchildren on a quiet street in Oswego;

Russell Beyer, a mold operator and union committee chairman from Machinists Local 1202 and the father of two children.

Now, as we have done so many times before in Congress, I will soon ask that we pause for a moment of silence; but this time, I would ask each of you to also think of the voting card that each of us carries on the House floor and the responsibility that you carry with that card, because this week we will finally be voting on legislation for effective and universal background checks for all gun sales. This is legislation supported by both Republicans and Democrats in Congress and supported by 97 percent of the American people.

So, our hearts go out to the family and friends of the victims left behind, and now I ask that we pause for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will rise for a moment of silence.

HONORING SHERIFF MIKE YEAGER

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coweta County Sheriff Mike Yeager.

Sheriff Yeager has dedicated over 35 years in law enforcement to keeping his community safe and serving his neighbors, both on and off of the job.

In fact, it would take far longer than I have here tonight to list all of the many organizations—such as the Georgia and National Sheriff's Association, the Newnan-Coweta Public Safety Board, and the Boy Scouts—so many organizations that he has served to make his community and State a better place.

It is no understatement that Sheriff Yeager is a pillar of his community and a model public servant. It is a testament to his hard work that President Trump appointed him to be the U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Georgia. I cannot think of anyone who is better suited for this position.

We are awfully proud of Sheriff Yeager and his accomplishments, and I know that he will continue to serve his State and our Nation well.

REMEMBERING THE AURORA VICTIMS

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago, five people, four of whom were my constituents, left their homes for work at the Henry Pratt Company in Aurora, Illinois, and never returned. Their lives were taken by an unspeakably horrible act, gun violence, which happens heartbreakingly frequently in this country.

As we consider legislation this week that is a critical first step towards preventing gun violence, I would like to take a few moments to honor the lives our community lost this month.

I wish to remember Russell Beyer. Proud chair of his union and a 20-year employee of Henry Pratt, Russell was the father of two and a steadfast Patriots fan.

We remember Clayton Parks, a Northern Illinois University grad whose wife, Abby, describes as an incredible father to their young son, Axel.

We remember Josh Pinkard. ''I want to shout from the rooftops about how amazing Josh was,'' his wife, Terra, wrote about a man who loved God, family, and college football.

We remember Trevor Wehner, a college student at Northern Illinois University, killed on the very first day of his internship. He was described by a friend as someone who would go out of his way for others.

We remember Vicente Juarez. The patriarch of a tight-knit family, Vicente was a caring husband, father, and grandfather to eight. His neighbors loved him for his efforts ridding the neighborhood of dandelions each summer.

We will never forget our five neighbors, and we will never forget the bravery of law enforcement and first responders who rushed toward the violence and undoubtedly saved countless lives.

May we honor them with our actions, and may our community come back stronger than ever before.

HONORING DR. MANDERLINE SCALES

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Dr. Manderline Scales of Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

During Black History Month, we especially remember the enduring contributions of great Americans like Dr. Scales, who is one of four Black teachers to integrate Winston-Salem schools.

Dr. Scales worked in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools for over 20 years and spent nearly 30 years in various roles at Winston-Salem State University. She brought the first Spanish programs to these schools and was known for her belief that every encounter was an opportunity to impact students in a positive way.

Additionally, she served on numerous boards, including the YMCA of Northwest North Carolina, Delta Fine Arts Center, and Northwest Child Development Center.

Dr. Scales passed away last month, but her legacy as a dedicated educator and selfless community leader will endure through the many lives she touched in her 91 years.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH AND MEDICINE

(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, some of the greatest contributions to medicine have been made by African Americans in this country.

The first open-heart surgery in the United States was successfully completed by Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, a Black man. Not only was he a pioneer of this lifesaving surgery, but also, in the late 1800s, he opened the country's first hospital with an interracial staff, Provident Hospital in Chicago.

Then, in the 1930s, Dr. Helen Dickens did her internship at Provident Hospital before becoming the first Black woman admitted to the American College of Surgeons.

And then, while Dr. Dickens was doing her internship at Provident, a young Black girl growing up in segregated Arkansas dreamed of becoming a doctor. Sixty years later, in 1993, Dr. Joycelyn Elders became America's first African American Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker, Black history is not something that is in the past. It is constantly unfolding. It is American history.

Our stories are being written and expanded upon all the time. That is why Black History Month is so important—not just to honor our past, but to celebrate our present and prepare for our future.

□ 1945

CONDEMNING THE FEBRUARY 14, 2019, TERRORIST ATTACK IN INDIA

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to condemn the senseless, cowardly, and horrific terrorist attack in India, the deadliest in three decades.

On February 14 of this year, a suicide bomber rammed an explosive-packed vehicle into a convoy, claiming the lives of 40 Indian paramilitary forces and wounding at least 44 others. The Pakistan-based militant group, Jaish-e-Muhammad, later claimed responsibility for the attack.

We mourn the victims of this act of terror and call for continued action against any nation, to include Pakistan, that harbors terrorists and promotes violent extremism.

India has announced its plans to diplomatically isolate Pakistan and cancel its preferential trade status. We support these efforts, Mr. Speaker. This attack only further strengthens our U.S.-India counterterrorism cooperation.

To the nation of India, we mourn with you, we pray for you, and we stand in solidarity with you during this difficult time.

RARE DISEASE WEEK

(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, I rise today in recognition of Rare Disease Week.

Around 350 million people, worldwide, suffer from a rare disease. That is more than the number of people who live in the United States, alone, and it is particularly alarming when we consider how few resources are available to those battling a rare disease.

In fact, of the 7,000 rare diseases in existence, half of them don't have a designated foundation or research support group, and nearly 90 percent lack an FDA-approved treatment.

As a member of the Rare Disease Congressional Caucus, I urge my colleagues to support measures that would increase funding for research and put our resources into the development and accessibility of lifesaving treatments. Treatments should not be as rare as the diseases they heal.

TEXANS FROM SWEDEN

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a force of nature that all Texans know: Texans from Sweden. I am one. But the most powerful one is a 17-year-old Cinco Ranch Cougar. Her name is Jennifer Lindgren.

As you can see, Jennifer was born without a left hand. Not a problem. Jennifer says: ''Most of the time, I forget that I have one hand. I have always just done pretty much what everybody else has done.''

Jennifer, you are wrong. You have done more than anyone else ever could do.

Jennifer is the president of the Cinco Ranch FFA. Her sheep, Lou, won third place at the recent FFA livestock show.

Jennifer, you are awesome. As you go off to the great Aggie school, Texas A&M University, you must change a little bit. You have to say ''howdy,'' ''gig em,'' and ''whoop'' a lot.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just recently, I was very proud and pleased that this body passed my legislation, the Juvenile Block Grant Anti-Bullying and Intervention Act, dealing with the prevention of bullying but, more importantly, dealing with the opportunities for communities across America to begin to think more creatively about how you deal with juvenile justice, how you deal with young people of juvenile age who have gone awry of school laws, regular actions of criminal activities. How do you deal with these young people?

It is clear that the juvenile justice system needs to be reformed. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, it is my commitment to listen to people from across the Nation.

Many people don't realize that once you are committed to a juvenile detention center or facility or jail, under juvenile laws in most States, and many of them receiving Federal dollars, you will find that there is no definitive sentence. They are sentenced and could be there from age 14 to 21.

It may be that their parents do not have resources to get them out; it may be that they do not have an alternative place to go; and it may be that they have no representation. That is not the way to treat young people.

So we will be looking for legislation to incentivize our States to change the juvenile justice and the criminal justice system, and we look forward to working with all of our colleagues.

CONGRATULATING MAUREEN McFADDEN ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Maureen McFadden on a remarkable 40-year career at WNDU-TV. I want to take a moment to honor the iconic legacy Maureen is leaving behind and thank her for all she has done for Michiana communities.

A lifelong Hoosier, Maureen has been a fixture in South Bend as a reporter and anchor at WNDU Newscenter 16 for the past four decades. She has played a

vital role in making northern Indiana stronger not only by bringing us the day's news, but always finding ways to serve her neighbors and give back to the community she loves to call home.

I am grateful to Maureen not only for her excellence in journalism, but also for the incredible example she has set for aspiring journalists and young Hoosier women who are always looking for ways to give back to build a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exceptional character, leadership, and compassion Maureen has demonstrated both on and off the air.

Mo, I wish you the very best.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

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

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act, which we will vote on tomorrow. This comprehensive public lands package has numerous provisions that benefit my State of Utah and makes permanent the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In my district, this legislation provides an important land conveyance to Juab County that will be used to house personnel to prevent and fight wildfires. This bill also facilitates a land transfer in Utah County to Utah's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, or SITLA.

SITLA holds lands in trust, proceeds which support Utah's education system. This land transfer will ultimately benefit Utah State University and its students.

I also want to congratulate my colleague, Representative JOHN CURTIS, for his work in bringing together and working with State, city, and county stakeholders in Emery County. The Emery County title in this bill has broad local support and will protect over 600,000 acres of wilderness, the largest wilderness designation in 25 years.

This legislation is good for Utah's economy. The Land and Water Conservation Fund should never have been allowed to expire because it is such a vital program.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COMMISSIONER MARCUS HARDY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness, but also to honor a commissioner, Commissioner Marcus Hardy, who was a highly respected leader in his community.

Marcus served as a city commissioner in the town of Crescent City, Florida, which is located in the district which I am proud to represent. I was fortunate enough to work alongside Mr. Hardy in efforts to improve Crescent City and the greater community.

Beyond being a devoted public servant, a coach, and a role model, Marcus was a family man and a friend to many. Anyone who knew him knew his heart and his passion for serving others. He often spent his free time serving as a mentor for the Boys II Men organization in Crescent City or working to revitalize Putnam County for the benefit of the whole community.

