



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2019

No. 199

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

During these cold, early darkening days, we ask Your special blessing upon those who labor in the Nation's Capitol.

Help the Members of the House, and those of the Senate, to act wisely and carefully in the important work they do. In the waning days of the session, may they continue to heed the voices of all their constituents, both those who voted for them and those who did not.

May all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUDD 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

12 DAYS OF SALT

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, on the seventh day of SALT, my constituents have said to me that we cannot fix the SALT deduction cap by simply slashing our State and local taxes because these taxes fund critical community priorities like our public school system.

I am incredibly proud that New Jersey's public school system was just ranked number one in the entire country. A number of factors go into that achievement, including student achievement, the success of students once they leave school, and school funding.

Madam Speaker, New Jersey ranks third in the country in the percentage of our tax dollars allocated to education. That is because our residents know that investment in our schools is a downpayment on a bright future. It is why so many families make New Jersey their home.

This investment benefits not only New Jersey. Our students grow up to work, serve, and lead in organizations across the Nation and around the globe.

That includes four—yes, four—NASA astronauts produced by the public schools in my congressional district alone.

We need to restore the SALT deduction cap and stop penalizing States like New Jersey that prioritize investment in our children and the professionals who educate the next generation, investments that benefit the entire country.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CAMERON WALTERS

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Cameron Walters, who passed away at the age of 21 on Friday, December 6, during the barbaric attack on Naval Air Station Pensacola.

Originally from Richmond Hill in the First Congressional District of Georgia, Mr. Walters was a pilot in training at the naval air station.

He had recently passed an exam in order to stand watch over the entrances to the station, and when the shots rang out, it was his first time on guard duty.

Before the tragic attack, Mr. Walters joined the Navy to follow in his father's footsteps and build a better sense of purpose in life.

His father remembers that when he graduated boot camp, the grin on his face said it all. He was so proud to have the opportunity to earn his wings as a Navy airman.

For his friends and classmates, his bright personality and sense of humor could light up any room he walked into.

It is truly devastating that Mr. Walters' life was cut so short by this tragic event, a life which had so much enthusiasm to serve his country and make this world a better place to live.

Mr. Walters' family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. FLETCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H10127

URGING SUPPORT FOR PASSAGE OF ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS LOWER DRUG COSTS NOW ACT

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be voting today for the passage of the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, a bill to lower healthcare costs by allowing Medicare to negotiate lower drug prices for certain high-cost drugs.

I am even prouder that H.R. 3 will reinvest the savings from these drug negotiations into a transformational expansion of Medicare benefits, which includes routine vision, hearing, and dental care.

I have fought for years to include these critical services in my Seniors Have Eyes, Ears, and Teeth Act because they will prevent healthcare costs and suffering due to senior accidents, falls, cognitive impairment, oral cancer, and increased chronic conditions.

Most importantly, giving our older adults the gift of hearing, vision, and oral health would go a long way to helping them enjoy their golden years free from depression and social isolation.

It is time to recognize total healthcare for our seniors must include adequate access to vision, hearing, and dental services.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 3.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL GUARD ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to wish a happy birthday to the National Guard and all servicemembers, past and present.

Established in 1636, our Nation’s first militia units organized in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and were referred to as Minutemen during the Revolutionary War.

Today, the Army and Air National Guard are made up of 184,000 heroes who bravely stepped up to defend our freedom.

They made history by forming one of the first all-African American units during the Civil War. They contributed 50,000 personnel following the 9/11 attacks. As I speak, they help secure our southern borders.

More importantly, the National Guard sets itself apart as each member is sworn to uphold two constitutions, both Federal and State.

Most of us are familiar with Guard units helping communities deal with floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, snowstorms, and other emergencies. But in times of civil unrest, the citizens of a State can rest assured that the Guard will be ready, if needed.

These incredible Americans deserve to be recognized and celebrated for their long and continued service to our Nation. So on behalf of a grateful Nation, I thank them for their sacrifice and commitment.

ANTI-SEMITISM THREATENS OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today because violent anti-Semitism continues to threaten our country, including in my home State of New Jersey.

Investigations are still underway, but I was devastated to learn that the victims in a kosher market in Jersey City, New Jersey, were likely targeted because they were Jewish.

All Americans should be outraged when fellow citizens are targeted simply because of their religion. The Anti-Defamation League has reported that anti-Semitism remains at near historic levels, with New Jersey ranked third in the Nation last year.

We must stand together now to denounce hate targeted at anyone and prevent more violence.

New Jersey stands together to honor the police officers harmed in the attack, who were doing what they do every single day, getting our backs, especially Detective Joseph Seals, a wonderful father of five beautiful children and a 15-year police veteran who gave his own life protecting his community.

We mourn with his loved ones, and our prayers are with the officers and community members still recovering.

Together, as one New Jersey, and as Americans, I know we can combat this hate, which has no place in our community, in the State of New Jersey, or in our country.

May God continue to bless the people of Jersey City, the State of New Jersey, and the United States of America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL JOHN EDWARD GRAY

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of retired Colonel John Edward Gray of Mount Ulla, North Carolina, who passed away earlier this month at age 94.

Colonel Gray was born in Cleveland, North Carolina, on August 24, 1925, and went on to serve in five campaigns against the Japanese in the Pacific theater in World War II.

Following the war, he returned home and resumed his education at Davidson College. After he graduated in 1949, he served again in both the Korean and Vietnam wars.

Selfless, legendary, valiant are all the words that come to mind when

thinking about all that this man accomplished in his life.

Colonel Gray is survived by his wife of 72 years, Sue, and his 5 children, 12 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandchild.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the life of Colonel John Edward Gray.

TOWNHALLS ESSENTIAL TO CONGRESSIONAL WORK

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because tomorrow I will be holding my 33rd townhall since being sworn in, with three in each of the 11 counties making up my district.

I promised my constituents that I would be transparent, accountable, and accessible. New York Congressional District 19 is nearly 8,000 square miles, larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. In the past year, we spent hours in the car, driving in the rain, snow, and sleet to meet folks where they are.

We have held townhalls in fire departments, schools, small businesses, and theaters, and even had crowds spilling into the hallway. When the broadband signal was strong enough, the entire conversation was streamed on Facebook Live.

These open forums are essential to my work to represent our district. That is how democracy is supposed to work: civil conversations with my constituents, finding common ground, and concluding with legislation reflecting the needs of the community.

Townhalls are a true highlight of my first year in office, and we are just getting started. I look forward to meeting more folks tomorrow at the Highland Middle School in Ulster.

COMMEMORATING 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GARDEN CITY

(Miss RICE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss RICE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the founding of my hometown, Garden City, New York.

As the first planned suburban community in the United States, the village of Garden City is steeped in history.

Home to Mitchel Air Force Base, Garden City has played a critical role in our Nation’s aviation industry. It was here where our Nation’s first fighter pilots trained during World War I. During World War II, the airbase played a pivotal role in defending our Nation’s Eastern seaboard and later served as a staging ground for the European air campaign against Nazi Germany.

Garden City is also at the epicenter of countless cultural and tourist attractions on Long Island, including the

Garden City Hotel, which today continues to serve thousands of visitors attending thoroughbred races at Belmont race track.

On a more personal note, Garden City is also a community that welcomed my family with open arms. It was in Garden City where my father, the eldest son of an Irish immigrant, ran a successful construction company, where my parents raised me and my nine brothers and sisters, and where I first learned about the importance of public service and civic engagement.

Garden City is a wonderful community filled with wonderful people. I am proud to join my friends, family, and neighbors in celebrating its 150th anniversary.

LOWER DRUG COSTS NOW ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). Pursuant to House Resolution 758 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3.

Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) kindly take the chair.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes, with Mrs. FLETCHER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, December 11, 2019, 60 minutes remained in general debate.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each have 30 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chair, with this legislation, Democrats are fulfilling our pledge to the American people in passing legislation that will bring down prescription drug costs for the people. That is one of the three central pillars of our For the People Agenda.

With H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, we are delivering for the people. This legislation, named in memory of my dear friend and our colleague, Elijah Cummings, who fought so hard to lower the cost of prescription drugs, will give Medicare the power to negotiate directly with drug companies, which will help bring drug prices down, as we do now, Madam Chair, for our veterans.

It will make those lower drug prices available to Americans with private in-

surance as well—not just Medicare, but with private insurance—and it will create a new out-of-pocket limit of \$2,000, a cap on out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drugs for those on Medicare part D.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 3 will save American taxpayers approximately half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years.

Now, H.R. 3 reinvests those savings, Madam Chair, in key initiatives, including expanding Medicare benefits to cover dental, vision, and hearing services; investing in new research, treatment, and cures; and combating the opioid crisis—all three objectives that the American public overwhelmingly support.

President Trump, Madam Chair, promised in 2016, before his election, that he would work to negotiate lower drug prices, something this bill would give his administration the authority to do. For that reason, he ought to support it.

He said in 2016: “When it comes time to negotiate the cost of drugs, we are going to negotiate like crazy.” He said that in a campaign setting. Hopefully, he still believes that today.

I hope he will join in encouraging the Senate to take up H.R. 3, because in 2018, he said this: “One common cancer drug is nearly seven times as expensive for Medicare as it is for other countries. . . . This happens because the government pays whatever price the drug companies set without any negotiation whatsoever.” So said President Trump on October 25, 2018.

He went on to say just 2 months ago, in October: “. . . we want to bring our prices down to what other countries are paying, or at least close. . . .”

Madam Chair, that is what this legislation does.

President Trump went on to say: “. . . and let the other countries pay more. Because they’re setting such low prices that we’re actually subsidizing other countries, and that’s just not going to happen anymore.”

Those were remarks before the Cabinet meeting on October 16, 2019, just a few weeks ago.

That is what this legislation does. That is why the Senate ought to pass this legislation and the President ought to sign it. I hope he will join us in encouraging the Senate to take up H.R. 3 without delay and pass it. And I urge the President to reverse his opposition to this bill and sign it, his opposition being totally inconsistent with those three quotes that I just articulated.

Too many Americans, Madam Chair, are struggling to pay for their prescription drugs. I have heard awful stories from constituents in my district, as I know every one of us has, about families rationing insulin and having to forego rent or food or other necessities in order to pay for their prescription drugs. That is not an option. Without them, their health will deteriorate, and, yes, they may die.

One senior from Clinton, Maryland, in my district, wrote to tell me that one of her prescription drugs more than doubled in price, and she left the pharmacy empty-handed because she couldn’t afford it.

With H.R. 3, we can bring relief to people like her.

With H.R. 3, we can lower the cost of prescription drugs so that Americans can live healthy lives and pursue their American Dream.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairman NEAL, Chairman SCOTT, and their committees for working hard on this bill to help Americans lower their prescription drug costs and live longer and healthier lives.

Madam Chair, this should not be a partisan issue. The President articulated the desire to achieve the objective of bringing prices down. That is what this bill does. That is what CBO says it does. So I urge my colleagues to support this.

Now, Madam Chair, I know you could do this, but I want to do it because I am so proud not only of HALEY STEVENS herself, who is an extraordinary Member of the Congress of the United States, a wonderful member of the previous administration, and somebody who has worked in the private sector and the public sector and who has been elected president of your class, Madam Chair, the freshman class, an extraordinary group of 63 people, 64 if we count our friend CONOR LAMB who was elected in a special election just before you—and he, of course, lords it over you that he is a senior member of the freshman class; I understand that.

But HALEY STEVENS leads an extraordinary group of 64 people who have contributed so much to our society already in their lives, in their productive, constructive lives, and now have come to the Congress. And they came with a promise to do three things, at least:

Number one, to help with wages and jobs and opportunities;

Number two, to bring prescription costs down; and

Number three, to invest in infrastructure.

In this bill, we meet one-third of those promises, and they have made it possible.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), the president of the freshman class, so she may manage the remainder of the time.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the distinguished majority leader’s comments about President Trump.

I have been around Congress for 21 years, and I have never seen a President of either party lean more forward in trying to get down the cost of prescription drugs, to give taxpayers more of their hard-earned income, to get an

economy up and running like we have never seen it before, to tackle the issue of unemployment and get unemployment numbers down to the lowest level in 50 years in every category all across the country, and to reduce the burdens of overregulation. President Trump has done all those things.

He also has called for getting down the price of prescription drugs. I have been in several meetings where he has done that, and I share his passion for that, and I know he wants a bipartisan bill that can become law and be put on his desk.

Everything you heard from the distinguished majority leader about President Trump's views are accurate, but he actually read H.R. 3. And if you read the Statement of Administration Policy, he recognizes that this goes too far and he would have to veto it, that it is a partisan-only bill—partisan only.

And here is part of the problem with H.R. 3: It hands the government a club. There is no negotiation in here. If you don't agree to what the government says the price should be, the government in Washington comes after your revenues, and up to 95 percent of your revenues for selling that drug they can just come and take.

By the way, when you throw in the cost of taxation and everything else, it is well over 100 percent that a drug manufacturer who is innovating some new drug and has the patent for that great American innovation, the government says: If you don't sell it for what we want within a band, we are taking it. We are not taking your patent—well, they might come back and do that in another iteration, but: What we are doing is taking all the revenues. We will bankrupt you.

That is why 138 different small innovative startup innovators in this space wrote to the Speaker and the Republican leader. And I want to quote from their letter, Madam Chair. It says: "We represent the community of emerging biotechnology companies whose researchers and scientists strive daily to develop innovative life-changing therapies and cures for patients. We take pride that we are providing hope to patients and their families and changing the world through medical breakthroughs. These dreams will be shattered if H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, is passed."

They went on to say: "Unfortunately, H.R. 3 is an unprecedented and aggressive government intervention in the U.S. market of drug development and delivery that will limit patient access to these extraordinary advancements in healthcare."

Look, we all agree drug costs are too high, and we want to work together to stop the gaming and bring down the prices.

Our alternative, which we will debate in a few minutes, does that, but it doesn't do it at the expense of completely upending the ecosystem that allows American innovators to do what no one else in the world does as well,

and that is come up with new cures for diseases and make them available.

Madam Chair, I enter into the RECORD the letter from 138 startup innovators in its full context.

DECEMBER 5, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCARTHY: We represent the community of emerging biotechnology companies whose researchers and scientists strive daily to develop innovative life-changing therapies and cures for patients. We take pride that we are providing hope to patients and their families and changing the world through medical breakthroughs. These dreams will be shattered if H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, is passed.

We are at an incredible inflection point in science and technology that is bringing forth transformative treatments and even cures for cancer, infectious diseases, and a myriad of other serious and rare diseases. These advancements are benefiting lives of millions of patients and alleviating human suffering, while helping to reduce other more expensive parts of our health care system, such as hospital spending. Our continued success depends on maintaining an environment that supports investment in tomorrow's discoveries.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3 is an unprecedented and aggressive government intervention in the U.S. market of drug development and delivery that will limit patient access to these extraordinary advancements in health care. This extreme proposal will upend the ecosystem of U.S. biomedical innovation, destroying our ability to attract private investment dollars that allow us to develop new treatments and change the course of healthcare delivery for so many patients.

We strongly urge you to abandon H.R. 3. Further, in order to keep pace with this biomedical revolution and ensure America remains the world leader in innovation, we hope that you will pursue bipartisan, holistic policies that modernize our health care payment system and lower drug costs for patients.

Sincerely,

Adelene Perkins, Chair & CEO, Infinity Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Adrian Gottschalk, President & CEO, Foghorn Therapeutics; Alden Pritchard, CEO, Kaio Therapy, Inc.; Alex Nichols, PhD, President & CEO, Mythic Therapeutics; Amit Munshi, President & CEO, Arena Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Andre Turenne, President & CEO, Voyager Therapeutics, Inc.; Aprile Pilon, PhD, President & CEO, Trove Therapeutics, Inc.; Armando Anido, Chairman & CEO, Zynerva Pharmaceuticals; Axel Bolte, Co-Founder, President & CEO, Inozyme Pharma; Barry Quart, President & CEO, Heron Therapeutics.

Bassil Dahiyat, President & CEO, Xencor, Inc.; Bill Enright, CEO, Vaccitech, Ltd.; Bill Newell, CEO, Sutro Biopharma; Blake Wise, CEO, Achaogen, Inc.; Bonnie Anderson, Chairman & CEO, Veracyte, Inc.; Bradford Zakes, President & CEO, Cerevast Therapeutics; Brandi Simpson, CEO, Navigen, Inc.; Brian Windsor, CEO, Lung Therapeutics, Inc.; Briggs W. Morrison, MD, CEO, Syndax Pharmaceuticals; Bruce Clark, PhD, President & CEO, Medicago, Inc.

Casey Lynch, CEO, Cortexyme; Cedric Francois, Co-Founder, CEO & Presi-

dent; Apellis Pharmaceuticals; Chris Gibson, Co-Founder & CEO, Recursion; Christopher Barden, CEO, Treventis Corporation; Christopher Burns, PhD, President & CEO, VenatoRx Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Christopher Schaber, President & CEO, Soligenix, Inc.; Ciara Kennedy, PhD, CEO, Amplyx Pharmaceuticals; Clay Seigall, President, CEO & Chairman, Seattle Genetics, Inc.; Craig Chambliss, President & CEO, Neurelis; David Baker, President & CEO, Vallon Pharmaceuticals.

David Bears, Founder & CEO, Tolero Pharmaceuticals; David de Graaf, PhD, President & CEO, Comet Therapeutics, Inc.; David Donabedian, PhD, Co-Founder & CEO, Axial Biotherapeutics; David Lucchino, President & CEO, Frequency Therapeutics, Inc.; David Mazzo, President & CEO, Caladrius Biosciences; David Meeker, CEO, KSQ Therapeutics; Doug Kahn, Chairman & CEO, TetraGenetics, Inc.; Douglas Doerfler, President & CEO, MaxCyte, Inc.; Dr. Elizabeth Poscillo, President & CEO, EluSys Therapeutics, Inc.; Eric Dube, PhD, CEO, Retrophin, Inc.

Eric Schuur, President & CEO, HepaTx Corporation; Erika Smith, CEO, ReNetX Bio; Francisco LePort, Founder & CEO, Gordian Biotechnology; Gail Maderis, President & CEO, Antiva Biosciences; Gary Phillips, President & CEO, Orphomed, Inc.; Geno Germano, President & CEO, Elucida Oncology, Inc.; George Scangos, CEO, VIR Biotechnology; Gil Van Bokkelen, Founder, Chairman & CEO, Athersys, Inc.; Greg Verdine, President & CEO, LifeMine Therapeutics, Inc.; FOG Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Imran Alibhai, CEO, Tvardi Therapeutics.

James Breitmeyer, President & CEO, Octernal Therapeutics, Inc.; James Flanigan, CEO, Honeycomb Biotechnologies; James Sapirstein, President & CEO, AzurRx BioPharma; Jay Evans, President & CEO, Inimmune Corporation; Jeb Keiper, CEO, Nimbus Therapeutics; Jeff Cleland, PhD, Executive Chair, Orpheris, Inc.; Jeff Jonker, President & CEO, Ambys Medicines; Jeff Kindler, CEO, Centrexion Therapeutics; Jeremy Levin, Chairman & CEO, Ovid Therapeutics, Inc.; Joe Payne, President & CEO, Arcturus Therapeutics, Inc..

John Crowley, Chairman & CEO, Amicus Therapeutics, Inc.; John Jacobs, President & CEO, Harmony Biosciences; John Maraganore, CEO, Alnylam Pharmaceuticals; Julia Owens, President & CEO, Millendo Therapeutics, Inc.; Justin Gover, CEO & Executive Director, Greenwich Biosciences; Keith Dionne, CEO, Casma Therapeutics; Keith Murphy, Founder, CEO & President, Viscient Biosciences; Ken Mills, CEO, REGENXBIO, Inc.; Ken Moch, President & CEO, Cognition Therapeutics; Kent Savage, CEO, PhotoPharmics, Inc.

Kevin Gorman, CEO, Neurocrine Biosciences; Kiran Reddy, MD, CEO, Praxis Medicines; Lawrence Brown, CEO, Galactica Pharmaceuticals; Lorenzo Pellegrini, Founder, Palladio Biosciences; Marc De Garidel, Chairman & CEO, Corvidia Therapeutics; Marilyn Bruno, PhD, CEO, Aequor, Inc.; Mark Leuchtenberger, Executive Chairman, Aleta Biotherapeutics; Mark Pruzanski, MD, President & CEO, Intercept Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Mark Timney, CEO, The Medicines Company; Markus Renschler, MD, President & CEO, Cyteir Therapeutics.