Marcus will be remembered for his compassion, his leadership, his friendship, his large, firm hand grip and contagious smile.

Thank you for your service, Marcus. You will be missed by many.

AMERICANS' SHIFTING VIEWS ON ABORTION

(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, I rise today to speak about a recent shift we have seen in this country over the recent weeks—that is Americans' views on abortion.

Not long ago, a Marist poll found that 55 percent of Americans were likely to identify as pro-choice compared to about 38 percent identifying as pro-life—indeed, a 17-point gap. Now, the polls are tied.

As reported this week by Axios, a similar Marist poll found that Americans are now, for the first time, equally likely to be pro-life as they are to be pro-choice, both registering at 47 percent.

Why the sudden change? The horrific rhetoric offered by some of the left, that is why, including the Virginia Governor's indefensible remarks that he would support the murder of a baby post-birth. It is inconceivable to me that someone could differentiate a post-birth ''abortion'' from actual murder.

The good news is I think most Americans agree with me. That is why we are seeing, finally, this dramatic shift.

My colleague from Missouri, Representative ANN WAGNER, has introduced the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act in order to end infanticide taking place after failed abortion attempts. The Democrats have repeatedly blocked the effort, including tonight. We need to have a vote on this bill.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues have made public the details of the so-called Green New Deal. Among other things, if implemented over the next 10 years, it would eliminate the use of fossil fuels and nuclear power. That means our gasoline-powered vehicles and implements would be useless, and there would be no air travel.

It would also require that virtually all building structures would be rebuilt or need to be remodeled. Every facet of life would be forced to change.

The most frightening thing about this is that my colleagues sponsoring it are actually serious.

Furthermore, the architects failed to explain how they are going to rebuild the economy they would decimate.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the architects of this legislation change the color of the Green New Deal and call it the Red—as in stop sign red—New Disaster.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to lead a Special Order alongside my colleagues to discuss, frankly, a reckless and misguided and radical proposal recently introduced by some of my Democratic colleagues, the Green New Deal.

Tonight, together with many of my fellow members of the Congressional Western Caucus, we will be taking the time to share with the American people the details of the ill-advised and bizarre provisions included in this green manifesto and the grave impacts that they would have on our Nation's economy.

□ 2000

We will also share what we, as Republicans in the people's House, believe when it comes to our national strategy to innovate, diversify, and strengthen America's energy sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the American people. This so-called deal calls for cutting of greenhouse gas emissions to net zero in only 10 years.

And while many studies are still working to grasp the perilous impacts and the enormous costs of this proposal, one independent estimate, led by a team of Stanford engineers, suggests it would cost our Nation in the neighborhood of $7 trillion to convert all of America's power to renewable power sources.

To quote the former Secretary of Energy under President Obama, Ernest Moniz, he said: ''I'm afraid I just cannot see how we could possibly go to zero carbon in the 10-year timeframe. It is just impractical.''

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal goes much further than just the energy sector, however. It also mandates the guarantee of a job for everyone, paid vacations for everyone, free college for everyone. It dictates that every existing building in this country must be upgraded and retrofitted for ''comfort.''

It calls for a drastic overhaul of our transportation systems across the country, threatening not only our trucking and airline industries, but also the daily lives of the 85 percent of Americans who drive every morning or evening to get to work.

Mr. Speaker, while calling for all of these implausible mandates, the Green New Deal would also insert the Federal Government into seemingly every aspect of our daily lives.

By expanding our Federal bureaucracy far beyond anything we have ever seen in history and undermining the federalist principles our country was founded upon in the Constitution, this proposal would jeopardize the future of America as we know it. It would sacrifice the American energy, manufacturing, and transportation sectors; jeopardize businesses small and large across the Nation; and lead our country down the path of socialist nations like Venezuela, North Korea, and Cuba.

As the Senate Democratic Whip DICK DURBIN said after reading the proposal: ''What in the heck is this?''

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more.

My State, the great State of Washington, consistently ranks among the top of the list of States with the cleanest energy production. Do you know why that is? It is because of the strong reliance on our incredible system of hydroelectric dams, many of which are in my congressional district along the Columbia and the Snake Rivers.

Nearly 70 percent of our power comes from hydropower, a clean, renewable, reliable, and affordable source of baseload energy.

It also comes from our use of nuclear power. The Columbia Generating Station, which is also in the Fourth Congressional District which I represent, is the only nuclear power plant in the greater Northwest region. It too provides clean, reliable power for the Pacific Northwest.

On top of these sources, Washington State uses a variety of other energy sources, including natural gas, coal, wind, solar, and biomass.

It is because we use an all-of-the-above mix of energy sources, but largely concentrated on clean, renewable, reliable hydropower, that Washington State continues to demonstrate how we can lead in the use of clean energy while still diversifying and thereby strengthening our energy portfolio.

Unfortunately, the Green New Deal negates this ability to do so. Not once is the word ''hydropower'' mentioned in the legislation. And in the frequently asked questions document that was released to accompany the introduction of the Green New Deal, it stated that ''The plan is to transition off of nuclear.''

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to continue to strengthen America's energy independence and increase our use of clean sources of energy, we must absolutely include hydropower and nuclear power. The science says so, the facts say so.

So when Democrats in Congress release a sweeping, colossal overhaul of our Nation's energy policies and do not include these clean energy sources, it is clear that this is far more about politics and not about sound science.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow House Republicans and I continue to advocate for sound, comprehensive approaches to energy policy. We must continue to explore every opportunity to develop viable alternative energy sources, which is why under Republican control of the House in recent Congresses, we have made serious investments in advanced nuclear and basic science research, grid-scale energy storage, and equipped our national laboratories with robust resources to lead the way in research, development, and innovation.

National laboratories, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my district, play a crucial role in developing the basic science research needed to pave the way for these alternative sources. Then when private industry can utilize this research, the open marketplace can put these new sources to use.

That is exactly what our country needs: more collaboration, more innovation; not a top-down mandated system of bureaucratic dictates based upon a green manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, I often share with my constituents that as a third generation farmer, I consider myself to be a conservationist and on the front lines of being a good steward of our natural resources. I know that we must respect our environment, we must ensure clean air and clean water for our citizens, and we must encourage innovative ways to produce energy through a variety of reliable, renewable traditional and alternative sources.

Tonight I am looking forward to hearing from my friends and my colleagues in the Congressional Western Caucus on why the Green New Deal would be catastrophic for their constituents and what we in our Nation's capital should really be prioritizing in order to continue America's energy independence dominance.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my first speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the gentleman that represents the Eighth District of that great State.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues in opposition to the Green New Deal.

This disastrous plan, cooked up by out-of-touch Washington elites, simply does not work for Minnesota families.

According to the Energy Information Administration, 68 percent of Minnesota's energy consumption comes from a combination of coal, natural gas, nuclear, hydropower, and gasoline, all of which are to be banned completely by the Green New Deal in 10 years.

Allowed under this radical pipe dream are wind, solar, and biomass, which barely account for 15 percent of Minnesota's energy consumption.

Picture a family in Ely, Minnesota, where wind chill temperatures reached 71 below zero this January, waking up in a warm house heated by natural gas.

They start a hot pot of coffee, powered by our affordable electric grid; take a hot shower, again, heated by natural gas; drive their kids to school in their van, powered by reliable, affordable gasoline; go to work, possibly at a mine or a local hospital; drive home again in that same gasoline-powered car; make dinner for their family, using their gas-powered stove; and then wake up again and do it all over.

The little things that we take for granted every day are powered by conventional energy.

The Green New Deal would have a severe impact on our everyday lives, something that northern Minnesotans do not want or need.

The Green New Deal would force every Minnesota family to turn in their cars for electric vehicles and retrofit their homes to run on renewable sources, like solar or wind.

I understand elites from D.C. and New York City may love this plan, but I know the reality. I encourage my colleagues, especially those who support this plan, to go back to their districts, like I did last week and really listen to their constituents, listen to their concerns, listen to how this plan would devastate the middle class and devastate hardworking Minnesota families.

Retrofitting homes, buying electric cars, and ending the mining, airline, and much of the shipping industries may be fun ideas for the ultra-wealthy, but I know what it really means for middle-class families in northern Minnesota.

We cannot let these unrealistic ideas get in the way of actual progress. We must develop renewable forms of energy, but at the same time, not shut out conventional, affordable energy sources on which millions rely.

Do not let the Green New Deal distract from what northern Minnesotans care about: expanding rural broadband for better internet access, bringing good paying jobs back to our communities, and protecting Social Security and Medicare.

With the projected cost of tens of trillions of dollars, the Green New Deal puts all of this at risk.

I will not risk the future of Medicare and Social Security. I will not risk the future of middle-class families.

However, I will stand up for the farmers, our miners, our small business owners, manufacturers, and workers threatened by this Green New Deal.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for expressing so eloquently how Americans around the country would be affected by this if this legislation was adopted into law. People from different parts of the country with extreme weather, as you have heard, depend on reliable sources of energy.

From minus 71 to hopefully a little warmer climate, the next speaker I am going to yield to is the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chairman of our Western Caucus and the representative from the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington, for organizing this important Special Order on the Green New Deal.

Mr. Speaker, America's energy renaissance is the backbone of our economy. It is a story of freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

After decades of reliance on other countries to meet our energy needs, the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that America will export more energy than it imports starting in 2020. We are no longer dependent on volatile foreign sources produced in Russia or Saudi Arabia.

Recent innovation and technology improvements associated with fracking and horizontal drilling have allowed shale resources, previously deemed uneconomical, to be developed, and are the main reason the U.S. was the world leader in carbon emissions reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017.

That is right. Fracking, demonized by environmental extremists without justification, has proven to be the best energy solution for our environment.

Abundant oil and natural gas has reduced electricity bills, kept gas prices low, and provided the largest share of U.S. electric power generation in recent years.

The oil and gas industry supports more than 10.3 million jobs and nearly 8 percent of our economy.

The United States is the world's top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving.

January 2019 saw the hundredth consecutive month of positive jobs growth in America, the longest period of continuous jobs growth on record.

The U.S. job market is strong, and in December, employers posted 7.3 million open jobs, a new record.

Now, despite America's energy renaissance and the aforementioned emissions reductions, we continue to hear hyperbolic statements about pending climate catastrophe and the need for radical change to stave off future disaster.

The Democrat socialists pushing the Green New Deal want to get rid of all energy sources except wind, solar, and batteries by 2030. How are we going to do that when wind and solar only produced 7.6 percent of our electricity in 2017?

The Green New Deal would drive energy production and jobs to countries like China and India that have much worse environmental standards. Global greenhouse gas emissions will increase as a result, in direct contradiction to the main talking point of the Green New Deal.

The socialist Green New Deal says it will provide higher education, higher quality healthcare, and affordable, safe, and adequate housing to all.

□ 2015

The Mercatus Center estimates that the cost of the single-payer healthcare provision alone would cost $32 trillion in the first 10 years, something that I think is probably on the low side.

The Green New Deal is an alarmist pipe dream that seeks to fundamentally transform America without a blueprint. This socialist manifesto changes by the day, and important details on how a transition of the Green New Deal's magnitude will occur are missing, including how we will pay for this pie in the sky aspiration.

If one needs to have more evidence that the Green New Deal is not plausible, look no further than the country of Australia where electricity prices are the highest in the world and the Aussies' obsession with renewables has destroyed their electric grid. Mass blackouts and mass power cuts are the new norm, and a massive Tesla battery backup system ran dry this past month as the Aussie power grid crashed in summer temperatures. Ninety thousand Aussie homes had no air-conditioning for the next 2 weeks of blistering heat.

Let's learn from Australia's mistakes. Let's not repeat them.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to enlightening everyone on this legislation further in the coming days.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Arizona for expressing his thoughts on how this would impact the people not only in Arizona, but also around the country.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents continue to ask me what is actually in this Green New Deal legislation. Unfortunately for the American people, the Members of Congress who introduced the resolution had, I guess, several hiccups along the way during their rollout and released conflicting documents to accompany the bill.

One significant piece of legislation that my constituents have asked me about is whether the related resolution mandated a job for everyone in the United States. Well, that is, in fact, true. A part of the frequently asked questions document that was released with the legislation even stated that economic security would be provided for those who are ''unwilling to work.'' Many of my constituents think that is an amazing statement.

After an adviser to the Green New Deal accused Republicans of doctoring this document, The Washington Post later reported that he erroneously made that accusation. In fact, this document was released by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ's office.

Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ has since retracted the frequently asked questions document, but the message I hope my constituents and the American people hear clearly is that we know the motives behind this legislation. We know the intent. From ending the airline industry to shutting down all nuclear power, unfortunately, some people on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side, are threatening the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the frequently asked questions document that was released by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ's office.

LAUNCH: Thursday, February 7, at 8:30 a.m.

OVERVIEW

We will begin work immediately on Green New Deal bills to put the nuts and bolts on the plan described in this resolution (important to say so someone else can't claim this mantle).

This is a massive transformation of our society with clear goals and a timeline.

The Green New Deal resolution a 10-year plan to mobilize every aspect of American society at a scale not seen since World War 2 to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and create economic prosperity for all. It will:

Move America to 100% clean and renewable energy

Create millions of family supporting-wage, union jobs

Ensure a just transition for all communities and workers to ensure economic security for people and communities that have historically relied on fossil fuel industries

Ensure justice and equity for frontline communities by prioritizing investment, training, climate and community resiliency, economic and environmental benefits in these communities.

Build on FDR's second bill of rights by guaranteeing:

A job with a family-sustaining wage, family and medical leave, vacations, and retirement security

High-quality education, including higher education and trade schools

Clean air and water and access to nature

Healthy food

High-quality health care

Safe, affordable, adequate housing

Economic environment free of monopolies

Economic security for all who are unable or unwilling to work

There is no time to waste.

IPCC Report said global emissions must be cut by 40–60% by 2030. US is 20% of total emissions. We must get to 0 by 2030 and lead the world in a global Green New Deal.

Americans love a challenge. This is our moonshot.

When JFK said we'd go to the by the end of the decade, people said impossible.

If Eisenhower wanted to build the interstate highway system today, people would ask how we'd pay for it.

When FDR called on America to build 185,000 planes to fight World War 2, every business leader, CEO, and general laughed at him. At the time, the U.S. had produced 3,000 planes in the last year. By the end of the war, we produced 300,000 planes. That's what we are capable of if we have real leadership

This is massive investment in our economy and society, not expenditure.

We invested 40–50% of GDP into our economy during World War 2 and created the greatest middle class the US has seen.

The interstate highway system has returned more than $6 in economic productivity for every $1 it cost

This is massively expanding existing and building new industries at a rapid pace—growing our economy

The Green New Deal has momentum.

92 percent of Democrats and 64 percent of Republicans support the Green New Deal

Nearly every major Democratic Presidential contender say they back the Green New Deal including: Elizabeth Warren, Cory Booker, Kamala Harris, Jeff Merkeley, Julian Castro, Kirsten Gillibrand, Bernie Sanders, Tulsi Gabbard, and Jay Inslee.

45 House Reps and 330+ groups backed the original resolution for a select committee

Over 300 local and state politicians have called for a federal Green New Deal

New Resolution has 20 co-sponsors, about 30 groups (numbers will change by Thursday).

FAQ

Why 100% clean and renewable and not just 100% renewable? Are you saying we won't transition off fossil fuels?

Yes, we are calling for a full transition off fossil fuels and zero greenhouse gases. Anyone who has read the resolution sees that we spell this out through a plan that calls for eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from every sector of the economy. Simply banning fossil fuels immediately won't build the new economy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically. We do this through a huge mobilization to create the renewable energy economy as fast as possible. We set a goal to get to net-zero, rather than zero emissions, in 10 years because we aren't sure that we'll be able to fully get rid of farting cows and airplanes that fast, but we think we can ramp up renewable manufacturing and power production, retrofit every building in America, build the smart grid, overhaul transportation and agriculture, plant lots of trees and restore our ecosystem to get to net-zero.

Is nuclear a part of this?

A Green New Deal is a massive investment in renewable energy production and would not include creating new nuclear plants. It's unclear if we will be able to decommission every nuclear plant within 10 years, but the plan is to transition off of nuclear and all fossil fuels as soon as possible. No one has put the full 10-year plan together yet, and if it is possible to get to fully 100% renewable in 10 years, we will do that.

Does this include a carbon tax?

The Green New Deal is a massive investment in the production of renewable energy industries and infrastructure. We cannot simply tax gas and expect workers to figure out another way to get to work unless we've first created a better, more affordable option. So we're not ruling a carbon tax out, but a carbon tax would be a tiny part of a Green New Deal in the face of the gigantic expansion of our productive economy and would have to be preceded by first creating the solutions necessary so that workers and working class communities are not affected. While a carbon tax may be a part of the Green New Deal, it misses the point and would be off the table unless we create the clean, affordable options first.

Does this include cap and trade?

The Green New Deal is about creating the renewable energy economy through a massive investment in our society and economy. Cap and trade assumes the existing market will solve this problem for us, and that's simply not true. While cap and trade may be a tiny part of the larger Green New Deal plan to mobilize our economy, any cap and trade legislation will pale in comparison to the size of the mobilization and must recognize that existing legislation can incentivize companies to create toxic hotspots in frontline communities, so anything here must ensure that frontline communities are prioritized.

Does a GND ban all new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear power plants?

The Green New Deal makes new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear plants unnecessary. This is a massive mobilization of all our resources into renewable energies. It would simply not make sense to build new fossil fuel infrastructure because we will be creating a plan to reorient our entire economy to work off renewable energy. Simply banning fossil fuels and nuclear plants immediately won't build the new economy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically.

Are you for CCUS?

We believe the right way to capture carbon is to plant trees and restore our natural ecosystems. CCUS technology to date has not proven effective.

How will you pay for it?

The same way we paid for the New Deal, the 2008 bank bailout and extended quantitative easing programs. The same way we paid for World War II and all our current wars. The Federal Reserve can extend credit to power these projects and investments and new public banks can be created to extend credit. There is also space for the government to take an equity stake in projects to get a return on investment. At the end of the day, this is an investment in our economy that should grow our wealth as a nation, so the question isn't how will we pay for it, but what will we do with our new shared prosperity.

Why do we need a sweeping Green New Deal investment program? Why can't we just rely on regulations and taxes and the private sector to invest alone such as a carbon tax or a ban on fossil fuels?

The level of investment required is massive. Even if every billionaire and company came together and were willing to pour all the resources at their disposal into this investment, the aggregate value of the investments they could make would not be sufficient.

The speed of investment required will be massive. Even if all the billionaires and companies could make the investments required, they would not be able to pull together a coordinated response in the narrow window of time required to jump-start major new projects and major new economic sectors. Also, private companies are wary of making massive investments in unproven research and technologies; the government, however, has the time horizon to be able to patiently make investments in new tech and R&D, without necessarily having a commercial outcome or application in mind at the time the investment is made. Major examples of government investments in ''new'' tech that subsequently spurred a boom in the private section include DARPA-projects, the creation of the internet—and, perhaps most recently, the government's investment in Tesla.