Martin Babier, CEO, Principia Biopharma; Melissa Bradford-Klug, CEO, Mayfield Pharmaceuticals; Michael Clayman, MD, CEO, Flexion Therapeutics; Michael J. Karlin, Co-CEO, IbeX Biosciences, LLC; Michael Raab, CEO, Ardelyx, Inc.; Mike Narachi, President & CEO, Coda Biotherapeutics; Ming Wang, PhD, President & CEO, Phanestra Therapeutics, Inc.; Morgan Brown, Executive VP & CFO, Lipocine; Nancy Simonian, CEO, Syros Pharmaceuticals; Olin Beck, CEO, Bastion Biologics.

Pam Randhawa, President & CEO, Empiriko Corporation; Pat McEnany, President & CEO, Catalyst Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Paul Bolno, MD, CEO, Wave Life Sciences; Paul Boucher, President & CEO, Parion Sciences, Inc.; Paul Hastings, CEO, Nkarta Therapeutics; Paul Laikind, President & CEO, Viacyte; Peter Savas, CEO & Chairman, LikeMinds, Inc.; Rachel King, Founder & CEO, GlycoMimetics, Inc.; Randy Milby, Founder & CEO, Hillstream BioPharma, Inc.; Rashida Karmali, PhD, President & CEO, Tactical Therapeutics, Inc.

Richard Markus, CEO, Dantari Pharmaceuticals; Richard Pascoe, Chairman & CEO, Histogen, Inc.; Richard Samulski, President, Asklepios BioPharmaceutical, Inc.; Rick Russell, President, Minverva Neurosciences; Rick Winningham, Chairman & CEO, Theravance Biopharma; Rob Etherington, President & CEO, Clene Nanomedicine; Robert Goodwin, PhD, CEO, Vibliome Therapeutics, Inc.; Robert Gould, PhD, President & CEO, Fulcrom Therapeutics; Robert M. Bernard, President & CEO, Ichor Medical Systems; Robert Wills, Chairman, CymaBay Therapeutics, Inc.

Roger Tung, President & CEO, CoNCERT Pharmaceuticals; Ron Cohen, Founder, President & CEO, Acorda Therapeutics, Inc.; Russ Teichert, PhD, CEO, Scintillant Bioscience; Russell Herndon, President & CEO, Hydra Biosciences, LLC; Samantha S. Truex, CEO, Quench Bio; Sandy Macrae, President & CEO, Sangamo Therapeutics, Inc.; Scott Koenig, President & CEO, MacroGenics, Inc.; Sean McCarthy, President, CEO & Chairman, CytomX; Sharon Mates, Founder, Chairman & CEO, Intra-Cellular Therapies; Shawn K. Singh, CEO, VistaGen Therapeutics, Inc.

Stan Abel, President & CEO, SiteOne Therapeutics, Inc.; Stanley Erck, President & CEO, Novavak; Stephen Farr, PhD, President & CEO, Zogenix, Inc.; Stephen R. Davis, CEO, ACADIA Pharmaceuticals; Stephen Yoder, CEO & President, Pieries Pharmaceuticals; Sue Washer, President & CEO, AGTC; Sujal Shah, President & CEO, CymaBay Therapeutics, Inc.; Ted Love, CEO, Global Blood Therapeutics; Terry Tormey, CEO, Kibow Biotech.

Thomas Wiggans, Founder, President & CEO, Dermira, Inc.; Tia Lyles-Williams, Founder & CEO, LucasPye BIO; Tim Bertram, CEO, inRegen & TC Bio; Timothy Walbert, President & CEO, Horizon Therapeutics; Todd Brady, CEO, Aldeyra Therapeutics; Vipin Garg, PhD, CEO, Altimmune; Wendye Robbins, MD, President & CEO, Blade Therapeutics; Will DeLoache, CEO, Novome Biotechnologies; Zandy Forbes, CEO, MeiraGTx.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I know the Democrats yesterday said: We

don't care. It is worth it. We don't need all those cures.

That is, in effect, what they said.

And then they said: Oh, those are just somebody's talking points.

No. This is the Congressional Budget Office's independent analysis that said we will lose 38 cures right out of the gate in the next two decades because of H.R. 3, and that for every year thereafter in the 2030s, we will lose 10 percent of what we otherwise would have.

Is that the cure for Alzheimer's? rheumatoid arthritis? ALS? Parkinson's?

That is what Democrats are saying they don't care about, that it is worth it to let those go in order to force the government price in this market.

We don't think that has to be the case. I don't think it is an either/or choice. They are making it that with H.R. 3.

I think we can have innovation without the heavy-handed club mugging innovation by taking the revenues of companies when they don't agree with what the government sets as the price.

And we know in foreign countries that they want to model America after, upwards of 40 percent of cancer drugs are not available in those countries, and they are available here in the United States.

You can go across every one of the six indicator countries, look at how they control drug costs, and, yes, they do have lower drug costs—and that is why we have a trade negotiator, so we can get lower drug costs in these trade agreements and stop getting ripped off—but what they do to really control is they control access.

There was a lot talked about in terms of death panels when ObamaCare was considered. This bill actually represents that.

We are told that by the people who innovate in this space that they will not be able to continue to innovate as they have in the past and that drugs that save lives will not be available because they won't be invented.

That is not just my words. That is the Congressional Budget Office; that is the Council of Economic Advisers.

There isn't a think tank out there yet that I have seen, no independent analysis that says H.R. 3 is going to do anything but that.

Innovation goes up on the rocks with H.R. 3. Lives will be lost; cures will never be found; and Americans won't be better off.

It doesn't have to be that way. We have bipartisan legislation in our substitute that will bring down prices, bring down drug costs, bring about transparency, put a cap on what seniors spend on Medicare, address the insulin cost issue, and it can become law.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I want to thank our majority leader for designating his time in managing the floor on the heels of the passage of today's historic vote.

Today is a beacon of hope for so many families who have been burdened by the outrageous costs of prescription drugs in this country.

Lower Drug Costs Now Act lowers drug costs now for the families who are counting on us, the families who are burdened with exorbitant costs of prescription drugs that they cannot afford. Lower prescription drugs for the parents of a child with a rare disability who are wondering how they can afford to pay that bill. Lower prescription drugs for the retired American who worked all of their life and now cannot afford to pay for that medication. Lower prescription drugs now for the senior who is afraid to go to the pharmacy to pick up that prescription drug because of what it might cost. Lower prescription drugs for a third of Americans who do not get their prescription drugs because they cannot afford them. That is what we are here today to do.

Some have chosen to listen to the drug companies. Some have chosen to take their cues. Take it from somebody who worked in an innovation research lab about the plight of research and development in this country and the investments that go into funding basic innovation research and how that gets done through public-private partnership. But do not put the American people at the expense of that plight because we know that our basic research dollars rest within the National Institutes of Health, that they rest within the work that we are doing in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

This legislation today, my friends, this legislation appropriately named after our beloved colleague, Elijah E. Cummings, someone who was never afraid to stand up for what was right and who led by true and pure example, we were so blessed to have stood in his light. And while serving as the Chair of the Oversight Committee, he showed us the way by uncovering many of these corrupt practices that have caused drug prices to be out of reach for so many.

I am also especially pleased to highlight provisions in this bill that were long championed by one of my great friends and mentors, former Congressman Sander Levin. These provisions for the first time will allow our Nation's older adults to receive coverage for dental, vision, and hearing under Medicare. I hope Mr. LEVIN is proudly watching as the House in which he served for 36 years, this very body, delivers on this effort.

I can speak for members of the freshman class, who have stood on the shoulders of the Members who have come before us to say that we were sent to Washington with a mandate to bring down the cost of prescription drugs and to deliver for the American people.

H.R. 3 is a long overdue change to the way we do business around here. This will untie the hands of the Federal Government to negotiate prices for the oldest and most expensive drugs in Medicare part D and apply those prices to all Americans.

In my district, in Michigan's 11th District, southeastern Michigan, H.R. 3, the Lower Prescription Drugs Now Act stands to benefit over 100,000 people enrolled in Medicare part D alone, as well as over 600,000 people who are enrolled in private health insurance.

We all know someone who has had their life impacted by cancer, whether it be a parent, a cousin, a relative, a dear friend. For the 9,000 women diagnosed with breast cancer in Michigan this year, H.R. 3 will lower their medication by 65 percent from \$69,000 to \$23,000 per year. For the 4,500 Michiganders diagnosed with prostate cancer this year, H.R. 3, the Lower Prescription Drugs Now Act will lower the cost of their medication from over \$100,000 to \$37,000 per year. And the list goes on.

Many of these patients live as close as a 10-minute drive from Canada in Michigan where Canadians are paying cents on the dollar for the exact same drugs. We ask why should that be in a country as wealthy, as prosperous, as innovative, as creative, and successful as ours? Drugs like insulin. H.R. 3 will finally level the global playing field for Americans.

The tremendous savings generated from H.R. 3, the Lower Prescription Drugs Now Act, will go right back into the research to develop new drugs with some of the savings also bringing us one step closer to stemming the devastating tide of the opioid epidemic.

I ask my friends to join me in commanding this opioid epidemic that is ravaging far too many communities across this beautiful country. Far too many communities. Where recent graduates from high school say we go to our high school reunions in graveyards, in cemeteries because of this opioid epidemic.

I am proud that this historic piece of legislation also includes a bill that I had the privilege of authoring to lower prescription drug costs for lower-income, older adults, who are enrolled in the lowest cost part D plan that covers their medication needs.

The time is now, and I urge my colleagues, I implore them, to follow the will of their constituents and pass H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is important to know that in our substitute we cut the costs of cancer treatment for seniors in half, as well. There is bipartisan agreement on this. In fact, everything in our substitute is bipartisan.

It is also important to note that in Canada it takes 14 months longer to

get access to miracle new medicines compared to what we have in America. They have 52 percent of the medicines there that we have here. They have 60 percent of the cancer medicines. That means 40 percent of the cancer medicines, the latest cutting-edge ones, the ones we read about and see on "60 Minutes" that are curing cancer here in America, you can't get in Canada. I don't want to import that here.

And when it comes to reducing access to drugs, basic research is essential. Nobody has done more to deal with that than the gentleman from Michigan, former chairman of the committee, FRED UPTON, who led the effort with Cures to get more research in the National Institutes of Health.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the Democratic leadership for, I think the first time this year, allowing our side to actually have a substitute to a major piece of legislation. And I thank our leadership, because that substitute is not a partisan substitute but, rather, a bipartisan substitute. In fact, every single provision in this bill has got strong bipartisan support, which was packaged together.

Tomorrow will mark the third anniversary of President Obama's signing of 21st Century Cures, a bill that DIANA DEGETTE and I helped shepherd through our committee on a unanimous vote, and we passed here in the House 392-26.

21st Century Cures increased NIH funding by some \$45 billion over a 10-year span. It sped up the approval of drugs and devices, and just after 3 years we have seen the number of cell, gene, and nucleoid therapies have more than doubled. In fact, research this last year will actually exceed \$13 billion. The FDA is predicted to approve as many as 20 gene therapy drugs by the year 2025. That is wonderful news.

We all want to do something about drug prices, and that is what a vote for our substitute, H.R. 19, will do. The President will sign that bill, but he is not going to sign this bill, H.R. 3, because it is going to slow down the ability to find the cures that we want to find for these awful diseases.

Now, those aren't my words. That is the CBO, a nonpartisan group, it is the CEA, the Council of Economic Advisers.

But in today's "Wall Street Journal," the former director of the FDA, Scott Gottlieb, writes, "This week the House will vote on legislation known as H.R. 3. The price-control approach would increase uncertainty and reduce returns from biotech investment, raising the cost of capital for these invaluable endeavors." He is right on. We want to find new cures. We want to find new technologies and to use those. We want precision medicine.

Madam Chair, I include the "Price Controls Would Stifle Biotech Innovation" in the RECORD.

PRICE CONTROLS WOULD STIFLE BIOTECH INNOVATION

A House price-control bill would do the most damage to transformative and life-saving medications.

(By Scott Gottlieb, Dec. 11, 2019)

Victoria Gray of Mississippi recently became the first U.S. patient with a genetic disorder to be treated using the Crispr gene-editing technique. Doctors used a novel drug to overwrite the function of a faulty gene that gave rise to her sickle-cell disease. Advances in life science can define this century, but policy makers must resist the urge to adopt policies that impose price controls and punish drugmakers for taking risks.

The convergence of information technology and biology allows scientists to translate the human genome into digital data that can accelerate diagnoses and cures. Over the next decade, it is a near certainty that we will have gene-therapy cures for deadly inherited disorders such as muscular dystrophy. Cell-based and regenerative medicine can restore human functions lost to disease, including returning some sight to the blind. Gene editing will be used to alter DNA to erase the origins of a range of debilitating inherited disorders.

These are only some of the opportunities at hand. Yet bad policies could sap the risk-taking that brings forth the most important innovations. For instance, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act would expose the 250 costliest drugs to government price controls. The high-cost drugs lawmakers target are often the most innovative and potentially transformative new medications. This week the House will vote on the legislation, known as H.R. 3.

The price-control approach would increase uncertainty and reduce returns from biotech investment, raising the cost of capital for these invaluable endeavors. It would alter incentives and shift money from the most speculative but highest-value science, including regenerative medicine and gene editing. Money would flow instead to known disease areas and well-characterized targets, using proven approaches such as pill-form drugs.

New and high-risk drug platforms like gene therapies are often targeted first to treat rare and serious conditions; after they are proven to work safely, they will be used to treat more common maladies, such as heart disease. This is how medicine advances. But if investors knew their returns would be capped, they would direct their investments toward safer projects with lesser payoffs. We would still get new drugs, but the treatments would be very different.

Fifteen years ago, the standard refrain from drug-industry critics was that all the big drugmakers did was develop "me too" medicines—the seventh version of a blood-pressure pill or a cholesterol-lowering statin. In response, the federal government took steps, some of which shaped Medicare Part D, to encourage investment in "specialty" drugs that were more novel.

Since then, investment capital has shifted sharply. Cancer and rare diseases receive substantially more attention and resources. The number of cell, gene and nucleotide therapies in development has more than doubled over the past three years, while total investment in cell and gene therapies eclipsed \$13 billion last year.

The Food and Drug Administration approved four gene therapies in only the past three years, with 800 similar kinds of products in various stages of development. An assessment of the current pipeline and historical rates of success in clinical trials suggests that by 2025 the FDA will be approving 10 to 20 gene-therapy drugs a year. Progress

is especially strong in oncology. The number of cancer drugs in development has quadrupled since 1996.

These specialty drugs often aren't cheap. They target narrow conditions for which the cost of risk-taking and drug development is amortized over a smaller number of eligible patients. Highly novel drug platforms can also cost more initially to perfect. Based on my informal survey of companies, enrolling a single patient in a clinical trial for a gene-altering drug often costs between \$500,000 and \$700,000 and can reach as high as \$1 million.

To support this innovation, total spending on research and development by the 15 biggest drugmakers topped \$100 billion in 2018, up 32 percent in the past five years. A cancer cure, or a gene-therapy remedy, can sharply reduce the lifetime cost of treating a debilitating disease. It can dramatically alter the length and productivity of people's lives. But high-cost treatments are pricing out a growing number of underinsured patients, keeping them from using medications that could alter their providence. This is unacceptable.

There are ways to make specialty drugs more affordable without eroding the incentives that drive capital into the riskiest but most promising endeavors. One is to help second-to-market drugs get through the regulatory process.

Once an effective drug is approved to treat a deadly condition, introducing a second drug to treat the same disease can be hard. It's tough to recruit patients with a debilitating disease for a clinical trial when a proven medicine is already available. Moreover, the smaller pool of patients who will be newly diagnosed each year with the same disease isn't always large enough to support the cost of developing a second drug, reducing competition that can lower prices.

We offer first-to-market breakthrough drugs an efficient route through FDA review. We could give second-to-market competing medicines the same regulatory benefits. Further, when the biology of a drug target is very well understood, and the basis for how it interacts with a disease firmly established, we can create a new regulatory designation to streamline development of a competing drug and shift data collection to real-world, post-approval settings.

Many drugs targeted by H.R. 3 for government price controls are examples of the innovation we should try to encourage. In fact, they are the investments that critics who griped about me-too medicines said they wanted. Now the same crowd is crafting policies that would shift investment back into the more mundane endeavors they once lamented.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, I have served on the Health Subcommittee for all my days on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we have seen firsthand the different families impacted by these awful diseases, whether it be Alzheimer's or sickle cell, cystic fibrosis.

Just this last week, we witnessed real advancements, we think, in pancreatic cancer stage III, stage IV. SMA, spinal muscular atrophy, a disease that is often fatal by the year 9 or 10; we saw a woman who had been on a new drug for 15 days, and for the first time she could actually move her neck after more than 10 years literally trapped in a wheelchair.

If we want to find the advancements and cures for these diseases, we need to pass H.R. 19.

I urge my colleagues to vote for that substitute and get a bill to the Presi-

dent that he will actually sign, and we can get something done.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

The rising costs of prescription drugs is one of the top issues I hear about from my constituents, and it has been getting worse.

This year alone, I have received nearly four times as many calls and letters about prescription drug prices than all of last year. And there are many, many stories, but I would like to share one today to remind us why this legislation is so necessary.

A constituent of mine, Dana from Kenmore, Washington, has lived with type 1 diabetes for nearly 14 years. When Dana was first diagnosed, insulin cost her \$50 each month. Today that same insulin costs over \$600 per month. That is an 1,100 percent increase for the exact same product.

We talked about innovation, but there have been virtually no changes to insulin since Dana's diagnosis, so the price spike is inexplicable.

Dana is not only a diabetes patient, but she is also a nurse practitioner and a diabetes educator. And she has told me about her patients that go to Canada where they can get insulin for just \$40 a month. She has also shared stories of her own patients who can't afford their medications, who ration their insulin, which we know can lead to poorer health, vision loss, kidney failure, and even death.

H.R. 3 will finally give the Health and Human Services secretary the power to negotiate a fair price for insulin, which will dramatically help patients like Dana and all the patients that she serves.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), Congress' only pharmacist.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have a situation here where we all want the same thing. We all want to bring down prescription drug prices. We want the same thing. We need the same thing. We can achieve the same thing. We can achieve the same thing without taking the risk of drugs not coming to the market.

Physicians take an oath when they graduate from medical school, it is called the Hippocratic Oath. It says, "first, do no harm." Now, whether you believe the Congressional Budget Office that it will be eight to 15 drugs, or whether you believe the Council of Economic Advisers that it will be over 100 drugs, even if it is one drug, that is one drug too many.

□ 0945

It is simply a chance we cannot afford to take. Every one of us in this body knows a story, knows someone who has suffered from that awful disease Alzheimer's. It is an awful disease.

Barbara Lutz tells the story about her husband, Richard, who suffered from that disease. She tells the story about how she and her family suffered through that with him. Oftentimes, it is the caregivers who suffer so much.

Finally, Richard has succumbed to that disease after a 7-year fight. Now, people who are diagnosed or who have family and loved ones who are diagnosed with Alzheimer's come up to Barbara and ask her: "What do I do? What do I do?" Barbara simply told me: "All I can tell them is to pray for a cure."

This is not a Republican-Democratic issue. This is our issue. This is America's issue. We have to solve it together, and we can do that.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I think we are all here to make sure that every Alzheimer's patient and every family affected by Alzheimer's has access to the lowest, most affordable prescription drugs possible, which is why we are so pleased to be ushering in today's piece of legislation.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Michigan for her leadership and for guiding this debate on the floor today.

Madam Chair, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, named after a man who I have great respect for, who was a mentor of mine, and who fought so hard to hold Big Pharma accountable.

Today is a big day for the American people because we are finally putting their health over the interests of Big Pharma's profits. I am speaking in support of this legislation for the hundreds, if not thousands, of constituents who have shared their stories with me throughout this year. This issue is the single most important issue in my district. I am speaking in support of people like my constituent Mario.

About a year ago, Mario was diagnosed with diabetes and recently sought care for a lesion on his foot that wouldn't heal. Because he couldn't afford the proper medications, Mario ended up losing his toe and had to leave his job. His daughter had to drop out of college to work full time to help pay for Mario's medications.