Simply put, we don't need to just stop doing some things we are doing (like using fossil fuels for energy needs); we also need to start doing new things (like overhauling whole industries or retrofitting all buildings to be energy efficient). Starting to do new things requires some upfront investment. In the same way that a company that is trying to change how it does business may need to make big upfront capital investments today in order to reap future benefits (for e.g., building a new factory to increase production or buying new hardware and software to totally modernize its IT system), a country that is trying to change how its economy works will need to make big investments today to jump-start and develop new projects and sectors to power the new economy.

Merely incentivizing the private sector doesn't work—e.g. the tax incentives and subsidies given to wind and solar projects have been a valuable spur to growth in the US renewables industry but, even with such investment-promotion subsidies, the present level of such projects is simply inadequate to transition to a fully greenhouse gas neutral economy as quickly as needed.

Once again, we're not saying that there isn't a role for private sector investments; we're just saying that the level of investment required will need every actor to pitch in and that the government is best placed to be the prime driver.

RESOLUTION SUMMARY

Created in consultation with multiple groups from environmental community, environmental justice community, and labor community

5 goals in 10 years:

Net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers

Create millions of high-wage jobs and ensure prosperity and economic security for all

Invest in infrastructure and industry to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century

Clean air and water, climate and community resiliency, healthy food, access to nature, and a sustainable environment for all

Promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of frontline and vulnerable communities

National mobilization our economy through 14 infrastructure and industrial projects. Every project strives to remove greenhouse gas emissions and pollution from every sector of our economy:

Build infrastructure to create resiliency against climate change-related disasters

Repair and upgrade U.S. infrastructure. ASCE estimates this is $4.6 trillion at minimum.

Meet 100% of power demand through clean and renewable energy sources

Build energy-efficient, distributed smart grids and ensure affordable access to electricity

Upgrade or replace every building in US for state-of-the-art energy efficiency

Massively expand clean manufacturing (like solar panel factories, wind turbine factories, battery and storage manufacturing, energy efficient manufacturing components) and remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing

Work with farmers and ranchers to create a sustainable, pollution and greenhouse gas free, food system that ensures universal access to healthy food and expands independent family farming

Totally overhaul transportation by massively expanding electric vehicle manufacturing, build charging stations everywhere, build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary, create affordable public transit available to all, with goal to replace every combustion-engine vehicle

Mitigate long-term health effects of climate change and pollution

Remove greenhouse gases from our atmosphere and pollution through afforestation, preservation, and other methods of restoring our natural ecosystems

Restore all our damaged and threatened ecosystems

Clean up all the existing hazardous waste sites and abandoned sites

Identify new emission sources and create solutions to eliminate those emissions

Make the US the leader in addressing climate change and share our technology, expertise and products with the rest of the world to bring about a global Green New Deal

Social and economic justice and security through 15 requirements:

Massive federal investments and assistance to organizations and businesses participating in the green new deal and ensuring the public gets a return on that investment

Ensure the environmental and social costs of emissions are taken into account

Provide job training and education to all

Invest in R&D of new clean and renewable energy technologies

Doing direct investments in frontline and deindustrialized communities that would otherwise be hurt by the transition to prioritize economic benefits there

Use democratic and participatory processes led by frontline and vulnerable communities to implement GND projects locally

Ensure that all GND jobs are union jobs that pay prevailing wages and hire local

Guarantee a job with family-sustaining wages

Protect right of all workers to unionize and organize

Strengthen and enforce labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards

Enact and enforce trade rules to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas and grow domestic manufacturing

Ensure public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and eminent domain is not abused

Obtain free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples

Ensure an economic environment free of monopolies and unfair competition

Provide high-quality health care, housing, economic security, and clean air, clean water, healthy food, and nature to all

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the other gentleman from the great State of Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who represents the Fifth District and I believe served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee very well.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I applaud and give my thanks and gratitude to the gentleman from Washington for his efforts in leading this today, and to the Congressional Western Caucus and the members who are exposing what is really not a Green New Deal, but really is a green socialist manifesto.

Here is what we need to understand about this. This is so broad and expansive, as Mr. NEWHOUSE has said, it will, basically, invade every aspect of every American's life, and it will cost tens of trillions of dollars to implement.

How will we pay for that? We are going to pay for that with crushing new taxes on individuals, families, and companies. We are going to destroy the current foundation of our entire American economy.

There will be more borrowing, not just from the public sector, but from the private sector. The public sector is in trouble because the Federal Government just hit $22 trillion of national debt.

The question is, what will the impact of this be on the environment? It would do little to solve the alleged problem of carbon in the atmosphere because the United States is no longer the primary source of carbon emissions.

Between 2005 and 2017, our Nation has reduced CO_2 emissions by 862 million tons. Today, the U.S. is responsible for only 15 percent of global CO_2 emissions. During roughly the same period, China increased its emissions by 4 billion tons and India by 1.3 billion tons.

Needless to say, the GND doesn't explain how we would compel other nations to change their behavior. But domestically, as I have said, we are going to emasculate our economy. The coal, nuclear, natural gas, petroleum, and air travel industries will be wiped out, and all of the industries that support those industries. That means hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs almost instantly.

At the same time, the Green New Deal, or the green socialist manifesto, is going to guarantee a wage. It is going to guarantee income for everyone.

As Representative RYAN said, we can't green the economy without the power of the free market system. He is right. That is the ultimate point of what I want to say today.

We know that science doesn't support the green socialist manifesto, but we know something that is really critical to understand. This proposal, which today is so vast, so encompassing, and so primitive in its creation, is also so destructive to our economy and multiple industries, multiple sectors of our economy, that I would say there is only one way that you can implement such an outlandish and reckless idea, and that is to use the awesome, overreaching power of government to not just induce, but to coerce implementation of this faulty idea.

In its scope, breadth, and depth, this plan is authoritarian in nature. It will require government flexing its muscles to mandate activities and forbid other actions in every American's life.

We can't afford this plan. This plan will not provide what it says it is going to do. Moreover, in a free, constitutional Republic, you can never allow this kind of socialism to be combined with authoritarianism.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for sharing his thoughts on the direction that this would take our Nation and the dangerous path it would lead us upon. Those are things that we need to make sure that we don't allow happen, and I think the American people would agree with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the good doctor from Kansas' First District who serves on the Agriculture Committee. I know this is going to have a huge impact on many industries, but particularly agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that, back home, the Green New Deal means that John Deere dealers are having a new combine sale.

I stand before you this evening to tell you exactly why the Green New Deal is a sham. Rather than setting realistic goals to reduce carbon emissions and incentivize cleaner energy development, this so-called deal stalls innovation and drastically expands government involvement in almost every aspect of everyday life, at a price tag of more than $50 trillion.

Over the past 2 years, we have unleashed our economy by reducing government overregulation, allowing more Americans to invest in their families, futures, and pursuits. The Green New Deal will throw the brakes on our economy, as well as the world's economy. Nothing will increase worldwide carbon production more than a stalled economy.

Additionally, this Green New Deal reverses our success by imposing harsher regulations that will put American workers and American companies at an extreme disadvantage. This socialist proposal that Democrats are championing completely ignores the cost to American taxpayers and fails to address the negative impacts that other countries have on global climate change. It implements policies that will dramatically increase taxes, burdens, and energy bills for families.

This deal will absolutely devastate our economy with its outrageous demands for new green infrastructure, new green labor practices, and new green taxes. It will crush American manufacturing and transportation industries. It would completely halt domestic energy production that has had record exports under the Trump administration.

I am a firm believer that we must focus on leaving this world better than we found it for the next generation. For my children, for your children, and for our grandchildren, we need to be good stewards of the resources and the planet we have been given, but any reasonable solution will require us to use common sense when approaching the issues.

We must also be careful not to fall into the trap of believing that the U.S. Government is the answer to correct all our problems. America has always been a nation of innovators, and instead of imposing new regulations and taxes, we must continue to lead the world and partner with American industries to develop creative solutions and new innovative technologies. Innovation will do more to impact climate change than any law Washington, D.C., can write.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. MARSHALL for sharing with us his thoughts from the great State of Kansas.

Some of the proponents of the Green New Deal have criticized others for criticizing the Green New Deal, saying that we don't have any room to talk if we are not going to offer something toward the issues that we face as a world and as a country.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, we do have options, and we do have solutions

that we have been offering. Let me share a piece written by my Republican colleagues just recently who lead the Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. GREG WALDEN, Mr. FRED UPTON, and Mr. JOHN SHIMKUS shared an article that was published in several newspapers around the country. Some of the things that they say go like this: ''America's approach for tackling climate change should be built upon the principles of innovation, conservation, and adaptation. Republicans have long championed realistic, innovative, and free-market strategies to promote a cleaner environment and to reduce emissions. The results are clear: The United States is leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions thanks to vibrant energy sector competition and innovation.''

They go on to say: ''We should continue to encourage innovation and renewable energy development. We should promote carbon capture and utilization, renewable hydropower, and safe nuclear power, which is emissions-free. We should also look to remove barriers to energy storage and commercial batteries to help make renewable sources more viable and our electricity grid more resilient. And we must encourage more research and business investments in new clean energy technologies. These are bipartisan solutions that we must seize on to deliver real results for the American people.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) from the 27th District.

□ 2030

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the people of America. Just days ago, we passed $22 trillion in debt for which we have no plan to begin paying off. The Green New Deal would only add trillions more while simultaneously destroying the American economy, which not only means families across our Nation would lose their ability to sustain themselves, but it would also shut down the innovation engine of the world.

The 27th District of Texas, which I represent, has a better approach. We are home to a diverse energy portfolio, which includes wind, nuclear, LNG, oil production—not to mention our fair share of cows and airplanes.

We are home to a safe, reliable nuclear power plant in Matagorda County that generates 2.7 gigawatts of power, and that is a power of nearly 2 million Texas homes and businesses. It would take 8.4 million solar panels to replace that kind of energy. Even President Obama's Secretary of Energy said, ''It's just impractical.''

We are also home to the leading export energy port in the Nation. We have been a great part in the success of what we have seen as a nation of going from an energy-dependent nation to an energy-dominant nation. And what that new American energy dominance means, it means global stability and peace in the world as our allies are able to buy energy from us rather than from countries who don't have our best intentions in mind.

But as the world's need for energy grows, American companies are more likely to care about being good stewards of our creation compared with those from other energy-producing nations.

The United States cut carbon emissions by 14 percent since 2005 while global emissions rose 26 percent over the same period. Of all the G20 countries, we have the best record recently on carbon emissions and reductions.

In Texas our market-based approach to energy is leading the way even as our economy continues to boom. Furthermore, a thriving economy is absolutely essential to creating and deploying the innovative solutions we need to face the environmental challenges of the future.

So when it comes to the Green New Deal, let's stop looking to socialism for answers and start looking to places like Texas.

This Green New Deal would be devastating to American jobholders, harmful to our allies around the world, and it is also counterproductive to advancing protections to our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to firmly oppose this outlandish and unrealistic idea.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for giving us great thoughts about the impacts of what the Green New Deal would actually mean for Americans and jobs in the United States of America.

As the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) makes his way to the microphone, I just want to share with you one study that was released today by the American Action Forum. It says that the Green New Deal will cost a startling $93 trillion over 10 years.

Now, put that into perspective: That is equivalent to $600,000 per household.

To generate $93 trillion in income tax revenue, we would have to tax every household earning more than $30,000 at a 100 percent rate for 10 years.

If every household earning over more than $200,000 were taxed at 100 percent for 10 years, it would still fall $58 trillion short. So you can just see that this does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

You know, those numbers are just shocking, as you related, in terms of how it would devastate the American economy and American families.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to add my voice in opposition to this so-called Green New Deal.

You know, this outrageous proposal would be a massive government takeover of every facet of our daily lives. From how we eat, to how we travel, this so-called Green New Deal calls to replace every building and car in America within 10 years. It would cost up to $93 trillion. That would cost every American household an extra $65,300 per year.

That might be crumbs in New York and California, but it is not in Kansas, where the average family income is $56,422.

If the crushing tax increase on every family isn't bad enough, the plan also calls for an eventual end to air travel.

As representative of the Air Capital of the World, clearly, this is alarming.

According to the Kansas Department of Transportation, aviation is responsible for 91,300 jobs in Kansas and has an economic impact on our state of $20.6 billion.

Grounding air travel would decimate jobs in Kansas, just as the entire Green New Deal would devastate the economy of our country.

The only thing this proposal accomplishes is exposing the priorities of politicians who are determined to increase taxes and expand government to impose their agenda on every family, farm, and business.

Kansans know how to protect our environment and quality of life without being told to do so by government officials in Washington, D.C., and I stand with them in opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading this special order.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES). I appreciate very much him sharing his thoughts about the Green New Deal and the impacts it would have on our country—something that we just absolutely cannot afford. So I appreciate very much his time this evening, and I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article from Reuters titled ''Labor Unions fear Democrats' Green New Deal poses job threat.''

I didn't write that title. That is what they did. In it, a spokesman for a major union in this country speaks on the legislation's language, calling for a transition for union jobs. He says, ''We've heard words like 'just transition' before, but what does that really mean? Our Members are worried about putting food on the table.''

Another labor union, the Laborers' International Union of North America states, ''We will never settle for 'just transition' language as a solution to the job losses that will surely come from some of the policies in the resolution.''

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans across the country deserve to be heard. Unfortunately, as this article states, neither union was contacted for input before the legislation was released.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from California's First District (Mr. LAMALFA), my good friend and a fellow farmer.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Indeed, what we know so far about the Green New Deal, it is more like a green pipe dream. It would lead to a total government takeover of just about every aspect of our lives.

Now, it is interesting to watch, since the deal was proposed not that many days ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them are starting to back away from it. There were 67 coauthors on that. We are seeing some starting to back away, saying, well, this really isn't the dream or the deal; it is more of an aspiration.

Well, by the time you freaked out half the country with these ideas that you put into legislation, maybe we need a little more heads-up on what really is the goal here.

Some of the guarantees in it:

A government paycheck for those unwilling to work.

Is that really in there? What are we talking about here?

The cost of this implementation? $93 trillion, quadruple of what our national debt is right now. The cost will be passed on, of course, to—as always—the taxpayer, to families, to those struggling—especially middle-income folks—who could see their energy bills going up from already at a high point to an additional $4,000 annually per family.

We should really have our supporters of this bill benefit from the lessons learned in California on the high-speed rail boondoggle that tripled in a short amount of time soon after it was barely approved, $10 billion by the taxpayers to a nearly $100 billion project, all under the guise of saving greenhouse gases.

Except during the construction of the high-speed rail in California, it will make a whole bunch of greenhouse gases with the equipment involved, so we are going to plant trees to offset that. Yet, at the same time, they are running the rails through hundreds of acres of almond trees in the middle of California that they are supposed to be offsetting.

It is a reckless attempt to undermine America's increasing dominance—not just energy independence—but now dominance in energy around the world.

It ignores the basic reality; a lot of what America was built upon were indeed fossil fuels, those known reserves that we have in this country.

Now, let's talk a little bit about the Paris accord that I think President Trump rightfully withdrew the United States from. The goal being greenhouse gas reduction, CO_2 reduction.

Well, when you look at the stats, who is already leading the way outside of the accord? The U.S.—of those western countries—is the only one that has actually reduced its number of CO_2 in that amount of time.

We are the ones doing it. You know why? Because we have freedom; because we have the ability to innovate here, to invent the new technology, to invent the things that are going to help us do things better and cleaner into the future.

I don't hear a lot of talk on this about new hydropower, which is clean and ready to go any time you turn on the switch to the gates to allow the turbines to flow.

Biomass. In my area of the country—the Western Caucus, my colleagues here—we burn part of the west every year. We should be putting that fuel into clean burning power plants to make electricity, cleaning our forest, making it more fire-safe, better for the wildlife, better for the environment, not having all that CO_2 go up. And then creating jobs in our backyard to get people to work from cleaning up the over-inventory the U.S. forest and BLM has from allowing their forest to run rampant with no management for the last 100 years.

These are things we should be talking about, not this green dream thing. Instead, we are going to hear nothing but climate change, climate change, climate change, with solutions that just harness or handcuff the economy, the jobs, and the people of this country inside this chamber and in the real world out there where people actually produce things.

We need to focus on the things that we know can work, producing energy with hydropower. Yes, with nuclear power, no emissions. With biomass, help clean that inventory that burns hundreds of thousands of acres every year of forest land, and put it to work for us.

That is what we are going to be successful at, because the United States is always number one in developing the new technology, the new ways to do cleaner, better, more efficiently, instead of handcuffing our economy and that innovation and exporting it somewhere else.

I do agree with my colleagues that have spoken here tonight. And in sending the message, we need to strongly oppose this bill and get back to something that actually works for the working people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time of the gentleman.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). I appreciate very much him sharing his thoughts—and California's thoughts—about what we have in front of us and the impact it would have.

And if anyone is thinking that this is just a bunch of Republicans that are thinking this way and have these thoughts, let me share with you some quotes from some of my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

Representative JEFF VAN DREW, a Democrat from New Jersey. He says of the Green New Deal, ''It is not a serious policy proposal. It seeks the complete reorganization of American society, which took hundreds of years to build, in a matter of 10 years.''

Or the senior Senator from California—Mr. LAMALFA's state—just stated last week that ''There's no way to pay for it.''

From my own State, my colleague, Representative RICK LARSEN just said recently, ''It is difficult to support the resolution right now when one of the lead sponsors says one of the intentions is to make air travel unnecessary.'' He is the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation.

My neighbor from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said, ''The idea that in 5 or 10 years we're not going to consume any more fossil fuels is technologically impossible. We can have grand goals, but let's be realistic about how we get there.''

Even our own Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI from California, said of the proposal, ''The green dream or whatever they call it, nobody knows what it is, but they're for it, right?''

So you can see, it is not just us, this is a bipartisan feeling about the Green New Deal that it needs a lot more consideration.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), my good friend from the Palmetto State, Fifth District, and a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading the effort on this.

And I rise to oppose the Green New Deal for many of the reasons that have already been said, but this is the most amateurish resolution that has come before this Congress in a long time, not from only my point of view but many others who have served longer than I have.

We were asked to consider a policy that would change every aspect of American life, deciding what we eat, how we travel, how we stay warm, and even what jobs we can take and what homes we are allowed to live in.

We are presented with a total overhaul of society, but with no explanation how. There is no roadmap, no method of implementation, and, of course, no price tag. All we know is that this will be dictated by a cabal of better-knowing bureaucrats. Yet every estimate shows just how unrealistic this green deal really is.

According to the American Action Forum, the total cost could run as high as $93 trillion over 10 years.

□ 2045

This totals 21 times our current Federal budget of $4.4 trillion. That can only mean one thing for the American people: taxes, taxes, and more taxes.

This resolution is so lacking in detail, we might as well vote on the merits of a scrap of paper that says, ''solve the problem.'' This is no way to govern.

The only details we do have are from a survey that enjoyed a brief existence online before it was removed out of embarrassment and has since been denied.

One source of embarrassment was the call to get rid of cows. To my knowledge, this is the first time that a Member of this House has called for bovine genocide.

That the deal's supporters are now hiding these facts reveals that the true agenda behind the Green New Deal is too horrifying to be shared with any of the public. As a rule of thumb, any law that cannot be shared with the people cannot serve the people.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his input on this important issue. It underscores the cost to the Nation if this were adopted and its impact on our economy. I thank the gentleman for that tremendous help.