This is an issue that not only impacts the lives of the patients who are in desperate need of lifesaving medications to stay healthy, but it is also impacting those who love and care for them. It is altering the future of their families.

As Chairman Cummings would say: "We are better than this." We are better than this as a nation, to put the interests of Big Pharma and their profits

over the interests of the American people and their health.

For far too long, American families have been forced to pay 4, 5, or even 10 times more for their prescriptions than patients in other countries.

Do my colleagues on the other side think that that is right, that your constituents are subsidizing the healthcare for people across the world when you have people in your own neighborhood who are rationing their medications, making false choices to pay their rent, buy food, or take the necessary medication as prescribed by their doctors? Well, I don't. I don't think that that is a choice the American people should have to make.

Today, we are taking the necessary action to move this legislation forward, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side will work with us and that the President will work with us.

What my constituents tell me is not that they are Democrats, not that they are Republicans, not that they are Democrats, not that they are independents. They tell me that they have diabetes, that they have cancer, that they have heart disease, that they have asthma, that they have HIV and AIDS, that they are dying, and that they need the healthcare that they demand.

Madam Chair, I ask us to pass H.R. 3.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 18 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Chair, H.R. 3 is a shortsighted proposal and a bad deal for our constituents.

It will compromise the strong legacy of innovation that our Nation is proud of. It will be a grave mistake to fundamentally change the market structure that makes America a viable market for cutting-edge innovation in biopharmaceuticals.

Government price setting will kill innovation in clinical areas where it is most needed. The pricing scheme outlined in H.R. 3 would disincentivize research and development for drugs that are first in their class, such as the future cure for Alzheimer's or ASL.

Government price controls will not only kill innovation but will also fundamentally change the doctor-patient relationship in this country. This bill would allow bureaucrats to make the most personal of choices about the course of treatment for our constituents. Treatment decisions in this country should be made between a patient and their physician and should not be based on the rationing of treatments by bureaucrats in foreign nations.

In North Carolina, H.R. 3's pricing scheme would shatter the biopharmaceutical ecosystem that supports 40,000 jobs directly, 200,000 jobs indirectly, and generates \$13 billion in economic

output annually. That is just in North Carolina.

H.R. 3 would put small and mid-sized biotech firms out of business and threaten hundreds of thousands of our constituents' jobs. We should reject H.R. 3 and, instead, advance meaningful legislation that lowers patients' out-of-pocket costs, that protects innovation, and that would actually be signed into law.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, and I am eager to vote for this landmark piece of legislation today.

I am proud that we are here boldly taking a stand against the influence of special interests in Congress and a stand for the American people, to help them afford critical lifesaving medications.

Back home in Colorado's Sixth Congressional District, when I am hosting townhalls or roundtables with families, college students, or seniors, I hear the same thing: Prescription drugs are too expensive, and Congress needs to act now.

Currently, as we stand here, one in three Coloradans can't afford to pay for their basic medications and are having to either ration their medication or stop taking it altogether. This needs to stop now.

Thousands of Coloradans are diagnosed with cancer every year, and the treatments for these patients cost \$100,000 or more. Instead of working to increase access and lower costs, the pharmaceutical companies are price gouging these patients, our constituents, across the country. This needs to stop now.

I am proud to have worked with my freshman colleague, Representative PORTER, to introduce H.R. 4663, the Freedom from Price Gouging Act, which has been included as a provision in H.R. 3. Our provision would hold these bad actors accountable and prevent them from raising the cost of prescription drugs past the rate of inflation. The CBO recently found that this measure would save American taxpayers \$38 billion over the next decade.

Importantly, H.R. 3 gives the Federal Government authority to negotiate prices for insulin and other lifesaving drugs. As I stand here today, 300,000 Coloradans with diabetes will save up to 75 percent on their insulin under H.R. 3. It also caps the exorbitant amount that seniors have to pay for drugs that simply improve the quality of their life.

As I stand here today, hundreds of thousands of Coloradans with heart disease, asthma, arthritis, and cancer will directly benefit from H.R. 3.

On top of the drug pricing provisions, this bill invests billions in savings back into our healthcare system. \$10 billion would go to our Nation's com-

munity health centers, which serve over 29 million Americans from underserved communities.

It also invests \$10 billion into the NIH and \$2 billion into the FDA to promote research and drug safety. It invests another \$10 billion to respond to our Nation's opioid epidemic, which has destroyed far too many American families.

We cannot wait any longer while our neighbors' and family members' lives are at risk and while pharmaceutical companies continue to fill their pockets, making tens of billions of dollars, historic profits.

Americans rightly expect us to deliver on our promise to fight and reduce the cost of prescription drugs. That is why I will cast my vote as a "yes" today to deliver relief for my constituents and the American people.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As a subtle point of clarification, today, as we embark on a historic moment, we are looking to pass the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now legislation, not the invest in R&D act. Embracing the status quo for the millions of Americans who are counting on us is certainly fully and wholly unacceptable.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Chair, I want to make clear that I am always willing to come to the other side of the aisle to work these things out.

All of us came here with similar cause and calling, to lower the price of prescription drugs, to stop the abuse and bad behavior of pharmaceutical companies when they keep generics from coming to market. But I don't think anybody came here to take away cures for patients who come to our offices every year begging for a cure for Alzheimer's, pancreatic cancer, or ASL, you name the disease.

My mother died of ovarian cancer. My father had bladder cancer. My sister-in-law died of brain cancer. We lost a son to a heart defect. We all want cures.

We know by independent analysis that H.R. 3 denies access to cures. That is a fact. It is a fact that the Council of Economic Advisers says up to 100 cures will be lost. The Congressional Budget Office says in the next two decades, 38 cures would be lost. It doesn't have to be that way.

We can lower drug costs. We can incent innovation. My friend from Michigan talked about being involved in the innovation world. This is a letter from 138 leaders of these incredible American innovators who beg us not to shatter the dreams of Americans, which they say H.R. 3 will do by completely upending the process.

That is why President Trump said he cannot sign this. No President has ever leaned further than President Trump.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 15 additional seconds.

We have an alternative. Everything in our substitute bill is bipartisan. Even if you feel like you have to vote for H.R. 3, there is no reason you should have to vote against the proposals in here. There is not a poison pill. They are all bipartisan. They will all bring meaningful relief to our folks at home, and nothing in here will reduce innovation.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I thank the Congresswoman for yielding.

I want to echo what I hear from my constituents: Do I put gas in my car, or do I buy my medication? Do I put food on the table for my family, or do I pay for my prescription drugs? Do I buy a generic drug here in the United States that costs \$900, or do I drive to Mexico where I can buy it for \$9?

These are real, lifesaving, life-or-death issues that we are dealing with.

I want you to know this is personal to me because, when I was a 19-year-old waitress, I came home one night to my family, and my parents weren't home. They said, "Your mom took your dad to the hospital," and I drove to the hospital.

I said: "Okay, I will go check on him."

As I was walking in the door, the doctor walked out, and he said: "Your dad is dead."

That was due to a lack of healthcare, including prescription drugs.

□ 1000

He had an undiagnosed heart disease that could have been treated, and in this day and age it would not have been an issue. So I fully support H.R. 3. This is something that is critical to American families and they are dealing with every day.

A mother shouldn't have to decide if she is going to drive to Mexico, where she is not exactly sure if the drug she is purchasing for her child has the same standards and quality that she would get here in the United States.

So, Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3. This is life or death.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who is a key leader on healthcare on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chair, 26 years ago, my sister had two forms of leukemia that most people die from immediately; but because of earlier clinical trials and innovative treatments, there was a way to get some leukemia patients into remission.

Then we developed bone marrow transplants, and I matched her for that.

Five years later, they called her a cure.

Today, my sister is alive, working, raising a family, and we have treat-

ments for leukemia that lead to a cure without even needing bone marrow transplants.

These treatments are just steps in finding cures; and, as we work to lower prescription drug prices, I want to make sure that we are looking at it from all angles. We need to be aware of the impacts on the quality of and access to care when considering effective solutions to lower drug prices.

H.R. 3 threatens and, actually, puts a knife in the heart of the pillars of research and development that have helped make America the leader in health innovation.

Relying on foreign countries to set our prices is misguided. I don't want to see the U.S. be controlled or manipulated by an arrangement some other cabal of countries makes to affect our markets and our patients. Other countries do not always share the same priorities we do on access to quality care and saving lives.

What do we sacrifice with this bill? The best care? Cutting-edge research? A lifesaving drug?

Unfortunately, the approach before us today is a dangerous one. Government price controls and a looming threat of a 95 percent tax will dramatically hurt our country's ability to research and innovate new cures. Estimates show that the bill would lead to the loss of dozens of new drugs. That means fewer lifesaving drugs and fewer American lives saved.

As a physician, I can attest that every doctor's goal is to get the best treatment for their patients. We can do more without going and having this stop development and innovation.

The Republican alternative to this bill, H.R. 19, is bipartisan, and it is an effort to lower prescription drug prices while also protecting patients' access to new medicines and cures.

Americans deserve to have a healthcare system that delivers treatments when they need it most and makes care more affordable.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding 1 minute.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Earlier this year, Chairman Cummings convened our first Oversight and Reform Committee hearing to examine the impact of soaring prescription drug costs on our constituents. It is fitting we named this legislation to honor our friend who used his gavel to highlight the stories of Americans who are suffering and dying because they couldn't afford astronomical drug prices while living in the greatest and richest country in the world.

This bill would institute negotiation for fair drug prices, lower out-of-pocket costs for seniors, improve coverage for Medicare beneficiaries, and invest in innovative new treatment in our fight against the addiction crisis.

Madam Chair, I support this legislation because it would improve access to affordable prescription drugs for more than 600,000 of my constituents, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and ensure our constituents have access to lifesaving medication.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

So we have heard today that we should pass H.R. 3 because you can go to Canada and get medicines for pennies on the dollar. Here is what they don't tell you:

There are lots of medicines you can get for zero in Canada because they are not available. Canadians have access to about half of the lifesaving cures available here in America.

Guess where they come when they need that cure and that recent medical breakthrough? They come to America.

What happens when we start acting and behaving like Canada? Who is going to be our safety net?

Why should patients in America have to choose between affordable medicines and a lifesaving cure for Alzheimer's, ALS, Parkinson's, or cancer?

Why should parents with sick children in America be forced to wait longer for the newest drug breakthrough that could save their life?

Why should Americans face a shorter life?

Because the costliest and most painful drug to me is the one that was never created.

At the depths of NANCY PELOSI's drug bill is a dangerous trade-off: lower drug prices in the short term, but fewer lifesaving cures in the future.

This is a cruel and false choice, which is why this bill will quickly die with no bipartisan support in the Senate.

As Republicans, we believe we need to do both: lower drug prices and accelerate new lifesaving cures.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that pharmaceutical drug companies spend more on marketing than they do on R&D.

It is a fact that life expectancy in this country is going down, and it has gone down for the third year in a row.

It is a fact that we are in a moment of crisis, and now is the time for us to pass the Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE), who is my good friend.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to speak in support of the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, and, in particular, I want to speak in support of my bill which is included in the act, the Enhancing Retirement Security for Medicare Beneficiaries Act, which would guarantee that the disbursements of retirement savings are not counted when determining if someone qualifies for Medicare part D's low-income subsidy program.

As a young girl, I learned the importance of saving money. My first job was running a paper route in my neighborhood in Canton, Ohio, at the age of 8. At the end of every week, I would put aside a quarter or two just to save up for a candy bar. It wasn't much, but it taught me the importance that saving money is worth it.

Americans and our seniors should not be punished for saving for their retirement, but when retirement savings are counted towards eligibility for prescription drug assistance, we are punishing the very seniors who have been working hard and saving money.

The fact is that no group of Nevadans relies more on prescription drugs than our seniors, and the rising cost of living is hard enough on older Americans. We should be making it easier for them to retire in dignity, and that means not forcing them to choose between buying groceries or lifesaving medication.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my bill was included in the underlying text of H.R. 3, and it is time that we lower prescription drug costs not just for seniors on Medicare, but for all Americans.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It is a fact that drug companies in America spend three times as much on R&D than on marketing and advertising.

It is a fact that the dangerous Pelosi drug bill robs up to \$1 trillion of research and development costs that will not be used for lifesaving cures in America.

It is a fact, from the Congressional Budget Office, that we will lose at least 38 new cures as a result of this bill; the Council of Economic Advisers, 100 new cures; and the California Life Sciences Association says 9 out of 10 cures that they would be working on will never happen in America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), who is a key leader on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and ranking Republican on Ways and Means for the opportunity, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that the prices of drugs are too high. We agree that something needs to be done to fix this for all Americans, not just our seniors.

The problem I have—and it is a big problem—is the way we go about doing this. It is like a rerun of ObamaCare. It is this government knows best, this top-down, government-controlled, let's tax, regulate, and mandate our way to a better system. It doesn't work.

So we are doubling down on a failed philosophy on how to deliver affordable quality products to the American people.

The approach should be more choices, more competition, a healthier market, and greater transparency.

By the way, we have worked on those issues in a bipartisan fashion. I have introduced two pieces of legislation with my Democrat friends that would do just that.

The problem here is not just this top-down, heavy-handed government knows best, let's fix the crisis and assume nothing bad will happen. It is that nothing is going to come of this H.R. 3. It is a messaging bill. It is purely political, and it won't help the people whom we all intend to help.

I do not judge the motives of my colleagues. I think they want to help our seniors just as I do. But we can't do it with partisan messaging bills. We have to do it by working together.

In a former life, I was vice chancellor at Texas Tech, and I was responsible for bringing new drug technologies, therapies, and biologics to market.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN), who is my dear friend.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, for the last 2 years, the single most common issue that Michiganders raise with me is the price of prescription drugs. Michiganders, regardless of party, are demanding that Congress do something about it. People literally clutch my arm at the grocery store to tell me how their son is rationing his insulin or their daughter couldn't go to summer camp because she couldn't afford the inhalers.

That is why shortly after being sworn in in January, I started working in earnest on the issue. I am very proud to stand behind my colleagues and support H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act. This important legislation will drive down the cost of the country's most expensive drugs by allowing our government to negotiate for the very best prices.

To be clear, the VA does the exact same thing. I am on military insurance, and the VA can negotiate for drug prices. Why not allow Medicare to do the very same thing?

To put this in perspective, there are over 800,000 Michiganders living with diabetes, and common insulin medications can cost somewhere between \$1,200 and \$20,000 a year. This includes Sarah, a woman who lives in Holly, Michigan, where I live, who literally says she is being priced out of her life. Her insulin costs are higher than her rent per month.

This bill, if passed, would allow the government to negotiate, bringing the price down to as little as \$400 a year. Once the price is negotiated, all Americans, including Medicare recipients, benefit from that price. The bill would also improve Medicare coverage for seniors and lower their out-of-pocket costs.

Two months ago, I cointroduced a bill that included vision coverage in Medicare. That means Medicare recipients, once every 2 years, will get an eye exam and one set of either glasses or contacts.

I am very pleased that this was incorporated into this bigger bill along with other measures that would include hearing coverage and dental coverage for the first time. So, finally, preventive care will be part of the routine coverage for Medicare.

To be clear, the bill pays for itself. Negotiation saves us, according to the CBO, \$450 billion, which covers the additions to Medicare and still gives \$10 billion for research and development to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman, you will hear my colleagues and Big Pharma say that you have to make a choice between research and lifesaving cures and the price of prescription drugs. That is a false choice, and anyone who watches TV and sees those annoying ads knows that the drug companies have plenty of places to cut their funding.

□ 1015

Members from both parties in the House and Senate, and indeed the President, have said the right things when it comes to lowering drug prices. Now it is time to walk the walk.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but more importantly, I thank him for his work on this bill, and all the others, as well, in their committees.

There is an urgent need to address the soaring cost of prescription drugs that burden too many American families. It is well past time that we offer a practical solution that actually lowers costs while ensuring new cures can reach Americans fighting disease and illness.

This Congress in the past has spent a great deal of time making sure that we have cures for the future. That is why Republicans introduced this bill, Lower Costs, More Cures Act, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

The bill was written with a rule: each policy must be bipartisan. I know in this town and in this climate, that is not achieved very often, but for an issue as crucial as lowering the cost of prescription drugs for Americans, partisanship should be set aside.

Later today, we will see which side and which bill is bipartisan. By drawing on the very best ideas, H.R. 19 makes crucial reforms that will lower out-of-pocket costs for Americans at drugstore counters. For seniors, it makes medication more affordable by capping their out-of-pocket costs. It increases the availability of generics and biosimilar drugs by prohibiting drug companies from delaying the start of their exclusivity period. It speeds up the FDA approval process. It provides greater price transparency by requiring insurance companies to make information about drug costs available in the doctor's office before a prescription is written. And for diabetics who have

high deductibles in their plans, it allows insurance companies to cover the cost of insulin before meeting the plan's deductibility.

While Republicans offer practical solutions, Democrats are catering to their progressive base by opening a door to a government takeover of our prescription drug market.

Mr. Chairman, Speaker PELOSI's partisan plan, H.R. 3, will make our broken system worse by placing more barriers between Americans and their medication, including by reducing the number of new drugs on the market instead of helping them reach the patients. According to estimates from the Council of Economic Advisers, the Speaker's radical proposal could kill upwards of 100 new drugs over the next decade.

Pause for one moment and think about that: 100 new drugs over the next decade will be killed by passing H.R. 3. That is one-third of the total number of new drugs expected to enter the market during that time.

Moreover, the Council estimates that H.R. 3 would reduce America's average life expectancy by 4 months. Nearly a quarter of the projected gains in life expectancies over the next decade, simply because you want to appease the progressive base and have a partisan bill that denies us more cures and shortens our lifespan.

But you will achieve one goal today: You will have one party vote for a bill that will not become law, but you will appease a base with this and impeachment.

And it is not just the Council. The CBO reports that fewer drugs will be available because of the provisions in H.R. 3. The Democrat's plan is yet another example of how unnecessary government control harms the very people it claims to help.

All of us have or know someone with a loved one who has fought a disease or an illness for which no cure has been found. Imagine how demoralizing it will be to cut off hope for a future cure. All of us have gone through this. My father never got to see the day I was elected because he lost his life to cancer. He battled it for 3 years. I would give anything to have found a cure for my father's cancer. But it is not just his.

If we delay one cure, that is one cure too many. The best way to lower costs is not to lose the cures, even the loss of one.

Mr. Chairman, Americans want their government to put the best available ideas into action. They deserve solutions, not political posturing filled with empty promises. The saddest part of today, we could have had prescription drug prices lowered on this floor even earlier in this year. There was a window of opportunity, a moment in time where you did not see the partisanship that we see today, a moment in the Committee on Energy and Commerce where every single Democrat and every single Republican voted on

three bills to lower the price of prescription drugs.

But as I learned as a child on "Schoolhouse Rock," "I am just a bill on Capitol Hill," at the time it goes from a committee and before it gets to the floor, it goes through leadership. And unfortunately for the Americans across this country, leadership changed that bill, not the Members in the House. They changed that bill so when it came to the floor it became partisan.

And you know what? Our drugs were not lowered, the bill did not become law, and we are impeding the exact same thing today.

You will have two choices: You will have a choice of H.R. 3, that, yes, had to be negotiated even this week with progressives on the other side to appease them to make sure this was as partisan as can be. It won't become law. It will be another talking point, a moment of time to try to explain why you wasted a majority on just investigations.

But you will have another opportunity, a substitute. If you want to lower drug prices in 2019, vote for H.R. 19. You know why? Because every single provision in that bill is bipartisan.

Can we not, with one issue, at one moment in one time put partisanship aside? Can we put people before politics? Can we expand our life expectancy? Can we find 100 more cures? Can we do that?

I know you might upset a few in your party, but think about how many more lives we will save. There is always a moment in time that I have hope that this Congress will rise and keep the promises that I heard before an election took place, that we would be different, that we would govern together, that we would find bipartisanship.

Today, on the floor, you will have that window. You will have a bill that has every single provision. You will have a report that says, No, we won't stop 100 new cures in the next decade. No, they will give hope to the American public that there will be opportunity to cure disease that you have today and live a long and full life.

And you know what? It is the only bill on the floor today that could become law. So if you want to make a real change, you have a voting card to do it.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), my friend.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chair, before I came to Congress, my job was to make sure that those without healthcare and those who could barely afford it, could have access.