I thank all my colleagues, members of the Congressional Western Caucus, for participating tonight to point out some of the fallacies of the Green New Deal. Certainly, it is something that, as legislation is proposed, this is the process: We talk about what we like, what we don't like, and we offer alternatives, trying to find solutions in a bipartisan way.

Republicans have always advocated to continue looking at these issues of climate change, of energy use and production, of issues facing the environment. We are always looking for ways to innovate, to adequately fund research, but, basically, underscoring all of that, relying on the use of sound science for any decisions that we make, to make sure that the policies that we adopt are those that will be sustaining and good for not only our country, but for the world.

So we base our decisions on science, not politics. As Republicans, as members of the Congressional Western Caucus, which is a bipartisan organization, we look forward to debating seriously and making serious decisions in regard to these very important issues that face our country, face the next generation, and face the world.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing debates on this important topic, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of inclement weather.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BIENNIAL REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR) to biennially submit a report containing recommendations regarding Federal workplace rights, safety and health, and public access laws and regulations that should be made applicable to Congress and its agencies. The purpose of this report is to ensure that the rights afforded by the CAA to legislative branch employees and visitors to Capitol Hill and district offices remain equivalent to those in the private sector and the executive branch of the Federal government. As such, these recommendations support the intent of Congress to keep pace with advances in workplace rights and public access laws.

Accompanying this letter is a copy of our section 102(b) report—titled ''Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act''—for consideration by the 116th Congress. We welcome discussion on these issues and urge that Congress act on these important recommendations.

Your office is receiving this initial copy prior to it being uploaded to our public website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be disseminated to the larger Congressional community and available on www.ocwr.gov. As required by the Congressional Accountability Act, 2 U.S.C. §1302(b), I request that this publication be printed in the Congressional Record, and referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and Senate with jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN,
Executive Director.

116TH CONGRESS—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Office of Congressional Workplace Rights—Board of Directors' Biennial Report required by §102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act issued at the conclusion of the 115th Congress (2017–2018) for consideration by the 116th Congress

Statement From the Board of Directors

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) embodies a promise by Congress to the American public that it will hold itself accountable to the same federal workplace and accessibility laws that it applies to private sector employers and executive branch agencies. This landmark legislation was also crafted to provide for ongoing review of the workplace and accessibility laws that apply to Congress. Section 102(b) of the CAA thus tasks the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR)—formerly the Office of Compliance—to review legislation and regulations to ensure that workplace protections in the legislative branch are on par with private sector and executive branch agencies. Accordingly, every Congress, the Board reports on: whether or to what degree [provisions of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (B) access to public services and accommodations] . . . are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and . . . with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. This section of the CAA also requires that the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate cause our report to be printed in the Congressional Record and refer the report to committees of the House and Senate with jurisdiction.

On December 21, 2018, as we were in the process of finalizing our Section 102(b) Report for the 115th Congress, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, S. 3749, was signed into law. Not since the passage of the CAA in 1995 has there been a more significant moment in the evolution of legislative branch workplace rights. The new law focuses on protecting victims, strengthening transparency, holding violators accountable for their personal conduct, and improving the adjudication process. Some of the changes in the CAA Reform Act are effective immediately, such as the name change of our Office, but most will be effective 180 days from enactment, i.e., on June 19, 2019. The CAA Reform Act incorporates several of the recommendations that the OCWR has made to Congress in past Section 102(b) Reports and in other contexts, such as in testimony before the Committee on House Administration (CHA) as part of that committee's comprehensive review in 2018 of the protections that the CAA offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace. These changes include the following:

Mandatory Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Anti-Retaliation Training

The Board has consistently recommended in its past biennial Section 102(b) Reports and in testimony before Congress that anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal training should be mandatory for all Members, officers, employees and staff of Congress and the other employing offices in the legislative branch. Last year, the House and the Senate adopted resolutions (S. Res 330 and H. Res. 630) that require all of its Members, Officers and employees, as well as interns, detailees, and fellows, to complete an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training program. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act includes these broader mandates for the congressional workforce at large. Under the new law, employing offices (other than the House of Representatives and the Senate) are also required to develop and implement a program to train and educate covered employees on the rights and protections provided under the CAA, including the procedures available under CAA title IV, which describes the OCWR administrative and judicial dispute resolution procedures. 509(a), 2 U.S.C. §1438(a). Employing offices must submit a report on the implementation of their CAA-required training and education programs to the CHA and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate no later than 45 days after the beginning of each Congress, beginning with the 117th Congress. For the 116th Congress, this report is due no later than 180 days after the enactment of the CAA Reform Act, which is June 19, 2019. 509(b)(1), (b)(2), 2 U.S.C. §1438(b)(1), (b)(2)

The OCWR stands ready to assist employing offices in developing their anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal

programs by providing training opportunities and materials that are easily understood, practical rather than legalistic, proven effective, and which emphasize the change of culture on Capitol Hill. Through these programs, we can achieve the goal of a legislative branch that is free from discrimination, harassment and reprisal.

Adopt All Notice-Posting Requirements that Exist Under the Federal Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Other Workplace Rights Laws Covered Under the CAA

The Board has long been concerned that employees who experience harassment or discrimination in the legislative branch may be deterred from taking action simply due to a lack of awareness of their rights under the CAA. The Board has therefore consistently recommended in its Section 102(b) reports that Congress adopt all notice-posting requirements that exist under the Federal antidiscrimination, anti-harassment, and other workplace rights laws covered under the CAA. Through permanent postings, current and new employees remain informed about their rights regardless of their location, employee turnover, or other changes in the workplace. The notices also serve as a reminder to employers about their workplace responsibilities and the legal ramifications of violating the law. They are also a visible commitment by Congress to the workplace protections embodied in the CAA. The CAA Reform Act now requires that employing offices post and keep posted in conspicuous places on their premises the notices provided by the OCWR, which must contain information about employees' rights and the OCWR's Administrative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, along with OCWR contact information. 2 U.S.C. §1362.

Name Change

As the Board advised Congress in 2014, changing the name of the office to ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights'' would better reflect our mission, raise our public profile in connection with our mandate to educate the legislative branch, and make it easier for employees to identify us when they need assistance. Effective December 21, 2018, the Reform Act renamed the ''Office of Compliance'' as the ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.'' This name change notifies legislative branch employees that the Office is tasked with protecting their workplace rights through its programs of dispute resolution, education, and enforcement. As the Office embraces its new name, it remains committed to the mission of advancing workplace rights, safety and health, and accessibility for workers and visitors on Capitol Hill, as envisioned in the CAA and the CAA Reform Act.

Extending Coverage to Interns, Fellows, and Detailees

The Board also has consistently recommended in its Section 102(b) Reports that Congress extend the coverage and protections of the anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal provisions of the CAA to all staff, including interns, fellows, and detailees working in any employing office in the legislative branch, regardless of how or whether they are paid. The CAA Reform Act amends section 201 of the CAA—which applies title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (outlawing discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—to apply the protections and remedies of those laws to current and former ''unpaid staff.'' ''Unpaid staff'' is defined in the Reform Act as ''any staff member of an employing office who carries out official duties of the employing office but who is not paid by the employing office for carrying out such duties . . . including an intern, an individual detailed to an employing office, and an individual participating in a fellowship program[.]'' These laws apply to unpaid staff ''in the same manner and to the same extent as such subsections apply with respect to a covered employee[.]'' 201(d), 2 U.S.C. §1311(d). The Reform Act thus ensures that unpaid interns, fellows, and detailees are covered by the CAA.

Extending Coverage to Library of Congress Employees

Prior to 2018, only certain provisions of the CAA applied to employees of the Library of Congress (LOC), and the Board expressed its support for proposals to amend the CAA to include the LOC within the definition of ''employing office,'' thereby extending CAA protections to LOC employees for most purposes. The 2018 omnibus spending bill amended the CAA to bring the LOC and its employees within the OCWR's (then OOC's) jurisdiction. That bill amended the definition of ''covered employee'' under the CAA to include employees of the LOC, and it added the LOC as an ''employing office'' for all purposes except the CAA's labor-management relations provisions. Among other changes, the bill gave to LOC employees a choice on how to pursue complaints of employment discrimination—allowing them to pursue a complaint either with the LOC's Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Programs or with the OCWR. The Reform Act incorporates these statutory changes and further clarifies the rights of LOC employees in this regard as well as others. Its provisions are effective retroactive to March 23, 2018. 2 U.S.C. §1401(d)(5).

Changes to the Dispute Resolution Procedures Under the CAA

In testimony before the CHA as part of that committee's comprehensive review of the CAA and the protections that law offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace, OCWR Executive Director Susan Tsui Grundmann conveyed the Board of Directors' considered recommendations for changes to the ADR procedures set forth in the Act, discussed below.

Pre-Reform Act Procedures Under the CAA

As stated above, the effective date for the new ADR procedures under the Reform Act is June 19, 2019. Currently, prior to filing a complaint with the OCWR pursuant to section 405 of the Act or in the U.S. District Court, the CAA requires that an employee satisfy two jurisdictional prerequisites: mandatory counseling and mandatory mediation. If a claim is not resolved during the counseling phase and the employee wishes to pursue the matter, the CAA currently requires the employee to file a request for mediation with the OCWR. When a case proceeds to mediation, the employing office is notified about the claim and the parties attempt to settle the matter with the assistance of a trained neutral mediator appointed by the OCWR.