Every day, we would see doctors and nurses do the impossible in the worst system. And without fail, we all would wonder why no one would do anything to change it. Well, today we are. This bill does not cater to a base. This bill does not cater to Big Pharma, but this bill does cater to that family tonight who is going to have to choose between paying for prescription drugs or put-

ting food on the table. This bill caters to the American people.

Today, Big Pharma loses, and the American people win. Because what we are doing today is giving Medicare the power to negotiate skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. This historic legislation also creates new out-of-pocket limits on prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries. It reinvests savings so that we can create new breakthrough treatments and cures at NIH, and it provides \$10 billion in funding to combat the opioid epidemic.

For decades, Big Pharma and corporate PACs could count on their lobbyists and politicians to keep them safe at the expense of the American people. Not anymore. Today, the American people win. I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), one of the leaders in healthcare.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank both leaders, first of all, for this debate. This is absolutely critical, and here is why:

The other day, I went to the doctor—a kind of a common ailment. The doctor prescribed an antibiotic.

I said, "Doc, let's check the price before we use the credit card."

He said, "Don't worry about it. It is going to be about \$6. It is commonly used."

But guess what? The list price was about \$430. It used to be \$6 in 2011; now, it is \$430.

We have a problem. We have a big problem in America. A very big Democrat, a very big Republican problem. I want to commend my Democratic colleagues for raising the issue, for putting this on the agenda, for making an attempt to propose something. There is strong disagreement with the nature of the policy proposal, but there ought to be unification around the idea that we have to do something.

I commend my Republican colleagues for putting together a bill of all the bipartisan initiatives that are around here that we can agree on.

So what is going to happen is we are going to get stuck again, really, really quickly. This bill now has a chance of going into law, the bipartisan bill. There is some opposition to it, and it could be fleshed out further.

The President has called for negotiations. This is an important part of all of us. So let's get back to work after we get past this moment.

Mr. Chair, I thank everyone for a spirited and good debate.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan, a leader in the freshman class, for yielding time and for her extraordinary leadership in so many ways.

It is just so invigorating to see the freshmen Members of this class taking

the lead on this important legislation. Many of us just came in from the steps of the Capitol where, again, the freshmen Members took the lead.

Following up on a promise made last year during the election, For the People, we will lower the cost of healthcare in America by lowering the cost of prescription drugs. H.R. 3 does just that, named for our great and departed—may he rest in peace—Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Drug Act.

This is very, very important. And it may come as news to some of our Republican friends who were saying things to the contrary, but this is a product of the work of three committees in Congress.

I thank Chairman PALLONE of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Chairman RICHIE NEAL of the Committee on Ways and Means, and BOBBY SCOTT, chair of the Committee on Education and Labor, for their relentless and persistent work on this lifesaving legislation where many freshmen are speaking now, controlling the time.

But in the course of the debate of yesterday, under the aegis of the committees of jurisdiction, many of them spoke at that time as well, demonstrating their leadership on this issue, making it a reality on the floor of the House. Again, I thank them for their bold urgency to lower the cost of drugs.

The crushing burden of prescription drugs is an issue that impacts every family in America. Much talk is given around here about having a seat at the table. The most important seat at the most important table is the kitchen table of America's working families where they enjoy family, but also address challenges that face them, whether it is in their health or in their financial health and how that is related.

□ 1030

This legislation today speaks to that important table of concerns.

In my travels across the country, I have seen grown men cry about how they cannot meet the needs of their families when it comes to prescription drug costs, a spouse with a long-term illness, children with chronic diseases, and the rest.

Prescription drug prices are out of control. The price of insulin invented nearly a century ago—when people say we have to cover our research costs—doubled from 2012 to 2016 because of Big Pharma.

Many people use it. A lot of people buy it. Let's increase our profits, they say.

Americans are paying four times or more for what Big Pharma charges for the exact drugs in other countries.

While Big Pharma companies reap record-breaking profits and multibillion-dollar windfalls from the GOP tax scam, 58 million Americans couldn't afford to fill a prescription they needed to stay healthy in the past year—58 million Americans.

Thirty-four million Americans know a loved one who died from not being able to afford a treatment that they needed.

We face medical, economic, and moral crises that demand that we act and that we act boldly.

Yes, they have a motion to recommit. I think it was appropriate that the Republicans have the opportunity to put an alternative on the floor, incremental pieces, not going to the heart of the matter. How dare they ever think of enabling the Secretary to negotiate for lower prices, which is the heart of the matter.

We have been trying to do this for a number of years. Today, we will.

Last year, again, we made the promise For the People, that we would lower the cost of prescription drugs. We are finally giving Medicare the power to negotiate lower drug prices.

Some Republicans say it is un-American for the Secretary to be able to negotiate for lower prices—un-American—then making those lower prices available to the hundreds of millions of Americans with private insurance, too.

We are insisting that American seniors and families shouldn't have to pay more for our medicines than what Big Pharma charges for the same drug overseas. I say that again. H.R. 3 means lowering the cost of medication for Americans with leukemia by more than 70 percent. It means lowering the cost of medication for arthritis, which more than 50 million Americans have, by almost 75 percent. It means lowering the cost of asthma medication for 25 million Americans with this condition from \$1,500 to \$270.

Yesterday, we had Mr. Riordan testify at our press conference. The cost of his medication for asthma, in his case, was over \$60,000 a month. Eighty percent of it was covered by Medicare, but he had to pay over \$4,000 a month.

Can you absorb that? \$4,000 a month for a drug that you are supposed to take four times a month? He was taking it twice a month, once a month, or not at all, not a healthy thing to do, but reaping big profits for Big Pharma.

Under H.R. 3, some commonly used insulins could cost as little as \$400 a year.

With the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019, we put more money back into the pockets of seniors and hardworking families. We drive down insurance premiums, making it easier to afford coverage.

When we lift the immense burden of drug costs on employers, the CBO says American businesses can expect bigger paychecks and salaries for their workers.

H.R. 3 also represents the most transformative expansion of Medicare since its inception.

Now, many people on the other side of the aisle did not support Medicare at its inception, but this is a vast improvement because we are investing more than a half-trillion dollars—that is with a T-R—a half-trillion dollars

that we are saving by lowering out-of-control prices and investing in historic new benefits for vision, dental, and hearing for Medicare beneficiaries for the first time.

With these huge savings, we are also investing in new research for new treatments and cures and fighting the opioid epidemic, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE) pointed out, and in the community health centers that deliver quality healthcare to so many Americans.

Advocacy groups representing tens of millions of Americans, seniors, retirees, patients, providers, faith leaders, businesses, and the men and women of labor, and more, support H.R. 3.

AARP wrote to Members of Congress this week and said: "This important legislation is a bold step toward lowering prescription drug prices and improving Medicare for seniors and families across the country. . . . H.R. 3 will help more Americans afford their prescription drugs and get the care they need to stay healthy." They said that in their support of the legislation.

There is every reason in the world for Republicans to join us in passing this bill. The bill delivers on President Trump's promise to the American people. In his words, he said: "When it comes time to negotiate the cost of drugs, we are going to negotiate like crazy."

Negotiation is what this bill is about. The Republican substitute is what this bill is not about, and that negotiation is the heart of the matter.

The President also said: "It's unacceptable that Americans pay vastly more than people in other countries for the exact same drugs, often made in the exact same place. This is wrong; this is unfair; and together, we will stop it."

Actually, in creating this bill, and working with the committees to do so, we were working with the interests of the White House, the administration, on all of this.

I don't know where it happened, but somewhere along the way, negotiation and the rest fell by the by, and that, again, could be attributed to I don't know what.

Democrats named H.R. 3, as I mentioned, in honor of Chairman Elijah Cummings, our North Star who worked across the aisle and down Pennsylvania Avenue—he met with the President—to lower prescription drug prices.

In honor of Chairman Cummings, and for the sake of the millions of Americans struggling with high prescription drug costs, I urge a strong vote on H.R. 3 to lower drug costs now for all Americans, for the people. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

When the Republican Congress, in 2003, joined with President Bush to create the affordable drug plan for seniors, then-Leader NANCY PELOSI and Democrats tried to kill it. She famously predicted that creating the part D program for seniors would end "Medicare as we know it."

Can you imagine how many seniors' lives would have been lost if Democrats had succeeded in stopping the affordable Medicare drug program that 43 million seniors have come to depend upon? They were dangerously wrong then, and they are dangerously wrong again.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the leader of the Health Subcommittee for the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me. I want to speak in opposition to H.R. 3.

Saying that drug costs are too high for many Americans, Republicans and Democrats can agree on that. That is why we spent the better part of a year working toward a bipartisan solution to lower out-of-pocket prescription drug costs and crack down on overpriced drugs.

Sadly, Democrats abandoned that effort in favor of the socialist policies in H.R. 3. For Democrats, the answer is always more government, and H.R. 3 is no exception.

The bill gives the government sweeping new powers to allow government bureaucrats to arbitrarily set drug prices. Democrats keep calling it negotiation.

Here is how negotiation works under H.R. 3. The Federal Government will tell a drug company what the drug price is going to be. If the drug company doesn't like it, they have two options: pay a 95 percent tax on their revenue or leave the U.S. market. That doesn't sound like negotiation to me.

The Congressional Budget Office claims this will result in such low drug prices that some of the lifesaving cures won't even come to market. Under this arrangement, there is very little incentive for drug companies to invest the time and money it takes to create new cures and treatments. We know it takes \$2.6 billion and 10 to 15 years, on average, to bring one drug to market.

This bill's arbitrary action against drug companies carries a steep cost to the American people in the form of fewer future cures. What cures will those be? Alzheimer's? Cancer? Schizophrenia?

Killing drug innovation and ending the development of lifesaving cures is unacceptable. We can't take that risk. We have to do better for sick Americans hoping and praying for a cure for themselves or their loved ones.

We can solve this problem, but not with the Democrats' fewer cures act. We have to do this in a bipartisan way.

Fortunately, there is an alternative to the Democrats' proposal. This week, Republicans have introduced H.R. 19.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROUDA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NUNES. I have introduced H.R. 19, the Lower Cost, More Cures Act.

This bill contains effective bipartisan policies that could become law right now.

It cracks down on overpriced drugs and lowers costs for patients without crushing the hope of future lifesaving medicines.

It is time to stop playing political games and start working toward solutions for the American people.

H.R. 3 is a terrible idea that will drive drugs out of the U.S. market.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas is prepared to close, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Imagine life under H.R. 3, the Democrats' fewer cures bill. There will be lower costs for some medicines, no doubt. Both bills do that. But if you have a rare disease, or your loved one does, whether it is ALS you are struggling with or dementia or Alzheimer's, if you were a dynamic person who now is struggling with Parkinson's, cancer, diabetes, pulmonary hypertension, the hope for your cure may never come. The waiting for your cure may be years, decades, or never.

The truth of the matter is—and it is undeniable—H.R. 3, the Democrats' bill, will cause fewer cures here in America.

Don't take my word for it. The Congressional Budget Office estimates 38 cures lost over the next two decades, the Council of Economic Advisers, 100 cures lost over the next several decades.

California Life Sciences Association said, if we do what NANCY PELOSI's bill does, nearly 9 out of 10 drugs we would have created will never exist. There will be fewer cures for Americans when we need it most.

I will tell you, drug prices are too high in many cases. There is no excuse for these price spikes, none at all.

But I will tell you what, the costliest drug ever is the one that is never created, that leaves the ravages of these diseases to these loved ones who are struggling with them.

We already know this is the case because in Canada, France, these other countries that H.R. 3 wants to make us look like, they have about half the medicines we do. When they do get a medicine, they will wait a year or 2 longer to even get it.

Well, if you have got ALS, if you have got a glioblastoma, you are done at that point. That is what that bill brings about.

We know, fewer drugs in America, because today, we have created, over the last several years, 111 new drugs in America. France, this is the France drug pricing scheme, 11. 111 in America. Eleven in France.

That is their vision of a day in the life of someone with a rare, deadly disease in America.

Our bill, the Lower Cost, More Cures Act, lowers out-of-pocket costs for Americans because we crack down on

overpriced drugs. We give seniors, for example, the power and the information to choose the right place for their medicines, which can lower their chemotherapy by half.

We pull back the curtain on everyone involved in this drug pricing process. We force drug companies to pay more and shoulder more burden in the part D prescription plan. We force them to justify their increases. We force them to list their prices in the ad so we know.

We accelerate; we don't kill lifesaving medical cures. We go further, further than H.R. 3. We permanently make it easier for Americans to deduct high medical expenses from their taxes, allowing them to use their HSAs for over-the-counter medicines, including feminine hygiene products. We save seniors over \$300 a year in the popular Medicare prescription drug program.

□ 1045

All these ideas are bipartisan. All these can be passed by Congress. All can be signed by President Trump this year if Democrats abandon their partisan game and continue what was really good bipartisan work that got shelved for this bill that dies.

When this is done, let's come back together. Let's work together. Everyone knows, in good faith, we have to tackle these drug prices. Let's prove to America that we can actually work together not for impeachment, not for the junk we are wasting our time on, but for things that really matter to families back home.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard compelling argument today. We have heard compelling argument around the need and the reason to lower the costs of prescription drugs now. We are taking bold and reasonable steps today to bring down the costs of prescription drugs in this country. It is a significant and historic day that ushers in a beacon of hope for so many.

The answer from our Democratic majority today is solutions, solutions based on fact, solutions based on the guiding principle of the people, who we represent, to deliver for them.

The question is, when will we do something? Today, our legislation, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, that is what we are going to be passing, lowering drug costs now for the people who cannot wait, for the child of parents who are pushed to the brink, for the older American who is afraid to go to the pharmacy to pick up their prescription drug because of what it might cost, for the senior who is afraid to go to the doctor just to get that prescription, for the one-third of Americans who forgo their prescription drugs because of their costs.

President Truman said that America is not built on fear. America is built on imagination. America is built on courage. And America is built on the willingness to do the job at hand.

That, my friends, is what our majority is doing here today, tackling a solution for the millions of people, the countless number of people, whose voices only make their way into this Chamber by those who represent them, not the large multinational company that has more money than it knows what to do with. It is for the individual, hardworking American, which is why, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act for every American, for the people, by the people.

This is a historic and proud day, Mr. Chairman, and this is what we came here for.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, today, I will vote in support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Because of pharmaceutical companies' price gouging, Americans pay more out-of-pocket for prescription drugs than individuals in any other country. Americans need lower drug prices now, and Congress has the ability to enact important reforms to deliver immediate relief.

I believe H.R. 3 takes some important first steps towards delivering that relief and towards improving the health and financial security of American seniors and families.

In particular, I am strongly supportive of provisions that will lower out-of-pocket prescription drug costs for Medicare Part D beneficiaries. The legislation also limits price increases under Medicare Part Band D by creating an inflation rebate. Specifically, if a drug company raises the price of a drug in Part B or D above the 2016 rate of inflation, the company must lower the price or be required to pay the entire price above inflation in the form of a rebate back to the Treasury.

After strong pushback from myself and other progressive members, I am pleased that House leadership restored language designed to prevent pharmaceutical price-gouging for upwards of 150 million Americans with private health care plans and increased the minimum number of drugs that must be negotiated per year from 25 to 50.

While I believe these provisions will ultimately deliver relief to millions of Americans, I believe Congress can and must do more to combat rising drug prices and price-gouging pharmaceutical companies.

Currently, pharmaceutical companies charge outrageous prices because there is no adequate law to prevent drug companies from reaping massive profits with drugs developed on the taxpayer's dime.

To combat this ridiculous practice, I introduced H.R. 4640, the Affordable Drug Pricing for Taxpayer-Funded Prescription Drugs Act, which would end price gouging on prescription drugs developed with taxpayer-funded research by requiring federal agencies and federally-funded non-profits to secure affordable pricing agreements from drug manufacturers before granting them exclusive rights to develop drugs or other health care products. Americans should not pay to develop a drug only to see it put on the shelves in the U.S. at a much higher price than other nations.

I partnered with Rep. DOGGETT to offer an amendment to H.R. 3 that is similar to my leg-

islation. While the amendment was not made in order, I will continue to push House leadership for full consideration of H.R. 4640.

Beyond this, I am a strong supporter of the Prescription Drug Price Relief Act, which would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to make sure that Americans don't pay more for prescription drugs than the median price of: Canada, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. If pharmaceutical manufacturers refuse to negotiate, HHS would be required to approve cheaper generic versions of those drugs, regardless of any prior patents or market exclusivities. If Congress were to enact this legislation, prices of most brand name drugs would be significantly reduced.

Furthermore, uninsured patients should have access to negotiated prices under H.R. 3. That's why I supported an amendment that would have guaranteed that any negotiated price savings could have been accessed by the most vulnerable in our country, those who lack health insurance. Unfortunately, this amendment was not included in the final bill, meaning uninsured patients will continue to face the highest price at the pharmacy counter—pharmaceutical companies' list price.

I am also disappointed that an amendment I supported to allow the federal government to negotiate prescription drug prices for Medicare Part D was not made in order.

In 2003, the House Republican majority passed Medicare Part D. While I have consistently been a leader in the fight to lower drug prices for seniors, I opposed this legislation because it included a provision that prevents the federal government from negotiating better prescription drug prices for Medicare recipients. This means that drug companies are free to charge Medicare recipients higher prices, more than anyone else in the world. This is unacceptable.

The amendment offered to H.R. 3 would have authorized the federal government to negotiate prescription drug prices for Medicare Part D, and if drug companies refuse to negotiate, this legislation would enable the federal government to issue a competitive license to another company to produce the medication as a generic. The bottom line is that seniors shouldn't have to ration their pills or limit their dosage because they can't afford to pay for prescriptions each month.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the "Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drugs Costs Now Act," named after my dear friend and colleague Elijah Cummings who passed away earlier this year. I commend the Speaker, Chairman NEAL, Chairman PALLONE and Chairman SCOTT for their efforts to bring this historic legislation to the floor today.

For too long Americans have seen prices for prescription drugs rise out of control, to the point where many must make the decision about whether they will spend limited income on their necessary prescriptions, or food, housing and transportation. How is it in the wealthiest country in the world this is happening?

I've heard from many constituents who are indeed facing this very choice.

Patricia, an 88 year old woman in Connecticut said, "Do I have to lose my rent or stop eating in order to continue breathing? I don't want to end up in a nursing home on oxygen. I am not an ex-smoker. I am the proud

daughter of a West Virginia coal miner. Please help me and other poor frail elderly."

Rosemary from Wethersfield wrote, "The cost of the Epi-Pen is outrageous. Even with my insurance it is so expensive I couldn't get the prescription filled and took my chances. When I had an allergic reaction I called 911 instead."

Kevin from Manchester, a young man in his mid-30s who has a job and health insurance, also wrote, "The annual cost of my medications is about \$8,000 . . . I stop taking my medication. My asthma is noticeably worse. I worry that it's only a matter of time until I have a flare up and end up in the hospital."

H.R. 3 will allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for better prices on prescription drugs in Medicare, lowering prices for patients in Medicare and the private market.

I have long advocated for negotiation of drug prices and have included it in the Medicare Buy In and Health Stabilization Act introduced with my colleague from New York, Rep. BRIAN HIGGINS, and with my colleague from Connecticut, Rep. JOE COURTNEY.

The bill also caps Medicare beneficiaries' out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs at \$2,000. And for the first time, with the savings from Medicare reimbursement for drugs, we are able to expand Medicare to cover dental, hearing and vision services as a benefit to traditional Medicare. In my district alone, more than 100,000 people will benefit from adding these new services.

It's time we implement these much-needed changes and make prescription drugs more affordable. It's time to pass the Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

This bill takes on Big Pharma to help lower the cost of prescription drugs for everyday families. It is beyond outrageous that the U.S. government is not currently allowed to negotiate drug prices through Medicare. And it is shocking that Big Pharma is charging people in the United States, hundreds of times more than what they charge in other countries.

But H.R. 3 will help fix that. It allows the government to negotiate drug pricing through Medicare, and expands Medicare to cover vision, dental and hearing for the first time, while also investing in community health centers and critical research.

I'm especially pleased that this bill incorporates key provisions championed by our Progressive Caucus Co-Chairs PRAMILA JAYAPAL and MARK POCAN that increase the number of drugs that Medicare is able to negotiate and protect 150 million Americans with private health care plans from being price gouged by Big Pharma.