If the parties fail to resolve their dispute in mediation, a covered employee may elect to proceed directly to the third step in the process, either by filing an administrative complaint with the OCWR, in which case the complaint would be decided by an OCWR Hearing Officer in a confidential setting, or by filing a lawsuit in a U.S. District Court, in which case the proceedings would be a matter of public record. By statute, this election—which is the employee's alone—must occur not later than 90 days, but not sooner than 30 days, after the end of the period of mediation. This statutory timing requirement creates a 30-day period—sometimes referred to as a ''cooling off period''—before the employee can proceed. A party dissatisfied with the decision of the Hearing Officer may file a petition for review with the OCWR Board of Directors, and any decision of the Board may be appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. If, instead of filing a request for an administrative hearing, the employee files a civil suit in Federal district court, an appeal of that decision would proceed under the rules of the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals. As is discussed below, the Board has advocated in the legislative process for several procedural changes now provided for in the Reform Act, which potentially shorten the case handling process without compromising its effectiveness in resolving disputes under the CAA.

Counseling and Mediation Changes

In testimony before the CHA, Executive Director Grundmann explained that counselors often provide covered employees with their first opportunity to discuss their workplace concerns and to learn about their statutory protections under the CAA. She conveyed the Board's view that, although counseling need not remain mandatory under the CAA, the CAA should not be amended in such a manner as to eliminate the availability of an opportunity for employees to voluntarily seek confidential assistance from our office. Under the new procedures set forth in the CAA Reform Act, counseling will no longer be mandatory. Rather, the CAA Reform Act provides for the optional services of a confidential advisor—an attorney who can, among other things, provide information to covered employees, on a privileged and confidential basis, about their rights under the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1402(a)(3).

As with counseling, the Executive Director also conveyed to the CHA the Board's view supporting the elimination of mediation as a mandatory jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA. The Board nonetheless recommended that mediation be maintained as a valuable option available to those parties who mutually seek to settle their dispute. The OCWR's experience over many years has been that a large percentage of controversies were successfully resolved without formal adversarial proceedings, due in large part to its mediation processes. Mediation can save the parties from burdensome litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity. Mediation also gives the parties an opportunity to explore resolving the dispute themselves without having a result imposed upon them. Furthermore, OCWR mediators are highly skilled professionals who have the sensitivity, expertise, and flexibility to customize the mediation process to meet the concerns of the parties. In short, the effectiveness of mediation as a tool to resolve workplace disputes cannot be understated. Under the CAA Reform Act, mediation still remains available, but it is optional. It is no longer a jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA, and it will take place only if requested and only if both parties agree.

''Cooling Off'' Period

As stated above, the CAA presently requires an employee to wait 30 days after mediation ends to pursue a formal administrative complaint or a lawsuit in a U.S. District Court. In her testimony before the CHA, Executive Director Grundmann conveyed the Board's recommendation that this period be eliminated from the statute. The Reform Act amendments do so.

As the changes set forth in the Reform Act take effect, the Board will carefully monitor

their effectiveness and advise Congress of its findings in this regard. In this Report, we also highlight key recommendations that the Board has made in past Section 102(b) Reports that have not yet been implemented. (see note 1.) We continue to believe that the adoption of these recommendations, discussed below, will best promote a model workplace in the legislative branch. The Board welcomes an opportunity to further discuss these recommendations and asks for careful consideration of the requests by the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

BARBARA CHILDS WALLACE,
Chair, Board of Directors.
BARBARA L. CAMENS.
ALAN V. FRIEDMAN.
ROBERTA L. HOLZWARTH.
SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL.

Recommendations for the 116th Congress

Apply the Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act of 2015 to the Legislative Branch (Public Law 114–75)

The Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act, enacted in 2015, affords wounded warriors the flexibility to receive medical care as they transition to serving the nation in a new capacity. Specifically, new federal employees who are also disabled veterans with a 30% or more disability may receive 104 hours of ''wounded warrior leave'' during their first year in the federal workforce so that they may seek medical treatment for their service-connected disabilities without being forced to take unpaid leave or forego their medical appointments. The Act was passed as a way to show gratitude and deep appreciation for the hardship and sacrifices of veterans and, in particular wounded warriors, in service to the United States. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch offer Wounded Warrior Federal Leave, the Board reiterates the recommendation made in its 2016 Section 102(b) Report to extend the benefits of that Act to the legislative branch with enforcement and implementation under the provisions of the CAA.

Approve the Board's Pending Regulations

The CAA directs the OCWR to promulgate regulations implementing the CAA to keep Congress current and accountable to the workplace laws that apply to private and public employers. The Board is required to amend its regulations to achieve parity, unless there is good cause shown to deviate from the private sector or executive branch regulations. The Board recommended in its 2016 section 102(b) Report to the 115th Congress that it approve its pending regulations that would implement the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), ADA titles II and III, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act (USERRA) in the legislative branch. The Board-adopted regulations ensure that same-sex spouses are recognized under the FMLA, in accordance with Supreme Court rulings, and further extend important protections for military caregivers and service members. The Board's adopted ADA regulations will avoid costly construction and contracting errors that result when there is uncertainty or ambiguity regarding what standards apply, and will improve access to Capitol Hill for visitors and employees with disabilities. The Board of Directors also transmitted to Congress its adopted USERRA regulations on December 3, 2008 and identified ''good cause'' to modify the executive branch regulations to implement more effectively the rights and protections for veterans as applied to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other employing offices. These rules are necessary to fulfill the commitments set forth in USERRA to our nation's veterans in the legislative branch.

Analysis of Pending FMLA Regulations:

On June 22, 2016, the Board of Directors adopted and transmitted to Congress for approval its regulations necessary for implementing the FMLA in the legislative branch. In accordance with the CAA, those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor, 2 U.S.C. §1312(d)(2), except where good cause was shown that a modification would be more effective in implementing FMLA rights under the CAA. We seek congressional approval of these important FMLA regulations. The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave and documentation, defining ''spouse'' to include same-sex spouses as required by the Supreme Court precedent, and adding military caregiver leave. Adoption of these regulations will reduce uncertainty for both employing offices and employees and provide greater predictability in the congressional workplace. First, these FMLA regulations add the military leave provisions of the FMLA, enacted under the National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA) for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 (see note 2), that extend the availability of FMLA leave to family members of the Regular Armed Forces for qualifying exigencies arising out of a service member's deployment. They also define those deployments covered under these provisions, extend FMLA military caregiver leave for family members of current service members to include an injury or illness that existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty, and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans with serious injuries or illnesses. As noted, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for service members and their families were enacted into law by the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010. The congressional committee reports that accompany the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 and the amended FMLA provisions do not ''describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment]... apply to the legislative branch'' or ''include a statement of the reasons the provision does not apply [to the legislative branch]'' (in the case of a provision not applicable to the legislative branch), as required by section 102(b)(3) of the CAA. (see note 3)

Consequently, when the FMLA was amended to add these additional rights and protections, it was not clear whether Congress intended that these additional rights and protections apply in the legislative branch. To the extent that there may be an ambiguity regarding the applicability to the legislative branch of the 2008 and 2010 FMLA amendments, the Board makes clear through these regulations that the rights and protections for military servicemembers apply in the legislative branch, and that protections under the CAA are in line with existing public and private sector protections under the FMLA. The Board-adopted FMLA regulations implement leave protections of significant importance to legislative branch employees and employing offices. Accordingly, the Board recommends that Congress approve the Board's adopted FMLA regulations. Second, these regulations set forth the revised definition of ''spouse'' under the FMLA in light of the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule on the definition of spouse, and the United States Supreme Court's decision in Obergefell v. Hodges (see note 4), which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

Analysis of Pending ADA Regulations:

Public access to Capitol Hill and constituent access to district and state offices has been a hallmark of many congresses. The Board recommends that Congress approve its adopted regulations implementing titles II and III of the ADA to Capitol Hill and the district offices. First, the Board's ADA regulations clarify which title II and title III regulations apply to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction review of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, under the regulations adopted by the Board, all leased spaces must meet some basic accessibility requirements that apply to all federal facilities that are leased or constructed. In this way, Congress will remain a model for ADA compliance and public access. Under the authority of the landmark CAA, the OOC has made significant progress towards making Capitol Hill more accessible for persons with disabilities. Our efforts to improve access to the buildings and facilities on the campus are consistent with the priority guidance in the Board's ADA regulations, which it adopted in February 2016. Congressional approval of those regulations would reaffirm its commitment to provide barrier-free access to the visiting public to the Capitol Hill complex.

Analysis of Pending USERRA Regulations:

On December 3, 2008, the Board of Directors adopted USERRA regulations to apply to the legislative branch. Those regulations, transmitted to Congress over 10 years ago, should be immediately approved. They support our nation's veterans by requiring continuous health care insurance and job protections for the men and women of the service who have supported our country's freedoms. The 114th Congress was particularly focused on issues concerning veterans' health, welfare, access, and employment status. Approving the USERRA regulations will assist service members in attaining and retaining a job despite the call to duty. The regulations commit to anti-discrimination, anti-retaliation, and job protection under USERRA. Approving USERRA regulations would signal congressional encouragement to veterans to seek work in the legislative branch where veteran employment levels have historically been well below the percentage in the executive branch, or even in the private sector, which is not under a mandate to provide a preference in hiring to veterans. Indeed, many reports have put the level of veteran employees on congressional staffs at two to three percent or less. The Veterans Congressional Fellowship Caucus, started in 2014, has supported efforts to bridge the gap between military service and legislative work. In addition, the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program exists in the House Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) where Members can hire veteran fellows for 2-year terms. In the Senate, the Armed Forces Internship Program exists to provide on-the-job training for returning veterans with disabilities. An extension of these laudable efforts should include the long-delayed passage of the Board's adopted USERRA regulations which implement protections for initial hiring and protect against discrimination based on military service. Congress can lead by example by applying the USERRA law encompassed in the CAA.