I urge a YES vote on this important bill named for our beloved, departed colleague Elijah Cummings who fought day in and out for the people. We miss him.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, today I rise in recognition of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act. This legislation will serve as a critical improvement towards ensuring that essential medications are finally affordable and accessible.

As the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I know how the exorbitantly high prices of critical medications burden individuals and their families. Americans should not have to

pay more for their medicines, when compared to the same ones sold by pharmaceutical companies, for drastically lower prices in other countries. It is why I rise today in support of this bill, which provides the authority, mandate, and tools for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate lower drug prices and caps annual out-of-pocket costs in Medicare Part D.

The Congressional Budget Office has scored the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act to save our country \$456 billion in the next ten years. With these savings generated from lowering drug costs, significant reinvestments will be made to reduce out-of-pocket costs, close coverage gaps for Medicare beneficiaries, invest in critical funding in innovative new treatments, and fight against our nation's opioid crisis.

Specifically, I was very pleased to support the inclusion of Medicare Part B coverage for dental, vision, and hearing benefits. For the thousands of seniors in my district and throughout the state of Texas, it is undeniable that this expansion of coverage will be lifechanging, especially as our constituents encounter additional health challenges associated with aging.

As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am especially vigilant in ensuring that minority communities which face higher rates of diabetes can access life-saving medications and are not forced to rationing their insulin out of desperation. People living with diabetes will be heartened to learn that the Lower Drug Costs Now Act could potentially save them more than \$700 on an annual supply of certain types of insulin.

The benefits of the Lower Drug Costs Now Act will even extend to the medical facilities we know and trust throughout our states. Our community health centers and nonprofit hospitals will be able to access the lowered negotiated drug prices because they qualify as providers of services, suppliers, and employers.

This bill moves our nation forward in addressing the need for accessible and affordable medications. However, it is prudent to note that there remains much to be done. We must continue to advocate for the inclusion of the uninsured population in these savings. Texas has the highest rate of uninsured individuals in the nation. Therefore, the lowered drug costs achieved in this bill will have limited impact in my state for the uninsured.

As members of this body, we should all stand in support to lower drug costs. I would like to especially honor the memory of my dear colleague, the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings. It is altogether very fitting that we recognize his long fight against high drug prices by passing H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, in his memory.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

I would like to thank Chairmen NEAL, PALONE, and SCOTT for their tireless efforts to get this legislation passed.

Prescriptions are not recommendations, Doctors have written them for a reason. Patients, our constituents, our friends, our family members, need these medications. They cannot afford to skip their medications.

However, I have heard so many heart-breaking stories from individuals in my district. Alice in Whittier has to rely on her doctors for insulin samples because she cannot afford in-

sulin. Adrian in Norwalk is choosing to pay his bills rather than his eight different medications. David in La Mirada is considering cutting his dosage because he cannot afford to refill his full dosage as often as he should. They, and so many others, are just making do. Frankly, that's not good enough for me.

With H.R. 3, we are giving power back to the people in my district and to millions of Americans. The savings from this bill will also be given back to the public with reinvestments in innovation and the search for new cures and treatments.

I look forward to this bill's passage today. It is time to act and lower the cost of prescription drugs now.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-41, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-334, shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—LOWERING PRICES THROUGH FAIR DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION

Sec. 101. Providing for lower prices for certain high-priced single source drugs.

Sec. 102. Selected drug manufacturer excise tax imposed during noncompliance periods.

Sec. 103. Fair Price Negotiation Implementation Fund.

TITLE II—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D PRESCRIPTION DRUG INFLATION REBATES

Sec. 201. Medicare part B rebate by manufacturers.

Sec. 202. Medicare part D rebate by manufacturers.

Sec. 203. Provision regarding inflation rebates for group health plans and group health insurance coverage.

Sec. 204. Annual report on drug costs in group health plans and group health insurance coverage.

Sec. 205. Collection of data.

TITLE III—PART D IMPROVEMENTS AND MAXIMUM OUT-OF-POCKET CAP FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

Sec. 301. Medicare part D benefit redesign.

Sec. 302. Allowing certain enrollees of prescription drugs plans and MA-PD plans under Medicare program to spread out cost-sharing under certain circumstances.

Sec. 303. Establishment of pharmacy quality measures under Medicare part D.

TITLE IV—DRUG PRICE TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 401. Drug price transparency.

TITLE V—PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS FOR MEDICARE LOW-INCOME BENEFICIARIES

Sec. 501. Dissemination to Medicare part D subsidy eligible individuals of information comparing premiums of certain prescription drug plans.

Sec. 502. Providing for intelligent assignment of certain subsidy eligible individuals auto-enrolled under Medicare prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans.

Sec. 503. Expanding eligibility for low-income subsidies under part D of the Medicare program.

Sec. 504. Automatic eligibility of certain low-income territorial residents for premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Medicare program; Sunset of enhanced allotment program.

Sec. 505. Automatic qualification of certain Medicaid beneficiaries for premium and cost-sharing subsidies under part D of the Medicare program.

Sec. 506. Providing for certain rules regarding the treatment of eligible retirement plans in determining the eligibility of individuals for premium and cost-sharing subsidies under part D of the Medicare program.

Sec. 507. Reducing cost-sharing and other program improvements for low-income beneficiaries.

TITLE VI—PROVIDING FOR DENTAL, VISION, AND HEARING COVERAGE UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Sec. 601. Dental and oral health care.

Sec. 602. Providing coverage for hearing care under the Medicare program.

Sec. 603. Providing coverage for vision care under the Medicare program.

TITLE VII—NIH, FDA, AND OPIOIDS FUNDING

Subtitle A—Biomedical Innovation Expansion

Sec. 701. NIH Innovation Initiatives.

Sec. 702. NIH clinical trial.

Subtitle B—Investing in Safety and Innovation

Sec. 711. Food and Drug Administration.

Subtitle C—Opioid Epidemic Response

Sec. 721. Opioid Epidemic Response Fund.

Sec. 722. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Sec. 723. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Sec. 724. Food and Drug Administration.

Sec. 725. National Institutes of Health.

Sec. 726. Health Resources and Services Administration.

Sec. 727. Administration for Children and Families.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 801. Guaranteed issue of certain Medigap policies.

Sec. 802. Reporting requirements for PDP sponsors regarding point-of-sale rejections under Medicare part D.

Sec. 803. Providing access to annual Medicare notifications in multiple languages.

Sec. 804. Temporary increase in Medicare part B payment for certain biosimilar biological products.

Sec. 805. Waiving medicare coinsurance for colorectal cancer screening tests.

Sec. 806. Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items.

Sec. 807. Physician fee update.

Sec. 808. Additional community health center funding.

Sec. 809. Grants to improve trauma support services and mental health care for children and youth in educational settings.

Sec. 810. Pathway to Health Careers Act.
Sec. 811. Home Visiting to Reduce Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Act.

TITLE I—LOWERING PRICES THROUGH FAIR DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION

SEC. 101. PROVIDING FOR LOWER PRICES FOR CERTAIN HIGH-PRICED SINGLE SOURCE DRUGS

U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART E—FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM TO LOWER PRICES FOR CERTAIN HIGH-PRICED SINGLE SOURCE DRUGS

“SEC. 1191. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Fair Price Negotiation Program (in this part referred to as the ‘program’). Under the program, with respect to each price applicability period, the Secretary shall—

“(1) publish a list of selected drugs in accordance with section 1192;

“(2) enter into agreements with manufacturers of selected drugs with respect to such period, in accordance with section 1193;

“(3) negotiate and, if applicable, renegotiate maximum fair prices for such selected drugs, in accordance with section 1194; and

“(4) carry out the administrative duties described in section 1196.

“(b) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO TIMING.—For purposes of this part:

“(1) INITIAL PRICE APPLICABILITY YEAR.—The term ‘initial price applicability year’ means a plan year (beginning with plan year 2023) or, if agreed to in an agreement under section 1193 by the Secretary and manufacturer involved, a period of more than one plan year (beginning on or after January 1, 2023).

“(2) PRICE APPLICABILITY PERIOD.—The term ‘price applicability period’ means, with respect to a drug, the period beginning with the initial price applicability year with respect to which such drug is a selected drug and ending with the last plan year during which the drug is a selected drug.

“(3) SELECTED DRUG PUBLICATION DATE.—The term ‘selected drug publication date’ means, with respect to each initial price applicability year, April 15 of the plan year that begins 2 years prior to such year.

“(4) VOLUNTARY NEGOTIATION PERIOD.—The term ‘voluntary negotiation period’ means, with respect to an initial price applicability year with respect to a selected drug, the period—

“(A) beginning on the sooner of—

“(i) the date on which the manufacturer of the drug and the Secretary enter into an agreement under section 1193 with respect to such drug; or

“(ii) June 15 following the selected drug publication date with respect to such selected drug; and

“(B) ending on March 31 of the year that begins one year prior to the initial price applicability year.

“(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part:

“(1) FAIR PRICE ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘fair price eligible individual’ means, with respect to a selected drug—

“(A) in the case such drug is furnished or dispensed to the individual at a pharmacy or by a mail order service—

“(i) an individual who is enrolled under a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII or an MA–PD plan under part C of such title if coverage is provided under such plan for such selected drug; and

“(ii) an individual who is enrolled under a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in the group or individual market (as such terms are defined in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act) with respect to which there is in effect an agreement with the Secretary under section 1197 with respect to such selected drug as so furnished or dispensed; and

“(B) in the case such drug is furnished or administered to the individual by a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier—

“(i) an individual who is entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under part B of such title if such selected drug is covered under the respective part; and

“(ii) an individual who is enrolled under a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in the group or individual market (as such terms are defined in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act) with respect to which there is in effect an agreement with the Secretary under section 1197 with respect to such selected drug as so furnished or administered.

“(2) MAXIMUM FAIR PRICE.—The term ‘maximum fair price’ means, with respect to a plan year during a price applicability period and with respect to a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) with respect to such period, the price published pursuant to section 1195 in the Federal Register for such drug and year.

“(3) AVERAGE INTERNATIONAL MARKET PRICE DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The terms ‘average international market price’ and ‘AIM price’ mean, with respect to a drug, the average price (which shall be the net average price, if practicable, and volume-weighted, if practicable) for a unit (as defined in paragraph (4)) of the drug for sales of such drug (calculated across different dosage forms and strengths of the drug and not based on the specific formulation or package size or package type), as computed (as of the date of publication of such drug as a selected drug under section 1192(a)) in all countries described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) that are applicable countries (as described in clause (i) of such subparagraph) with respect to such drug.

“(B) APPLICABLE COUNTRIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a country described in clause (ii) is an applicable country described in this clause with respect to a drug if there is available an average price for any unit for the drug for sales of such drug in such country.

“(ii) COUNTRIES DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the following are countries described in this clause:

“(I) Australia.

“(II) Canada.

“(III) France.

“(IV) Germany.

“(V) Japan.

“(VI) The United Kingdom.

“(4) UNIT.—The term ‘unit’ means, with respect to a drug, the lowest identifiable quantity (such as a capsule or tablet, milligram of molecules, or grams) of the drug that is dispensed.

“SEC. 1192. SELECTION OF NEGOTIATION-ELIGIBLE DRUGS AS SELECTED DRUGS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the selected drug publication date with respect to an initial price applicability year, the Secretary shall select and publish in the Federal Register a list of—

“(1)(A) with respect to an initial price applicability year during 2023, at least 25 negotiation-eligible drugs described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), but not subparagraph (C), of subsection (d)(1) (or, with respect to an initial price applicability year during such period beginning after 2023, the maximum number (if such number is less than 25) of such negotiation-eligible drugs for the year) with respect to such year; and

“(B) with respect to an initial price applicability year during 2024 or a subsequent year, at least 50 negotiation-eligible drugs described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), but not subparagraph (C), of subsection (d)(1) (or, with respect to an initial price applicability year during such period, the maximum number (if such number is less than 50) of such negotiation-eligible drugs for the year) with respect to such year;

“(2) all negotiation-eligible drugs described in subparagraph (C) of such subsection with respect to such year; and

“(3) all new-entrant negotiation-eligible drugs (as defined in subsection (g)(1)) with respect to such year.

Each drug published on the list pursuant to the previous sentence shall be subject to the negotiation process under section 1194 for the voluntary negotiation period with respect to such initial price applicability year (and the negotiation process under such section as applicable for any subsequent year during the applicable price applicability period). In applying this subsection, any negotiation-eligible drug that is selected under this subsection for an initial price applicability year shall not count toward the required minimum amount of drugs to be selected under paragraph (1) for any subsequent year, including such a drug so selected that is subject to renegotiation under section 1194.

“(b) SELECTION OF DRUGS.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1) the Secretary shall select for inclusion on the published list described in subsection (a) with respect to a price applicability period, the negotiation-eligible drugs that the Secretary projects will result in the greatest savings to the Federal Government or fair price eligible individuals during the price applicability period. In making this projection of savings for drugs for which there is an AIM price for a price applicability period, the savings shall be projected across different dosage forms and strengths of the drugs and not based on the specific formulation or package size or package type of the drugs, taking into consideration both the volume of drugs for which payment is made, to the extent such data is available, and the amount by which the net price for the drugs exceeds the AIM price for the drugs.

“(c) SELECTED DRUG.—For purposes of this part, each drug included on the list published under subsection (a) with respect to an initial price applicability year shall be referred to as a ‘selected drug’ with respect to such year and each subsequent plan year beginning before the first plan year beginning after the date on which the Secretary determines two or more drug products—

“(1) are approved or licensed (as applicable)—

“(A) under section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act using such drug as the listed drug; or

“(B) under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act using such drug as the reference product; and

“(2) continue to be marketed.

“(d) NEGOTIATION-ELIGIBLE DRUG.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘negotiation-eligible drug’ means, with respect to the selected drug publication date with respect to an initial price applicability year, a qualifying single source drug, as defined in subsection (e), that meets any of the following criteria:

“(A) COVERED PART D DRUGS.—The drug is among the 125 covered part D drugs (as defined in section 1860D–2(e)) for which there was an estimated greatest net spending under parts C and D of title XVIII, as determined by the Secretary, during the most recent plan year prior to such drug publication date for which data are available.

“(B) OTHER DRUGS.—The drug is among the 125 drugs for which there was an estimated greatest net spending in the United States (including the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States), as determined by the Secretary, during the most recent plan year prior to such drug publication date for which data are available.

“(C) INSULIN.—The drug is a qualifying single source drug described in subsection (e)(3).

“(2) CLARIFICATION.—In determining whether a qualifying single source drug satisfies any of the criteria described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, use data that is aggregated across dosage forms and strengths of the drug and not based on the specific formulation or package size or package type of the drug.

“(3) PUBLICATION.—Not later than the selected drug publication date with respect to an initial price applicability year, the Secretary

shall publish in the Federal Register a list of negotiation-eligible drugs with respect to such selected drug publication date.

“(e) **QUALIFYING SINGLE SOURCE DRUG.**—For purposes of this part, the term ‘qualifying single source drug’ means any of the following:

“(1) **DRUG PRODUCTS.**—A drug that—
“(A) is approved under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and continues to be marketed pursuant to such approval; and

“(B) is not the listed drug for any drug that is approved and continues to be marketed under section 505(j) of such Act.

“(2) **BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.**—A biological product that—

“(A) is licensed under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, including any product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351 of such Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009, and continues to be marketed under section 351 of such Act; and

“(B) is not the reference product for any biological product that is licensed and continues to be marketed under section 351(k) of such Act.

“(3) **INSULIN PRODUCT.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), any insulin product that is approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and continues to be marketed under such section 505 or 351, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

For purposes of applying paragraphs (1) and (2), a drug or biological product that is marketed by the same sponsor or manufacturer (or an affiliate thereof or a cross-licensed producer or distributor) as the listed drug or reference product described in such respective paragraph shall not be taken into consideration.

“(f) **INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONAL DRUG PRICES.**—For purposes of determining which negotiation-eligible drugs to select under subsection (a) and, in the case of such drugs that are selected drugs, to determine the maximum fair price for such a drug and whether such maximum fair price should be renegotiated under section 1194, the Secretary shall use data relating to the AIM price with respect to such drug as available or provided to the Secretary and shall on an ongoing basis request from manufacturers of selected drugs information on the AIM price of such a drug.

“(g) **NEW-ENTRANT NEGOTIATION-ELIGIBLE DRUGS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this part, the term ‘new-entrant negotiation-eligible drug’ means, with respect to the selected drug publication date with respect to an initial price applicability year, a qualifying single source drug—

“(A) that is first approved or licensed, as described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (e), as applicable, during the year preceding such selected drug publication date; and

“(B) that the Secretary determines under paragraph (2) is likely to be included as a negotiation-eligible drug with respect to the subsequent selected drug publication date.

“(2) **DETERMINATION.**—In the case of a qualifying single source drug that meets the criteria described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), with respect to an initial price applicability year, if the wholesale acquisition cost at which such drug is first marketed in the United States is equal to or greater than the median household income (as determined according to the most recent data collected by the United States Census Bureau), the Secretary shall determine before the selected drug publication date with respect to the initial price applicability year, if the drug is likely to be included as a negotiation-eligible drug with respect to the subsequent

selected drug publication date, based on the projected spending under title XVIII or in the United States on such drug. For purposes of this paragraph the term ‘United States’ includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States.

“**SEC. 1193. MANUFACTURER AGREEMENTS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of section 1191(a)(2), the Secretary shall enter into agreements with manufacturers of selected drugs with respect to a price applicability period, by not later than June 15 following the selected drug publication date with respect to such selected drug, under which—

“(1) during the voluntary negotiation period for the initial price applicability year for the selected drug, the Secretary and manufacturer, in accordance with section 1194, negotiate to determine (and, by not later than the last date of such period and in accordance with subsection (c), agree to) a maximum fair price for such selected drug of the manufacturer in order to provide access to such price—

“(A) to fair price eligible individuals who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (A) of section 1191(c)(1) and are furnished or dispensed such drug during, subject to subparagraph (2), the price applicability period; and

“(B) to hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers with respect to fair price eligible individuals who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (B) of such section and are furnished or administered such drug during, subject to subparagraph (2), the price applicability period;

“(2) the Secretary and the manufacturer shall, in accordance with a process and during a period specified by the Secretary pursuant to rulemaking, renegotiate (and, by not later than the last date of such period and in accordance with subsection (c), agree to) the maximum fair price for such drug if the Secretary determines that there is a material change in any of the factors described in section 1194(d) relating to the drug, including changes in the AIM price for such drug, in order to provide access to such maximum fair price (as so renegotiated)—

“(A) to fair price eligible individuals who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (A) of section 1191(c)(1) and are furnished or dispensed such drug during any year during the price applicability period (beginning after such renegotiation) with respect to such selected drug; and

“(B) to hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers with respect to fair price eligible individuals who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (B) of such section and are furnished or administered such drug during any year described in subparagraph (A);

“(3) the maximum fair price (including as renegotiated pursuant to paragraph (2)), with respect to such a selected drug, shall be provided to fair price eligible individuals, who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (A) of section 1191(c)(1), at the pharmacy or by a mail order service at the point-of-sale of such drug;

“(4) the manufacturer, subject to subsection (d), submits to the Secretary, in a form and manner specified by the Secretary—

“(A) for the voluntary negotiation period for the price applicability period (and, if applicable, before any period of renegotiation specified pursuant to paragraph (2)) with respect to such drug all information that the Secretary requires to carry out the negotiation (or renegotiation process) under this part, including information described in section 1192(f) and section 1194(d)(1); and

“(B) on an ongoing basis, information on changes in prices for such drug that would affect the AIM price for such drug or otherwise provide a basis for renegotiation of the maximum fair price for such drug pursuant to paragraph (2);

“(5) the manufacturer agrees that in the case the selected drug of a manufacturer is a drug described in subsection (c), the manufacturer will, in accordance with such subsection, make any payment required under such subsection with respect to such drug; and

“(6) the manufacturer complies with requirements imposed by the Secretary for purposes of administering the program, including with respect to the duties described in section 1196.

“(b) **AGREEMENT IN EFFECT UNTIL DRUG IS NO LONGER A SELECTED DRUG.**—An agreement entered into under this section shall be effective, with respect to a drug, until such drug is no longer considered a selected drug under section 1192(c).

“(c) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN SELECTED DRUGS WITHOUT AIM PRICE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a selected drug for which there is no AIM price available with respect to the initial price applicability year for such drug and for which an AIM price becomes available beginning with respect to a subsequent plan year during the price applicability period for such drug, if the Secretary determines that the amount described in paragraph (2)(A) for a unit of such drug is greater than the amount described in paragraph (2)(B) for a unit of such drug, then by not later than one year after the date of such determination, the manufacturer of such selected drug shall pay to the Treasury an amount equal to the product of—

“(A) the difference between such amount described in paragraph (2)(A) for a unit of such drug and such amount described in paragraph (2)(B) for a unit of such drug; and

“(B) the number of units of such drug sold in the United States, including the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States, during the period described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(2) **AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.**—

“(A) **WEIGHTED AVERAGE PRICE BEFORE AIM PRICE AVAILABLE.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount described in this subparagraph for a selected drug described in such paragraph, is the amount equal to the weighted average manufacturer price (as defined in section 1927(k)(1)) for such dosage strength and form for the drug during the period beginning with the first plan year for which the drug is included on the list of negotiation-eligible drugs published under section 1192(d) and ending with the last plan year during the price applicability period for such drug with respect to which there is no AIM price available for such drug.

“(B) **AMOUNT MULTIPLIER AFTER AIM PRICE AVAILABLE.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount described in this subparagraph for a selected drug described in such paragraph, is the amount equal to 200 percent of the AIM price for such drug with respect to the first plan year during the price applicability period for such drug with respect to which there is an AIM price available for such drug.

“(d) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**—Information submitted to the Secretary under this part by a manufacturer of a selected drug that is proprietary information of such manufacturer (as determined by the Secretary) may be used only by the Secretary or disclosed to and used by the Comptroller General of the United States or the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission for purposes of carrying out this part.

“(e) **REGULATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, pursuant to rulemaking, specify, in accordance with paragraph (2), the information that must be submitted under subsection (a)(4).

“(2) **INFORMATION SPECIFIED.**—Information described in paragraph (1), with respect to a selected drug, shall include information on sales of the drug (by the manufacturer of the drug or by another entity under license or other agreement with the manufacturer, with respect to the sales of such drug, regardless of the name under which the drug is sold) in any foreign country

that is part of the AIM price. The Secretary shall verify, to the extent practicable, such sales from appropriate officials of the government of the foreign country involved.

“(f) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall comply with requirements imposed by the Secretary or a third party with a contract under section 1196(c)(1), as applicable, for purposes of administering the program.

“SEC. 1194. NEGOTIATION AND RENEGOTIATION PROCESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this part, under an agreement under section 1193 between the Secretary and a manufacturer of a selected drug, with respect to the period for which such agreement is in effect and in accordance with subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary and the manufacturer—

“(1) shall during the voluntary negotiation period with respect to the initial price applicability year for such drug, in accordance with this section, negotiate a maximum fair price for such drug for the purpose described in section 1193(a)(1); and

“(2) as applicable pursuant to section 1193(a)(2) and in accordance with the process specified pursuant to such section, renegotiate such maximum fair price for such drug for the purpose described in such section.

“(b) NEGOTIATING METHODOLOGY AND OBJECTIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and use a consistent methodology for negotiations under subsection (a) that, in accordance with paragraph (2) and subject to paragraph (3), achieves the lowest maximum fair price for each selected drug while appropriately rewarding innovation.

“(2) PRIORITIZING FACTORS.—In considering the factors described in subsection (d) in negotiating (and, as applicable, renegotiating) the maximum fair price for a selected drug, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, consider all of the available factors listed but shall prioritize the following factors:

“(A) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—The factor described in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (d).

“(B) MARKET DATA.—The factor described in paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection.

“(C) UNIT COSTS OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.—The factor described in paragraph (1)(C) of such subsection.

“(D) COMPARISON TO EXISTING THERAPEUTIC ALTERNATIVES.—The factor described in paragraph (2)(A) of such subsection.

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In negotiating the maximum fair price of a selected drug, with respect to an initial price applicability year for the selected drug, and, as applicable, in renegotiating the maximum fair price for such drug, with respect to a subsequent year during the price applicability period for such drug, in the case that the manufacturer of the selected drug offers under the negotiation or renegotiation, as applicable, a price for such drug that is not more than the target price described in subparagraph (B) for such drug for the respective year, the Secretary shall agree under such negotiation or renegotiation, respectively, to such offered price as the maximum fair price.

“(B) TARGET PRICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the target price described in this subparagraph for a selected drug with respect to a year, is the average price (which shall be the net average price, if practicable, and volume-weighted, if practicable) for a unit of such drug for sales of such drug, as computed (across different dosage forms and strengths of the drug and not based on the specific formulation or package size or package type of the drug) in the applicable country described in section 1191(c)(3)(B) with respect to such drug that, with respect to such year, has the lowest average price for such drug

as compared to the average prices (as so computed) of such drug with respect to such year in the other applicable countries described in such section with respect to such drug.

“(ii) SELECTED DRUGS WITHOUT AIM PRICE.—In applying this paragraph in the case of negotiating the maximum fair price of a selected drug for which there is no AIM price available with respect to the initial price applicability year for such drug, or, as applicable, renegotiating the maximum fair price for such drug with respect to a subsequent year during the price applicability period for such drug before the first plan year for which there is an AIM price available for such drug, the target price described in this subparagraph for such drug and respective year is the amount that is 80 percent of the average manufacturer price (as defined in section 1927(k)(1)) for such drug and year.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—After the completion of each voluntary negotiation period, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the maximum fair prices negotiated (or, as applicable, renegotiated) for such period. Such report shall include information on how such prices so negotiated (or renegotiated) meet the requirements of this part, including the requirements of this subsection.

“(c) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the maximum fair price negotiated (including as renegotiated) under this section for a selected drug, with respect to each plan year during a price applicability period for such drug, shall not exceed 120 percent of the AIM price applicable to such drug with respect to such year.

“(2) SELECTED DRUGS WITHOUT AIM PRICE.—In the case of a selected drug for which there is no AIM price available with respect to the initial price applicability year for such drug, for each plan year during the price applicability period before the first plan year for which there is an AIM price available for such drug, the maximum fair price negotiated (including as renegotiated) under this section for the selected drug shall not exceed the amount equal to 85 percent of the average manufacturer price for the drug with respect to such year.

“(d) CONSIDERATIONS.—For purposes of negotiating and, as applicable, renegotiating (including for purposes of determining whether to renegotiate) the maximum fair price of a selected drug under this part with the manufacturer of the drug, the Secretary, consistent with subsection (b)(2), shall take into consideration the factors described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5), and may take into consideration the factor described in paragraph (4):

“(1) MANUFACTURER-SPECIFIC INFORMATION.—The following information, including as submitted by the manufacturer:

“(A) Research and development costs of the manufacturer for the drug and the extent to which the manufacturer has recouped research and development costs.

“(B) Market data for the drug, including the distribution of sales across different programs and purchasers and projected future revenues for the drug.

“(C) Unit costs of production and distribution of the drug.

“(D) Prior Federal financial support for novel therapeutic discovery and development with respect to the drug.

“(E) Data on patents and on existing and pending exclusivity for the drug.

“(F) National sales data for the drug.

“(G) Information on clinical trials for the drug in the United States or in applicable countries described in section 1191(c)(3)(B).

“(2) INFORMATION ON ALTERNATIVE PRODUCTS.—The following information:

“(A) The extent to which the drug represents a therapeutic advance as compared to existing therapeutic alternatives and, to the extent such information is available, the costs of such existing therapeutic alternatives.

“(B) Information on approval by the Food and Drug Administration of alternative drug products.

“(C) Information on comparative effectiveness analysis for such products, taking into consideration the effects of such products on specific populations, such as individuals with disabilities, the elderly, terminally ill, children, and other patient populations.

In considering information described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall not use evidence or findings from comparative clinical effectiveness research in a manner that treats extending the life of an elderly, disabled, or terminally ill individual as of lower value than extending the life of an individual who is younger, nondisabled, or not terminally ill. Nothing in the previous sentence shall affect the application or consideration of an AIM price for a selected drug.

“(3) FOREIGN SALES INFORMATION.—To the extent available on a timely basis, including as provided by a manufacturer of the selected drug or otherwise, information on sales of the selected drug in each of the countries described in section 1191(c)(3)(B).

“(4) VA DRUG PRICING INFORMATION.—Information disclosed to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (f).

“(5) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Information submitted to the Secretary, in accordance with a process specified by the Secretary, by other parties that are affected by the establishment of a maximum fair price for the selected drug.

“(e) REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.—For purposes of negotiating and, as applicable, renegotiating (including for purposes of determining whether to renegotiate) the maximum fair price of a selected drug under this part with the manufacturer of the drug, with respect to a price applicability period, and other relevant data for purposes of this section—

“(1) the Secretary shall, not later than the selected drug publication date with respect to the initial price applicability year of such period, request drug pricing information from the manufacturer of such selected drug, including information described in subsection (d)(1); and

“(2) by not later than October 1 following the selected drug publication date, the manufacturer of such selected drug shall submit to the Secretary such requested information in such form and manner as the Secretary may require. The Secretary shall request, from the manufacturer or others, such additional information as may be needed to carry out the negotiation and renegotiation process under this section.

“(f) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—For purposes of this part, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may disclose to the Secretary of Health and Human Services the price of any negotiation-eligible drug that is purchased pursuant to section 8126 of title 38, United States Code.

“SEC. 1195. PUBLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an initial price applicability year and selected drug with respect to such year, not later than April 1 of the plan year prior to such initial price applicability year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the maximum fair price for such drug negotiated under this part with the manufacturer of such drug.

“(b) UPDATES.—

“(1) SUBSEQUENT YEAR MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.—For a selected drug, for each plan year subsequent to the initial price applicability year for such drug with respect to which an agreement for such drug is in effect under section 1193, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), the amount equal to the maximum fair price published for such drug for the previous year, increased by the annual percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (all items; U.S. city average) as of September of such previous year; or

“(B) in the case the maximum fair price for such drug was renegotiated, for the first year for which such price as so renegotiated applies, such renegotiated maximum fair price.

“(2) PRICES NEGOTIATED AFTER DEADLINE.—In the case of a selected drug with respect to an initial price applicability year for which the maximum fair price is determined under this part after the date of publication under this section, the Secretary shall publish such maximum fair price in the Federal Register by not later than 30 days after the date such maximum price is so determined.

“SEC. 1196. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES; COORDINATION PROVISIONS.

“(a) ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 1191, the administrative duties described in this section are the following:

“(A) The establishment of procedures (including through agreements with manufacturers under this part, contracts with prescription drug plans under part D of title XVIII and MA-PD plans under part C of such title, and agreements under section 1197 with group health plans and health insurance issuers of health insurance coverage offered in the individual or group market) under which the maximum fair price for a selected drug is provided to fair price eligible individuals, who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (A) of section 1191(c)(1), at pharmacies or by mail order service at the point-of-sale of the drug for the applicable price period for such drug and providing that such maximum fair price is used for determining cost-sharing under such plans or coverage for the selected drug.

“(B) The establishment of procedures (including through agreements with manufacturers under this part and contracts with hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers and agreements under section 1197 with group health plans and health insurance issuers of health insurance coverage offered in the individual or group market) under which, in the case of a selected drug furnished or administered by such a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier to fair price eligible individuals (who with respect to such drug are described in subparagraph (B) of section 1191(c)(1)), the maximum fair price for the selected drug is provided to such hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers (as applicable) with respect to such individuals and providing that such maximum fair price is used for determining cost-sharing under the respective part, plan, or coverage for the selected drug.

“(C) The establishment of procedures (including through agreements and contracts described in subparagraphs (A) and (B)) to ensure that, not later than 90 days after the dispensing of a selected drug to a fair price eligible individual by a pharmacy or mail order service, the pharmacy or mail order service is reimbursed for an amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the lesser of—

“(I) the wholesale acquisition cost of the drug;

“(II) the national average drug acquisition cost of the drug; and

“(III) any other similar determination of pharmacy acquisition costs of the drug, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(ii) the maximum fair price for the drug.

“(D) The establishment of procedures to ensure that the maximum fair price for a selected drug is applied before—

“(i) any coverage or financial assistance under other health benefit plans or programs that provide coverage or financial assistance for the purchase or provision of prescription drug coverage on behalf of fair price eligible individuals as the Secretary may specify; and

“(ii) any other discounts.

“(E) The establishment of procedures to enter into appropriate agreements and protocols for the ongoing computation of AIM prices for se-

lected drugs, including, to the extent possible, to compute the AIM price for selected drugs and including by providing that the manufacturer of such a selected drug should provide information for such computation not later than 3 months after the first date of the voluntary negotiation period for such selected drug.

“(F) The establishment of procedures to compute and apply the maximum fair price across different strengths and dosage forms of a selected drug and not based on the specific formulation or package size or package type of the drug.

“(G) The establishment of procedures to negotiate and apply the maximum fair price in a manner that does not include any dispensing or similar fee.

“(H) The establishment of procedures to carry out the provisions of this part, as applicable, with respect to—

“(i) fair price eligible individuals who are enrolled under a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII or an MA-PD plan under part C of such title;

“(ii) fair price eligible individuals who are enrolled under a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in the individual or group market with respect to which there is an agreement in effect under section 1197; and

“(iii) fair price eligible individuals who are entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under part B of such title.

“(I) The establishment of a negotiation process and renegotiation process in accordance with section 1194, including a process for acquiring information described in subsection (d) of such section and determining amounts described in subsection (b) of such section.

“(J) The provision of a reasonable dispute resolution mechanism to resolve disagreements between manufacturers, fair price eligible individuals, and the third party with a contract under subsection (c)(1).

“(2) MONITORING COMPLIANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor compliance by a manufacturer with the terms of an agreement under section 1193, including by establishing a mechanism through which violations of such terms may be reported.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—If a third party with a contract under subsection (c)(1) determines that the manufacturer is not in compliance with such agreement, the third party shall notify the Secretary of such noncompliance for appropriate enforcement under section 4192 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or section 1198, as applicable.

“(b) COLLECTION OF DATA.—

“(1) FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS.—The Secretary may collect appropriate data from prescription drug plans under part D of title XVIII and MA-PD plans under part C of such title in a timeframe that allows for maximum fair prices to be provided under this part for selected drugs.

“(2) FROM HEALTH PLANS.—The Secretary may collect appropriate data from group health plans or health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage in a timeframe that allows for maximum fair prices to be provided under this part for selected drugs.

“(3) COORDINATION OF DATA COLLECTION.—To the extent feasible, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall ensure that data collected pursuant to this subsection is coordinated with, and not duplicative of, other Federal data collection efforts.

“(c) CONTRACT WITH THIRD PARTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a contract with 1 or more third parties to administer the requirements established by the Secretary in order to carry out this part. At a minimum, the contract with a third party under the preceding sentence shall require that the third party—

“(A) receive and transmit information between the Secretary, manufacturers, and other

individuals or entities the Secretary determines appropriate;

“(B) receive, distribute, or facilitate the distribution of funds of manufacturers to appropriate individuals or entities in order to meet the obligations of manufacturers under agreements under this part;

“(C) provide adequate and timely information to manufacturers, consistent with the agreement with the manufacturer under this part, as necessary for the manufacturer to fulfill its obligations under this part; and

“(D) permit manufacturers to conduct periodic audits, directly or through contracts, of the data and information used by the third party to determine discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer under the program.

“(2) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish performance requirements for a third party with a contract under paragraph (1) and safeguards to protect the independence and integrity of the activities carried out by the third party under the program under this part.

“SEC. 1197. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION BY OTHER HEALTH PLANS.

“(a) AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE UNDER PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), under the program under this part the Secretary shall be treated as having in effect an agreement with a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage (as such terms are defined in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act), with respect to a price applicability period and a selected drug with respect to such period—

“(A) with respect to such selected drug furnished or dispensed at a pharmacy or by mail order service if coverage is provided under such plan or coverage during such period for such selected drug as so furnished or dispensed; and

“(B) with respect to such selected drug furnished or administered by a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier if coverage is provided under such plan or coverage during such period for such selected drug as so furnished or administered.

“(2) OPTING OUT OF AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall not be treated as having in effect an agreement under the program under this part with a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage with respect to a price applicability period and a selected drug with respect to such period if such a plan or issuer affirmatively elects, through a process specified by the Secretary, not to participate under the program with respect to such period and drug.

“(b) PUBLICATION OF ELECTION.—With respect to each price applicability period and each selected drug with respect to such period, the Secretary and the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of the Treasury, as applicable, shall make public a list of each group health plan and each health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage, with respect to which coverage is provided under such plan or coverage for such drug, that has elected under subsection (a) not to participate under the program with respect to such period and drug.

“SEC. 1198. CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY.

“(a) VIOLATIONS RELATING TO OFFERING OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICE.—Any manufacturer of a selected drug that has entered into an agreement under section 1193, with respect to a plan year during the price applicability period for such drug, that does not provide access to a price that is not more than the maximum fair price (or a lesser price) for such drug for such year—

“(1) to a fair price eligible individual who with respect to such drug is described in subparagraph (A) of section 1191(c)(1) and who is furnished or dispensed such drug during such year; or

“(2) to a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier with respect to fair price eligible individuals who with respect to such drug is described in subparagraph (B) of such section and is furnished or administered such drug by such hospital, physician, or provider or supplier during such year;

shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty equal to ten times the amount equal to the difference between the price for such drug made available for such year by such manufacturer with respect to such individual or hospital, physician, provider, or supplier and the maximum fair price for such drug for such year.

“(b) VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—Any manufacturer of a selected drug that has entered into an agreement under section 1193, with respect to a plan year during the price applicability period for such drug, that is in violation of a requirement imposed pursuant to section 1193(a)(6) shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of not more than \$1,000,000 for each such violation.

“(c) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil monetary penalty under this section in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“SEC. 1199. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

“(a) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to data collected under this part.

“(b) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF MEDICINE STUDY.—Not later than December 31, 2025, the National Academy of Medicine shall conduct a study, and submit to Congress a report, on recommendations for improvements to the program under this part, including the determination of the limits applied under section 1194(c).

“(c) MEDPAC STUDY.—Not later than December 31, 2025, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study, and submit to Congress a report, on the program under this part with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII, including with respect to the effect of the program on individuals entitled to benefits or enrolled under such title.

“(d) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The following shall not be subject to judicial review:“(1) The selection of drugs for publication under section 1192(a).

“(2) The determination of whether a drug is a negotiation-eligible drug under section 1192(d).

“(3) The determination of the maximum fair price of a selected drug under section 1194.

“(4) The determination of units of a drug for purposes of section 1191(c)(3).

“(e) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this part with respect to group health plans or health insurance coverage offered in the group market that are subject to oversight by the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall coordinate with such respective Secretary.

“(f) DATA SHARING.—The Secretary shall share with the Secretary of the Treasury such information as is necessary to determine the tax imposed by section 4192 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(g) GAO STUDY.—Not later than December 31, 2025, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of, and submit to Congress a report on, the implementation of the Fair Price Negotiation Program under this part.”.

(b) APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) UNDER MEDICARE.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PAYMENTS UNDER PART B.—Section 1847A(b)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a(b)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting “or in the case of such a drug or biological that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)), with respect to a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b)(2)), 106 percent of the maximum fair price (as de-

finied in section 1191(c)(2) applicable for such drug and a plan year during such period” after “paragraph (4)”.

(B) EXCEPTION TO PART D NON-INTERFERENCE.—Section 1860D–11(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–11(i)) is amended by inserting “, except as provided under part E of title XI” after “the Secretary”.

(C) APPLICATION AS NEGOTIATED PRICE UNDER PART D.—Section 1860D–2(d)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–102(d)(1)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, subject to subparagraph (D),” after “negotiated prices”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICE FOR SELECTED DRUGS.—In applying this section, in the case of a covered part D drug that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)), with respect to a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b)(2)), the negotiated prices used for payment (as described in this subsection) shall be the maximum fair price (as defined in section 1191(c)(2)) for such drug and for each plan year during such period.”.

(D) INFORMATION FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA–PD PLANS REQUIRED.—

(i) PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS.—Section 1860D–12(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–112(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PROVISION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.—Each contract entered into with a PDP sponsor under this part with respect to a prescription drug plan offered by such sponsor shall require the sponsor to provide information to the Secretary as requested by the Secretary in accordance with section 1196(b).”.