Approving the three sets of Board-adopted regulations outlined above would not only signify a commitment to the laws of the CAA—which passed in 1995 with nearly unanimous, bi-cameral, and bipartisan support—but would further help legislative branch

managers effectively implement the laws' protections and benefits on behalf of the workforce.

Protect Employees and Applicants Who Are or Have Been in Bankruptcy (11 U.S.C. § 525)

Section 525(a) of title 11 of the U.S. Code provides that ''a governmental unit'' may not deny employment to, terminate the employment of, or discriminate with respect to employment against, a person because that person is or has been a debtor under the bankruptcy statutes. This provision currently does not apply to the legislative branch. Reiterating the recommendations made in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 Section 102(b) reports, the Board advises that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to employing offices within the legislative branch.

Prohibit Discharge of Employees Who Are or Have Been Subject to Garnishment (15 U.S.C. § 1674(A))

Section 1674(a) of title 15 of the U.S. Code prohibits discharge of any employee because his or her earnings ''have been subject to garnishment for any one indebtedness.'' This section is limited to private employers, so it currently has no application to the legislative branch. For the reasons set forth in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 Section 102(b) Reports, the Board recommends that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to employing offices within the legislative branch.

Provide Whistleblower Protections to the Legislative Branch

Civil service law provides broad protection to whistleblowers in the executive branch to safeguard workers against reprisal for reporting violations of laws, rules, or regulations, gross mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety. In the private sector, whistleblowers also are often protected by provisions of specific federal laws. However, these provisions do not apply to the legislative branch. The OCWR has received a number of inquiries from congressional employees concerned about the lack of whistleblower protections. The absence of specific statutory protection such as that provided under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8) chills the disclosure of such information. Granting whistleblower protection could significantly improve the rights and protections afforded to legislative branch employees in an area fundamental to the institutional integrity of the legislative branch by uncovering waste and fraud and safeguarding the budget.

The Board has recommended in its previous Section 102(b) reports and continues to recommend that Congress provide whistleblower reprisal protections to legislative branch employees comparable to that provided to executive branch employees under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8), and 5 U.S.C. § 1221. Additionally, as discussed below, the Board recommends that the Office also be granted investigatory and prosecutorial authority over whistleblower reprisal complaints, by incorporating into the CAA the authority granted to the Office of Special Counsel, which investigates and prosecutes claims of whistleblower reprisal in the executive branch.

Provide Subpoena Authority to Obtain Information Needed for Safety & Health Investigations and Require Records To Be Kept of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses

The CAA applies the broad protections of section 5 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHAct) to the congressional workplace. The OCWR enforces the OSHAct in the legislative branch much in the same way the Secretary of Labor enforces the OSHAct in the private sector. Under the CAA, the OCWR is required to conduct safety and health inspections of covered employing offices at least once each Congress and in response to any request, and to provide employing offices with technical assistance to comply with the OSHAct's requirements. But Congress and its agencies are still exempt from critical OSHAct requirements imposed upon American businesses. Under the CAA, employing offices in the legislative branch are not subject to investigative subpoenas to aid in inspections as are private sector employers under the OSHAct. Similarly, Congress exempted itself from the OSHAct's recordkeeping requirements pertaining to workplace injuries and illnesses that apply to the private sector. The Board recommends that legislative branch employing offices be subject to the investigatory subpoena provisions contained in OSHAct § 8(b) and that legislative branch employing offices be required to keep records of workplace injuries and illnesses under OSHAct § 8(c), 29 U.S.C. § 657(c).

Adopt Recordkeeping Requirements Under Federal Workplace Rights Laws

The Board, in several Section 102(b) reports, has recommended and continues to recommend that Congress adopt all recordkeeping requirements under Federal workplace rights laws, including title VII. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch keep personnel records, there are no legal requirements under the CAA to do so.

ENDNOTES

1. The Board has long advocated for legislation granting the OCWR General Counsel the authority to investigate and prosecute complaints of discrimination, harassment and reprisal in order to assist victims and to improve the adjudicatory process under the CAA. As discussed in this Report, the Reform Act establishes new procedures that are also clearly intended to further these policy goals. Under these circumstances, the Board believes that the best course of action is to evaluate the efficacy of the new Reform Act procedures once they have been implemented before revisiting the issue of whether the OCRW General Counsel should be granted such investigatory and prosecutorial authority. Accordingly, this recommendation is not discussed further below.

2. Pub. L. 110–181, Div. A, Title V § 585(a)(2), (3)(A)–(D) and Pub. L. 111–84, Div. A, Title V § 565(a)(1)(B) and (4).

3. U.S.C. § 1302(3); House Committee on Armed Services, H. Rpt. 110–146 (May 11, 2007), H. Rpt. 111–166 (June 18, 2009)

4. Obergefell v. Hodges, 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

223. A letter from the Acting Architect, Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 116—14); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

224. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting biennial report on recommendations for improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act, pursuant to section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 received February 25, 2019, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1302; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and Labor.

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:

Mrs. TORRES of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 144. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019 (Rept. 116–13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RASKIN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee (Rept. 116–14). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. KATKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COOK, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WILD, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KIM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. REED, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLE, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 1327. A bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 1328. A bill to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for medical assistance under Medicaid for inmates during the 30-day period preceding release from a public institution; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 1330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the site known as ''Amache'' in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CRAIG (for herself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1332. A bill to address the high costs of health care services, prescription drugs, and health insurance coverage in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, Education and Labor, Rules, the Budget, Armed Services, and House Administration, 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. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to create a buffer in between oil and gas drilling operations and homes, businesses, schools, and other buildings that require special protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide grants for projects to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes and to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 1335. A bill to provide that the production safety systems rule and the well control rule in section 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, shall have the same force and effect of law as if such rules had been enacted by an Act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1336. A bill to require the Federal Government to provide mental health services to each child who has been separated from one or more parent as a result of implementation of the Trump Administration's zero tolerance policy at the United States border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1337. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 1338. A bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BACON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUDD, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 1339. A bill to enhance penalties for theft of a firearm from a Federal firearms licensee, to establish a Mass Violence Prevention Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 1340. A bill to designate the Quindaro Townsite in Kansas City, Kansas, as a National Commemorative Site; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1341. A bill to designate the Mental Health Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility Expansion of the Department of Veterans Affairs Alvin C. York Medical Center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, as the ''Sergeant John Toombs Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1342. A bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the protection for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1344. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend titles XVI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to remove limitations on Medicaid, Medicare, SSI, and CHIP benefits for persons in custody pending disposition of charges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILD, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for individuals who are ages 50 to 64 to buy into Medicare, to provide for health insurance market stabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1347. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 1348. A bill to require the publication of the name of any person pardoned by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 1350. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Green Alert plans throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COLE, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 1352. A bill to provide for parity for Guam and the United States Virgin Islands under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to apply the same apportionment formula to territories and the District of Columbia as is applied to States with respect to amounts made available for State purposes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1355. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Simeon Booker in recognition of his achievements in the field of journalism, including his reporting during the Civil Rights movement and his social and political commentary; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KING of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 143. A resolution electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 146. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of the month of September 2019 as ''PCOS Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 147. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 3, 2019, as World Hearing Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

Provides Congress with the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises'' in order to ''provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 1330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 states, ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .'' This clause allows Congress to create national parks and establish studies to determine the feasibility of designating a study area as a unit of the National Parks System.

By Mrs. CRAIG:

H.R. 1331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 1338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 1340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution [Page H4570]

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 1345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 1346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 1348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 1349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1355.

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 Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 49.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 40: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 73: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 132: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 141: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 155: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 180: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 197: Ms. PORTER and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 203: Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 211: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 276: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 281: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 291: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CASE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 299: Mr. HIMES, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 310: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 330: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 369: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 372: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 384: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 385: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 393: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 425: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 435: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 481: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 485: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 501: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 510: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 530: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 539: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 540: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 541: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 553: Mr. COHEN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 555: Mr. KEATING, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 569: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 583: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FLORES, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 587: Mr. TONKO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 597: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 601: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 603: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 611: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 613: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 616: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 643: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 647: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 649: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 652: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 656: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 661: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 666: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 668: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 669: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 677: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 678: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 679: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 688: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 693: Mr. KIM, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 714: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 724: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. LAMB, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 728: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 741: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 759: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 768: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 770: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 804: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 806: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 808: Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 824: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 830: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 833: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 850: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 864: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CRIST, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 871: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 872: Ms. DEAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 877: Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 886: Mr. KIM and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 888: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 890: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 891: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 897: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 900: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 915: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 921: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 925: Mr. COOK, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 935: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 945: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 949: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 956: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 961: Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 962: Mr. POSEY and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 978: Mr. SIRES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 996: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1002: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WILD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1011: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1012: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1013: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1019: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CROW, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1029: Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 1030: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1035: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1042: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1043: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 1044: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1046: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARKe of New York, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1049: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1051: Mr. CLAY and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1052: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 1057: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 1058: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1073: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1078: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1094: Mr. SIRES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1108: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1109: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1126: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1129: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1137: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COX of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1140: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1146: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1155: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1156: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1168: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1171: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1186: Mr. BEYER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1190: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1197: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1201: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. HECK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1212: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1216: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1225: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1229: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1232: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1234: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1235: Mr. YOUNG, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 1241: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1245: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1246: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1247: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1254: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1255: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1265: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 1277: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1293: Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 1305: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1320: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. YOHO.
H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.J. Res. 44: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. KIM.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. WOODALL.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. TRONE and Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Con. Res. 12: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Con. Res. 13: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Con. Res. 15: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. REED, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BARR, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. CHENEY.
H. Res. 33: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KIM, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. BASS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CROW.
H. Res. 40: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 54: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 58: Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 60: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. ZELDIN.
H. Res. 72: Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 96: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Res. 107: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 109: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BASS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 110: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 114: Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 138: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. NORTON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H.J. Res. 46 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.