(ii) MA–PD PLANS.—Section 1857(f)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–27(f)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.—Section 1860D–12(b)(8).”.

(2) UNDER GROUP HEALTH PLANS AND HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—

(A) PHSA.—Part A of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 2729 the following new section:

“SEC. 2729A. FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM AND APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage that is treated under section 1197 of the Social Security Act as having in effect an agreement with the Secretary under the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act, with respect to a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b) of such Act) and a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) with respect to such period with respect to which coverage is provided under such plan or coverage—

“(1) the provisions of such part shall apply—

“(A) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan or coverage if the drug is furnished or dispensed at a pharmacy or by a mail order service, to the plans or coverage offered by such plan or issuer, and to the individuals enrolled under such plans or coverage, during such period, with respect to such selected drug, in the same manner as such provisions apply to prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans, and to individuals enrolled under such prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans during such period; and

“(B) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan or coverage if the drug is furnished or administered by a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier, to the plans or coverage offered by such plan or issuers, to the individuals enrolled under such

plans or coverage, and to hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers during such period, with respect to such drug in the same manner as such provisions apply to the Secretary, to individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under part B of such title, and to hospitals, physicians, and other providers and suppliers participating under title XVIII during such period;

“(2) the plan or issuer shall apply any cost-sharing responsibilities under such plan or coverage, with respect to such selected drug, by substituting an amount not more than the maximum fair price negotiated under such part E of title XI for such drug in lieu of the drug price upon which the cost-sharing would have otherwise applied, and such cost-sharing responsibilities with respect to such selected drug may not exceed such maximum fair price; and

“(3) the Secretary shall apply the provisions of such part E to such plan, issuer, and coverage, such individuals so enrolled in such plans and coverage, and such hospitals, physicians, and other providers and suppliers participating in such plans and coverage.

“(b) NOTIFICATION REGARDING NONPARTICIPATION IN FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM.—A group health plan or a health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall publicly disclose in a manner and in accordance with a process specified by the Secretary any election made under section 1197 of the Social Security Act by the plan or issuer to not participate in the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act with respect to a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) for which coverage is provided under such plan or coverage before the beginning of the plan year for which such election was made.”.

(B) ERISA.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181 et. seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 716. FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM AND APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage that is treated under section 1197 of the Social Security Act as having in effect an agreement with the Secretary under the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act, with respect to a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b) of such Act) and a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) with respect to such period with respect to which coverage is provided under such plan or coverage—

“(1) the provisions of such part shall apply, as applicable—

“(A) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan or coverage if the drug is furnished or dispensed at a pharmacy or by a mail order service, to the plans or coverage offered by such plan or issuer, and to the individuals enrolled under such plans or coverage, during such period, with respect to such selected drug, in the same manner as such provisions apply to prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans, and to individuals enrolled under such prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans during such period; and

“(B) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan or coverage if the drug is furnished or administered by a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier, to the plans or coverage offered by such plan or issuers, to the individuals enrolled under such plans or coverage, and to hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers during such period, with respect to such drug in the same manner as such provisions apply to the Secretary, to individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under

part B of such title, and to hospitals, physicians, and other providers and suppliers participating under title XVIII during such period;

“(2) the plan or issuer shall apply any cost-sharing responsibilities under such plan or coverage, with respect to such selected drug, by substituting an amount not more than the maximum fair price negotiated under such part E of title XI for such drug in lieu of the drug price upon which the cost-sharing would have otherwise applied, and such cost-sharing responsibilities with respect to such selected drug may not exceed such maximum fair price; and

“(3) the Secretary shall apply the provisions of such part E to such plan, issuer, and coverage, and such individuals so enrolled in such plans.

“(b) NOTIFICATION REGARDING NONPARTICIPATION IN FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM.—A group health plan or a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage shall publicly disclose in a manner and in accordance with a process specified by the Secretary any election made under section 1197 of the Social Security Act by the plan or issuer to not participate in the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act with respect to a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) for which coverage is provided under such plan or coverage before the beginning of the plan year for which such election was made.”.

(ii) APPLICATION TO RETIREE AND CERTAIN SMALL GROUP HEALTH PLANS.—Section 732(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191a(a)) is amended by striking “section 711” and inserting “sections 711 and 716”.

(iii) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Sec. 716. Fair Price Negotiation Program and application of maximum fair prices.”.

(C) IRC.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9816. FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM AND APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a group health plan that is treated under section 1197 of the Social Security Act as having in effect an agreement with the Secretary under the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act, with respect to a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b) of such Act) and a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) with respect to such period with respect to which coverage is provided under such plan—

“(1) the provisions of such part shall apply, as applicable—

“(A) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan if the drug is furnished or dispensed at a pharmacy or by a mail order service, to the plan, and to the individuals enrolled under such plan during such period, with respect to such selected drug, in the same manner as such provisions apply to prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans, and to individuals enrolled under such prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans during such period; and

“(B) if coverage of such selected drug is provided under such plan if the drug is furnished or administered by a hospital, physician, or other provider of services or supplier, to the plan, to the individuals enrolled under such plan, and to hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services and suppliers during such period, with respect to such drug in the same manner as such provisions apply to the Secretary, to individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under part B of such title, and to hospitals, physicians, and

other providers and suppliers participating under title XVIII during such period;

“(2) the plan shall apply any cost-sharing responsibilities under such plan, with respect to such selected drug, by substituting an amount not more than the maximum fair price negotiated under such part E of title XI for such drug in lieu of the drug price upon which the cost-sharing would have otherwise applied, and such cost-sharing responsibilities with respect to such selected drug may not exceed such maximum fair price; and

“(3) the Secretary shall apply the provisions of such part E to such plan and such individuals so enrolled in such plan.

“(b) NOTIFICATION REGARDING NONPARTICIPATION IN FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM.—A group health plan shall publicly disclose in a manner and in accordance with a process specified by the Secretary any election made under section 1197 of the Social Security Act by the plan to not participate in the Fair Price Negotiation Program under part E of title XI of such Act with respect to a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c) of such Act) for which coverage is provided under such plan before the beginning of the plan year for which such election was made.”.

(ii) APPLICATION TO RETIREE AND CERTAIN SMALL GROUP HEALTH PLANS.—Section 9831(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “other than with respect to section 9816,” before “any group health plan”.

(iii) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 100 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9816. Fair Price Negotiation Program and application of maximum fair prices.”.

(3) FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION PROGRAM PRICES INCLUDED IN BEST PRICE AND AMP.—Section 1927 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(C)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking at the end “; and”;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking at the end the period and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(V) in the case of a rebate period and a covered outpatient drug that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) during such rebate period, shall be inclusive of the price for such drug made available from the manufacturer during the rebate period by reason of application of part E of title XI to any wholesaler, retailer, provider, health maintenance organization, nonprofit entity, or governmental entity within the United States.”; and

(B) in subsection (k)(1)(B), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) CLARIFICATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), in the case of a rebate period and a covered outpatient drug that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) during such rebate period, any reduction in price paid during the rebate period to the manufacturer for the drug by a wholesaler or retail community pharmacy described in subparagraph (A) by reason of application of part E of title XI shall be included in the average manufacturer price for the covered outpatient drug.”.

SEC. 102. SELECTED DRUG MANUFACTURER EXCISE TAX IMPOSED DURING NON-COMPLIANCE PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter E of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4192. SELECTED DRUGS DURING NON-COMPLIANCE PERIODS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of any selected drug during a day described in subsection (b) a tax in an amount such that the applicable percentage is equal to the ratio of—

“(1) such tax, divided by

“(2) the sum of such tax and the price for which so sold.

“(b) NONCOMPLIANCE PERIODS.—A day is described in this subsection with respect to a selected drug if it is a day during one of the following periods:

“(1) The period beginning on the June 16th immediately following the selected drug publication date and ending on the first date during which the manufacturer of the drug has in place an agreement described in subsection (a) of section 1193 of the Social Security Act with respect to such drug.

“(2) The period beginning on the April 1st immediately following the June 16th described in paragraph (1) and ending on the first date during which the manufacturer of the drug has agreed to a maximum fair price under such agreement.

“(3) In the case of a selected drug with respect to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services has specified a renegotiation period under such agreement, the period beginning on the first date after the last date of such renegotiation period and ending on the first date during which the manufacturer of the drug has agreed to a renegotiated maximum fair price under such agreement.

“(4) With respect to information that is required to be submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under such agreement, the period beginning on the date on which such Secretary certifies that such information is overdue and ending on the date that such information is so submitted.

“(5) In the case of a selected drug with respect to which a payment is due under subsection (c) of such section 1193, the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services certifies that such payment is overdue and ending on the date that such payment is made in full.

“(c) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘applicable percentage’ means—

“(1) in the case of sales of a selected drug during the first 90 days described in subsection (b) with respect to such drug, 65 percent,

“(2) in the case of sales of such drug during the 91st day through the 180th day described in subsection (b) with respect to such drug, 75 percent,

“(3) in the case of sales of such drug during the 181st day through the 270th day described in subsection (b) with respect to such drug, 85 percent, and

“(4) in the case of sales of such drug during any subsequent day, 95 percent.

“(d) SELECTED DRUG.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘selected drug’ means any selected drug (within the meaning of section 1192 of the Social Security Act) which is manufactured or produced in the United States or entered into the United States for consumption, use, or warehousing.

“(2) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ has the meaning given such term by section 4612(a)(4).

“(3) COORDINATION WITH RULES FOR POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (4) of section 4132(c) shall apply for purposes of this section.

“(e) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms ‘selected drug publication date’ and ‘maximum fair price’ have the meaning given such terms in section 1191 of the Social Security Act.

“(f) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—In the case of a sale which was timed for the purpose of avoiding the tax imposed by this section, the Secretary may treat such sale as occurring during a day described in subsection (b).”.

(b) NO DEDUCTION FOR EXCISE TAX PAYMENTS.—Section 275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding “or by section 4192” before the period at the end of subsection (a)(6).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4221(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “or 4192” after “section 4191”.

(2) Section 6416(b)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting “or 4192” after “section 4191”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of subchapter E of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “**Medical Devices**” and inserting “**Other Medical Products**”.

(2) The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E and inserting the following new item:

“SUBCHAPTER E. OTHER MEDICAL PRODUCTS”.

(3) The table of sections for subchapter E of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 4192. Selected drugs during noncompliance periods.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. FAIR PRICE NEGOTIATION IMPLEMENTATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established a Fair Price Negotiation Implementation Fund (referred to in this section as the “Fund”). The Secretary of Health and Human Services may obligate and expend amounts in the Fund to carry out this title and titles II and III (and the amendments made by such titles).

(b) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Fund \$3,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) \$600,000,000 shall become available on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) \$600,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2020;

(3) \$600,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2021;

(4) \$600,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2022; and

(5) \$600,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2023.

(c) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to any other amounts otherwise appropriated pursuant to any other provision of law.

TITLE II—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D PRESCRIPTION DRUG INFLATION REBATES**SEC. 201. MEDICARE PART B REBATE BY MANUFACTURERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) REBATE BY MANUFACTURERS FOR SINGLE SOURCE DRUGS WITH PRICES INCREASING FASTER THAN INFLATION.—

“(I) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) SECRETARIAL PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 6 months after the end of each calendar quarter beginning on or after July 1, 2021, the Secretary shall, for each part B rebateable drug, report to each manufacturer of such part B rebateable drug the following for such calendar quarter:

“(i) Information on the total number of units of the billing and payment code described in subparagraph (A)(i) of paragraph (3) with respect to such drug and calendar quarter.

“(ii) Information on the amount (if any) of the excess average sales price increase described in subparagraph (A)(ii) of such paragraph for such drug and calendar quarter.

“(iii) The rebate amount specified under such paragraph for such part B rebateable drug and calendar quarter.

“(B) MANUFACTURER REQUIREMENT.—For each calendar quarter beginning on or after July 1, 2021, the manufacturer of a part B rebateable drug shall, for such drug, not later

than 30 days after the date of receipt from the Secretary of the information described in subparagraph (A) for such calendar quarter, provide to the Secretary a rebate that is equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3) for such drug for such calendar quarter.

“(2) PART B REBATEABLE DRUG DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term ‘part B rebateable drug’ means a single source drug or biological (as defined in subparagraph (D) of section 1847A(c)(6)), including a bio-similar biological product (as defined in subparagraph (H) of such section), paid for under this part, except such term shall not include such a drug or biological—

“(i) if the average total allowed charges for a year per individual that uses such a drug or biological, as determined by the Secretary, are less than, subject to subparagraph (B), \$100; or

“(ii) that is a vaccine described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 1861(s)(10).

“(B) INCREASE.—The dollar amount applied under subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(i) for 2022, shall be the dollar amount specified under such subparagraph for 2021, increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12 month period ending with June of the previous year; and

“(ii) for a subsequent year, shall be the dollar amount specified in this clause (or clause (i)) for the previous year, increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12 month period ending with June of the previous year.

Any dollar amount specified under this subparagraph that is not a multiple of \$10 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10.

“(3) REBATE AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount specified in this paragraph for a part B rebateable drug assigned to a billing and payment code for a calendar quarter is, subject to paragraph (4), the amount equal to the product of—

“(i) subject to subparagraphs (B) and (G), the total number of units of the billing and payment code for such part B rebateable drug furnished under this part during the calendar quarter; and

“(ii) the amount (if any) by which—

“(I) the payment amount under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 1847A(b)(1), as applicable, for such part B rebateable drug during the calendar quarter; exceeds

“(II) the inflation-adjusted payment amount determined under subparagraph (C) for such part B rebateable drug during the calendar quarter.

“(B) EXCLUDED UNITS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), the total number of units of the billing and payment code for each part B rebateable drug furnished during a calendar quarter shall not include—

“(i) units packaged into the payment for a procedure or service under section 1833(t) or under section 1833(i) (instead of separately payable under such respective section);

“(ii) units included under the single payment system for renal dialysis services under section 1881(b)(14); or

“(iii) units of a part B rebateable drug of a manufacturer furnished to an individual, if such manufacturer, with respect to the furnishing of such units of such drug, provides for discounts under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act or for rebates under section 1927.

“(C) DETERMINATION OF INFLATION-ADJUSTED PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The inflation-adjusted payment amount determined under this subparagraph for a part B rebateable drug for a calendar quarter is—

“(i) the payment amount for the billing and payment code for such drug in the payment amount benchmark quarter (as defined in subparagraph (D)); increased by

“(ii) the percentage by which the rebate period CPI-U (as defined in subparagraph (F)) for the calendar quarter exceeds the benchmark period CPI-U (as defined in subparagraph (E)).

“(D) PAYMENT AMOUNT BENCHMARK QUARTER.—The term ‘payment amount benchmark quarter’ means the calendar quarter beginning January 1, 2016.

“(E) BENCHMARK PERIOD CPI-U.—The term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ means the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for July 2015.

“(F) REBATE PERIOD CPI-U.—The term ‘rebate period CPI-U’ means, with respect to a calendar quarter described in subparagraph (C), the greater of the benchmark period CPI-U and the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the first month of the calendar quarter that is two calendar quarters prior to such described calendar quarter.

“(G) COUNTING UNITS.—

“(i) CUT-OFF PERIOD TO COUNT UNITS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), subject to clause (ii), to count the total number of billing units for a part B rebateable drug for a quarter, the Secretary may use a cut-off period in order to exclude from such total number of billing units for such quarter claims for services furnished during such quarter that were not processed at an appropriate time prior to the end of the cut-off period.

“(ii) COUNTING UNITS FOR CLAIMS PROCESSED AFTER CUT-OFF PERIOD.—If the Secretary uses a cut-off period pursuant to clause (i), in the case of units of a part B rebateable drug furnished during a quarter but pursuant to application of such cut-off period excluded for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i) from the total number of billing units for the drug for such quarter, the Secretary shall count such units of such drug so furnished in the total number of billing units for such drug for a subsequent quarter, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(4) SPECIAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DRUGS AND EXEMPTION.—

“(A) SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED DRUGS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of a part B rebateable drug first approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration after July 1, 2015, clause (i) of paragraph (3)(C) shall be applied as if the term ‘payment amount benchmark quarter’ were defined under paragraph (3)(D) as the third full calendar quarter after the day on which the drug was first marketed and clause (ii) of paragraph (3)(C) shall be applied as if the term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ were defined under paragraph (3)(E) as if the reference to ‘July 2015’ under such paragraph were a reference to ‘the first month of the first full calendar quarter after the day on which the drug was first marketed’.

“(B) TIMELINE FOR PROVISION OF REBATES FOR SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED DRUGS.—In the case of a part B rebateable drug first approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration after July 1, 2015, paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied as if the reference to ‘July 1, 2021’ under such paragraph were a reference to the later of the 6th full calendar quarter after the day on which the drug was first marketed or July 1, 2021.

“(C) EXEMPTION FOR SHORTAGES.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the rebate amount under paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a part B rebateable drug that is described as currently in shortage on the shortage list in effect under section 506E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or in the case of other exigent circumstances, as determined by the Secretary.

“(D) SELECTED DRUGS.—In the case of a part B rebateable drug that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) for a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b)(2))—

“(i) for calendar quarters during such period for which a maximum fair price (as defined in section 1191(c)(2)) for such drug has been determined and is applied under part E of title XI,

the rebate amount under paragraph (1)(B) shall be waived; and

“(ii) in the case such drug is determined (pursuant to such section 1192(c)) to no longer be a selected drug, for each applicable year beginning after the price applicability period with respect to such drug, clause (i) of paragraph (3)(C) shall be applied as if the term ‘payment amount benchmark quarter’ were defined under paragraph (3)(D) as the calendar quarter beginning January 1 of the last year beginning during such price applicability period with respect to such selected drug and clause (ii) of paragraph (3)(C) shall be applied as if the term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ were defined under paragraph (3)(E) as if the reference to ‘July 2015’ under such paragraph were a reference to the July of the year preceding such last year.

“(5) APPLICATION TO BENEFICIARY COINSURANCE.—In the case of a part B rebatable drug, if the payment amount for a quarter exceeds the inflation adjusted payment for such quarter—

“(A) in computing the amount of any coinsurance applicable under this title to an individual with respect to such drug, the computation of such coinsurance shall be based on the inflation-adjusted payment amount determined under paragraph (3)(C) for such part B rebatable drug; and

“(B) the amount of such coinsurance is equal to 20 percent of such inflation-adjusted payment amount so determined.

“(6) REBATE DEPOSITS.—Amounts paid as rebates under paragraph (1)(B) shall be deposited into the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1841.

“(7) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—If a manufacturer of a part B rebatable drug has failed to comply with the requirements under paragraph (1)(B) for such drug for a calendar quarter, the manufacturer shall be subject to, in accordance with a process established by the Secretary pursuant to regulations, a civil money penalty in an amount equal to at least 125 percent of the amount specified in paragraph (3) for such drug for such calendar quarter. The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) (with respect to amounts of penalties or additional assessments) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this paragraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(8) STUDY AND REPORT.—

“(A) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of and operational issues involved with the following:

“(i) Including multiple source drugs (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(C)) in the rebate system under this subsection.

“(ii) Including drugs and biologicals paid for under MA plans under part C in the rebate system under this subsection.

“(iii) Including drugs excluded under paragraph (2)(A) and units of the billing and payment code of the drugs excluded under paragraph (3)(B) in the rebate system under this subsection.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

“(9) APPLICATION TO MULTIPLE SOURCE DRUGS.—The Secretary may, based on the report submitted under paragraph (8) and pursuant to rulemaking, apply the provisions of this subsection to multiple source drugs (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(C)), including, for purposes of determining the rebate amount under paragraph (3), by calculating manufacturer-specific average sales prices for the benchmark period and the rebate period.”

(b) AMOUNTS PAYABLE; COST-SHARING.—Section 1833 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (S), by striking “with respect to” and inserting “subject to subparagraph (DD), with respect to”;

(ii) by striking “and (CC)” and inserting “(CC)”;

(iii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, and (DD) with respect to a part B rebatable drug (as defined in paragraph (2) of section 1834(x)) for which the payment amount for a calendar quarter under paragraph (3)(A)(ii)(I) of such section for such quarter exceeds the inflation-adjusted payment under paragraph (3)(A)(ii)(II) of such section for such quarter, the amounts paid shall be the difference between (i) the payment amount under paragraph (3)(A)(ii)(I) of such section for such drug, and (ii) 20 percent of the inflation-adjusted payment amount under paragraph (3)(A)(ii)(II) of such section for such drug”;

(B) by adding at the end of the flush left matter following paragraph (9), the following:

“For purposes of applying paragraph (1)(DD), subsections (i)(9) and (t)(8)(F), and section 1834(x)(5), the Secretary shall make such estimates and use such data as the Secretary determines appropriate, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, may do so by program instruction or otherwise.”;

(2) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) In the case of a part B rebatable drug (as defined in paragraph (2) of section 1834(x)) for which payment under this subsection is not packaged into a payment for a covered OPD service (as defined in subsection (t)(1)(B)) (or group of services) furnished on or after July 1, 2021, under the system under this subsection, in lieu of calculation of coinsurance and the amount of payment otherwise applicable under this subsection, the provisions of section 1834(x)(5), paragraph (1)(DD) of subsection (a), and the flush left matter following paragraph (9) of subsection (a), shall, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, apply under this subsection in the same manner as such provisions of section 1834(x)(5) and subsection (a) apply under such section and subsection.”; and

(3) in subsection (t)(8), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) PART B REBATABLE DRUGS.—In the case of a part B rebatable drug (as defined in paragraph (2) of section 1834(x)) for which payment under this part is not packaged into a payment for a service furnished on or after July 1, 2021, under the system under this subsection, in lieu of calculation of coinsurance and the amount of payment otherwise applicable under this subsection, the provisions of section 1834(x)(5), paragraph (1)(DD) of subsection (a), and the flush left matter following paragraph (9) of subsection (a), shall, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, apply under this subsection in the same manner as such provisions of section 1834(x)(5) and subsection (a) apply under such section and subsection.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TO PART B ASP CALCULATION.—Section 1847A(c)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(3)) is amended by inserting “or section 1834(x)” after “section 1927”.

(2) EXCLUDING PARTS B DRUG INFLATION REBATE FROM BEST PRICE.—Section 1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(c)(1)(C)(ii)(I)) is amended by inserting “or section 1834(x)” after “this section”.

(3) COORDINATION WITH MEDICAID REBATE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.—Section 1927(b)(3)(D)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)(D)(i)) is amended by striking “to carry out section 1847B” and inserting “to carry out section 1847B or section 1834(x)”.

SEC. 202. MEDICARE PART D REBATE BY MANUFACTURERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1860D-14A (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114a) the following new section:

“SEC. 1860D-14B. MANUFACTURER REBATE FOR CERTAIN DRUGS WITH PRICES INCREASING FASTER THAN INFLATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this section, in order for coverage to be available under this part for a part D rebatable drug (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) of a manufacturer (as defined in section 1927(k)(5)) dispensed during an applicable year, the manufacturer must have entered into and have in effect an agreement described in subsection (b).

“(2) AUTHORIZING COVERAGE FOR DRUGS NOT COVERED UNDER AGREEMENTS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the dispensing of a covered part D drug if—

“(A) the Secretary has made a determination that the availability of the drug is essential to the health of beneficiaries under this part; or

“(B) the Secretary determines that in the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, there were extenuating circumstances.

“(3) APPLICABLE YEAR.—For purposes of this section the term ‘applicable year’ means a year beginning with 2022.

“(b) AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—An agreement described in this subsection, with respect to a manufacturer of a part D rebatable drug, is an agreement under which the following shall apply:

“(A) SECRETARIAL PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 9 months after the end of each applicable year with respect to which the agreement is in effect, the Secretary, for each part D rebatable drug of the manufacturer, shall report to the manufacturer the following for such year:

“(i) Information on the total number of units (as defined in subsection (h)(2)) for each dosage form and strength with respect to such part D rebatable drug and year.

“(ii) Information on the amount (if any) of the excess average manufacturer price increase described in subsection (c)(1)(B) for each dosage form and strength with respect to such drug and year.

“(iii) The rebate amount specified under subsection (c) for each dosage form and strength with respect to such drug and year.

“(B) MANUFACTURER REQUIREMENTS.—For each applicable year with respect to which the agreement is in effect, the manufacturer of the part D rebatable drug, for each dosage form and strength with respect to such drug, not later than 30 days after the date of receipt from the Secretary of the information described in subparagraph (A) for such year, shall provide to the Secretary a rebate that is equal to the amount specified in subsection (c) for such dosage form and strength with respect to such drug for such year.

“(2) LENGTH OF AGREEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An agreement under this section, with respect to a part D rebatable drug, shall be effective for an initial period of not less than one year and shall be automatically renewed for a period of not less than one year unless terminated under subparagraph (B).

“(B) TERMINATION.—

“(i) BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may provide for termination of an agreement under this section for violation of the requirements of the agreement or other good cause shown. Such termination shall not be effective earlier than 30 days after the date of notice of such termination. The Secretary shall provide, upon request, a manufacturer with a hearing concerning such a termination, but such hearing shall not delay the effective date of the termination.

“(ii) BY A MANUFACTURER.—A manufacturer may terminate an agreement under this section for any reason. Any such termination shall be effective, with respect to a plan year—

“(I) if the termination occurs before January 30 of the plan year, as of the day after the end of the plan year; and

“(II) if the termination occurs on or after January 30 of the plan year, as of the day after the end of the succeeding plan year.

“(C) EFFECTIVENESS OF TERMINATION.—Any termination under this paragraph shall not affect rebates due under the agreement under this section before the effective date of its termination.

“(D) DELAY BEFORE REENTRY.—In the case of any agreement under this section with a manufacturer that is terminated in a plan year, the Secretary may not enter into another such agreement with the manufacturer (or a successor manufacturer) before the subsequent plan year, unless the Secretary finds good cause for an earlier reinstatement of such an agreement.

“(c) REBATE AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the amount specified in this subsection for a dosage form and strength with respect to a part D rebatable drug and applicable year is, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (5), the amount equal to the product of—

“(A) the total number of units of such dosage form and strength with respect to such part D rebatable drug and year; and

“(B) the amount (if any) by which—

“(i) the annual manufacturer price (as determined in paragraph (2)) paid for such dosage form and strength with respect to such part D rebatable drug for the year; exceeds

“(ii) the inflation-adjusted payment amount determined under paragraph (3) for such dosage form and strength with respect to such part D rebatable drug for the year.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL MANUFACTURER PRICE.—The annual manufacturer price determined under this paragraph for a dosage form and strength, with respect to a part D rebatable drug and an applicable year, is the sum of the products of—

“(A) the average manufacturer price (as defined in subsection (h)(6)) of such dosage form and strength, as calculated for a unit of such drug, with respect to each of the calendar quarters of such year; and

“(B) the ratio of—

“(i) the total number of units of such dosage form and strength dispensed during each such calendar quarter of such year; to

“(ii) the total number of units of such dosage form and strength dispensed during such year.

“(3) DETERMINATION OF INFLATION-ADJUSTED PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The inflation-adjusted payment amount determined under this paragraph for a dosage form and strength with respect to a part D rebatable drug for an applicable year, subject to subparagraphs (A) and (D) of paragraph (5), is—

“(A) the benchmark year manufacturer price determined under paragraph (4) for such dosage form and strength with respect to such drug and an applicable year; increased by

“(B) the percentage by which the applicable year CPI-U (as defined in subsection (h)(5)) for the applicable year exceeds the benchmark period CPI-U (as defined in subsection (h)(4)).

“(4) DETERMINATION OF BENCHMARK YEAR MANUFACTURER PRICE.—The benchmark year manufacturer price determined under this paragraph for a dosage form and strength, with respect to a part D rebatable drug and an applicable year, is the sum of the products of—

“(A) the average manufacturer price (as defined in subsection (h)(6)) of such dosage form and strength, as calculated for a unit of such drug, with respect to each of the calendar quarters of the payment amount benchmark year (as defined in subsection (h)(3)); and

“(B) the ratio of—

“(i) the total number of units of such dosage form and strength dispensed during each such calendar quarter of such payment amount benchmark year; to

“(ii) the total number of units of such dosage form and strength dispensed during such payment amount benchmark year.

“(5) SPECIAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DRUGS AND EXEMPTION.—

“(A) SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED DRUGS.—In the case of a part D rebatable drug first approved or

licensed by the Food and Drug Administration after January 1, 2016, subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) shall be applied as if the term ‘payment amount benchmark year’ were defined under subsection (h)(3) as the first calendar year beginning after the day on which the drug was first marketed by any manufacturer and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) shall be applied as if the term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ were defined under subsection (h)(4) as if the reference to ‘January 2016’ under such subsection were a reference to ‘January of the first year beginning after the date on which the drug was first marketed by any manufacturer’.

“(B) EXEMPTION FOR SHORTAGES.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the rebate under paragraph (1) with respect to a part D rebatable drug that is described as currently in shortage on the shortage list in effect under section 506E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or in the case of other exigent circumstances, as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) TREATMENT OF NEW FORMULATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a part D rebatable drug that is a line extension of a part D rebatable drug that is an oral solid dosage form, the Secretary shall establish a formula for determining the amount specified in this subsection with respect to such part D rebatable drug and an applicable year with consideration of the original part D rebatable drug.

“(ii) LINE EXTENSION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘line extension’ means, with respect to a part D rebatable drug, a new formulation of the drug (as determined by the Secretary), such as an extended release formulation, but does not include an abuse-deterrent formulation of the drug (as determined by the Secretary), regardless of whether such abuse-deterrent formulation is an extended release formulation.

“(D) SELECTED DRUGS.—In the case of a part D rebatable drug that is a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) for a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b)(2))—

“(i) for plan years during such period for which a maximum fair price (as defined in section 1191(c)(2)) for such drug has been determined and is applied under part E of title XI, the rebate under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall be waived; and

“(ii) in the case such drug is determined (pursuant to such section 1192(c)) to no longer be a selected drug, for each applicable year beginning after the price applicability period with respect to such drug, subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) shall be applied as if the term ‘payment amount benchmark year’ were defined under subsection (h)(3) as the last year beginning during such price applicability period with respect to such selected drug and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) shall be applied as if the term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ were defined under subsection (h)(4) as if the reference to ‘January 2016’ under such subsection were a reference to January of the last year beginning during such price applicability period with respect to such drug.

“(d) REBATE DEPOSITS.—Amounts paid as rebates under subsection (c) shall be deposited into the Medicare Prescription Drug Account in the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1841.

“(e) INFORMATION.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary shall use information submitted by manufacturers under section 1927(b)(3).

“(f) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—In the case of a manufacturer of a part D rebatable drug with an agreement in effect under this section who has failed to comply with the terms of the agreement under subsection (b)(1)(B) with respect to such drug for an applicable year, the Secretary may impose a civil money penalty on such manufacturer in an amount equal to 125 percent of the amount specified in subsection (c) for such drug for such year. The provisions of section

1128A (other than subsections (a) (with respect to amounts of penalties or additional assessments) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subsection in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There shall be no judicial review of the following:

“(1) The determination of units under this section.

“(2) The determination of whether a drug is a part D rebatable drug under this section.

“(3) The calculation of the rebate amount under this section.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) PART D REBATABLE DRUG DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘part D rebatable drug’ means a drug or biological that would (without application of this section) be a covered part D drug, except such term shall, with respect to an applicable year, not include such a drug or biological if the average annual total cost under this part for such year per individual who uses such a drug or biological, as determined by the Secretary, is less than, subject to subparagraph (B), \$100, as determined by the Secretary using the most recent data available or, if data is not available, as estimated by the Secretary.

“(B) INCREASE.—The dollar amount applied under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) for 2023, shall be the dollar amount specified under such subparagraph for 2022, increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12-month period beginning with January of 2022; and

“(ii) for a subsequent year, shall be the dollar amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year, increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12-month period beginning with January of the previous year.

Any dollar amount specified under this subparagraph that is not a multiple of \$10 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10.

“(2) UNIT DEFINED.—The term ‘unit’ means, with respect to a part D rebatable drug, the lowest identifiable quantity (such as a capsule or tablet, milligram of molecules, or grams) of the part D rebatable drug that is dispensed to individuals under this part.

“(3) PAYMENT AMOUNT BENCHMARK YEAR.—The term ‘payment amount benchmark year’ means the year beginning January 1, 2016.

“(4) BENCHMARK PERIOD CPI-U.—The term ‘benchmark period CPI-U’ means the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for January 2016.

“(5) APPLICABLE YEAR CPI-U.—The term ‘applicable year CPI-U’ means, with respect to an applicable year, the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for January of such year.

“(6) AVERAGE MANUFACTURER PRICE.—The term ‘average manufacturer price’ has the meaning, with respect to a part D rebatable drug of a manufacturer, given such term in section 1927(k)(1), with respect to a covered outpatient drug of a manufacturer for a rebate period under section 1927.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TO PART B ASP CALCULATION.—Section 1847A(c)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(3)), as amended by section 201(c)(1), is further amended by striking “section 1927 or section 1834(x)” and inserting “section 1927, section 1834(x), or section 1860D-14B”.

(2) EXCLUDING PART D DRUG INFLATION REBATE FROM BEST PRICE.—Section 1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(c)(1)(C)(ii)(I)), as amended by section 201(c)(2), is further amended by striking “or section 1834(x)” and inserting “, section 1834(x), or section 1860D-14B”.

(3) COORDINATION WITH MEDICAID REBATE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.—Section

1927(b)(3)(D)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)(D)(i)), as amended by section 201(c)(3), is further amended by striking “or section 1834(x)” and inserting “, section 1834(x), or section 1860D-14B”.

SEC. 203. PROVISION REGARDING INFLATION REBATES FOR GROUP HEALTH PLANS AND GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

(a) *IN GENERAL*.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) potential models for an agreement process with manufacturers of prescription drugs under which such manufacturers provide for inflation rebates with respect to such drugs that are furnished or dispensed to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans and health insurance coverage offered in the group market in a manner similar to how manufacturers provide for rebates under section 1834(x) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 201, and section 1860D-14B of such Act, as added by section 202, with respect to prescription drugs that are furnished or dispensed under part B of title XVIII of such Act and part D of such title, respectively; and

(2) potential models for enforcement mechanisms with respect to such an agreement process that ensure that such inflation rebates are proportionally distributed, with respect to costs, to group health plans and health insurance issuers offering health insurance coverage in the group market, to participants and beneficiaries of such plans and coverage, or to both.

(b) *REGULATIONS*.—Not later than December 31, 2022, the Secretary of Labor shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury, promulgate regulations to implement a model described in subsection (a)(1) and a model described in subsection (a)(2), if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the process of a sufficient number (as determined by the Secretary) of drugs described in subsection (a)(1) have increased over a period of time (as determined by the Secretary) at a percentage that exceeds the percentage by which the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) has increased over such period; and

(2) such model described in subsection (a)(1) and such model described in subsection (a)(2) are feasible.

SEC. 204. ANNUAL REPORT ON DRUG COSTS IN GROUP HEALTH PLANS AND GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

(a) *INITIAL REPORT*.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Labor shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury, submit to Congress a report, with respect to a period (as determined by the Secretary of Labor), on—

(1) whether the prices of prescription drugs that are furnished or dispensed to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans and health insurance coverage offered in the group market during such period have increased at a percentage that exceeds the percentage by which the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) increased for such period; and

(2) whether there are mechanisms by which manufacturers of prescription drugs have attempted to recover rebate payments required of such manufacturers under section 1834(x) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 201, and section 1860D-14B of such Act, as added by section 202, with respect to prescription drugs that are furnished or dispensed under part B of title XVIII of such Act and part D of such title, respectively, through increased prices charged with respect to drugs that are furnished or dispensed to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans and health insurance cov-

erage offered in the group market during such period.

(b) *ANNUAL REPORT*.—Not later than December 31 of each year following 2021, the Secretary of Labor shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury, submit to Congress a report updating the information and analysis included in the report required under subsection (a), reflecting, in part, new price and cost information and data for the 12-month period after the period on which the prior year's report was based.

SEC. 205. COLLECTION OF DATA.

(a) *MANUFACTURERS OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS*.—Manufacturers of prescription drugs shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury appropriate data as necessary for the Secretaries to obtain information needed to provide the reports under sections 203 and 204.

(b) *GROUP HEALTH PLANS AND HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUERS OFFERING HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE IN THE GROUP MARKET*.—Group health plans and health insurance issuers offering health insurance coverage in the group market shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury appropriate data as necessary for the Secretaries to obtain information needed to provide the reports under sections 203 and 204.

TITLE III—PART D IMPROVEMENTS AND MAXIMUM OUT-OF-POCKET CAP FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

SEC. 301. MEDICARE PART D BENEFIT REDESIGN.

(a) *BENEFIT STRUCTURE REDESIGN*.—Section 1860D-2(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—
(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022 and for costs above the annual deductible specified in paragraph (1) and up to the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in paragraph (4)(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year” after “paragraph (3)”;
(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “paragraph (4),”; and
(ii) in clause (ii)(III), by striking “and each subsequent year” and inserting “and 2021”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—
(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “paragraph (4),”; and
(II) in subclause (I)(bb), by striking “a year after 2018” and inserting “each of years 2018 through 2021”; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(V), by striking “2019 and each subsequent year” and inserting “each of years 2019 through 2021”;
(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “and (4),”; and
(B) in clause (ii), by striking “for a subsequent year” and inserting “for each of years 2007 through 2021”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—
(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—
(I) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively, and moving the margin of each such redesignated item 2 ems to the right;

(II) in the matter preceding item (aa), as redesignated by subclause (I), by striking “is equal to the greater of—” and inserting “is equal to—
“(I) for a year preceding 2022, the greater of—”;

(III) by striking the period at the end of item (bb), as redesignated by subclause (I), and inserting “; and”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:
“(I) for 2022 and each succeeding year, \$0.”;

and
(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “clause (i)(I)” and inserting “clause (i)(I)(aa)”;
(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i)—
(I) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

(II) in subclause (VI)—
(aa) by striking “for a subsequent year” and inserting “for 2021”; and
(bb) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(III) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:
“(VII) for 2022, is equal to \$2,000; or
“(VIII) for a subsequent year, is equal to the amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year, increased by the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (6) for the year involved.”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “clause (i)(II)” and inserting “clause (i)”;
(C) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “and for amounts” and inserting “and, for a year preceding 2022, for amounts”; and
(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking “In applying” and inserting “For each of years 2011 through 2021, in applying”.

(b) *DECREASING REINSURANCE PAYMENT AMOUNT*.—Section 1860D-15(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-115(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after “80 percent” the following: “(or, with respect to a coverage year after 2021, 20 percent)”.

(c) *MANUFACTURER DISCOUNT PROGRAM*.—
(1) *IN GENERAL*.—Part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.), as amended by section 202, is further amended by inserting after section 1860D-14B the following new section:
“**SEC. 1860D-14C. MANUFACTURER DISCOUNT PROGRAM.**

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT*.—The Secretary shall establish a manufacturer discount program (in this section referred to as the ‘program’). Under the program, the Secretary shall enter into agreements described in subsection (b) with manufacturers and provide for the performance of the duties described in subsection (c). The Secretary shall establish a model agreement for use under the program by not later than January 1, 2021, in consultation with manufacturers, and allow for comment on such model agreement.

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—

“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—

“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—
“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—
“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—
“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

“(b) *TERMS OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—
“(A) *AGREEMENT*.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.
“(B) *PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE*.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.
“(C) *TIMING OF AGREEMENT*.—
“(i) *SPECIAL RULE FOR 2022*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on December 31, 2022, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a model agreement under subsection (a).
“(ii) *2023 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS*.—In order for an agreement with a manufacturer to be in effect under this section with respect to plan year 2023 or a subsequent plan year, the manufacturer shall enter into such agreement (or such agreement shall be renewed under paragraph (4)(A)) not later than January 30 of the preceding year.
“(2) *PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA*.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under

this section shall collect and have available appropriate data, as determined by the Secretary, to ensure that it can demonstrate to the Secretary compliance with the requirements under the program.

“(3) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall comply with requirements imposed by the Secretary or a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3), as applicable, for purposes of administering the program, including any determination under subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(1) or procedures established under such subsection (c)(1).

“(4) LENGTH OF AGREEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An agreement under this section shall be effective for an initial period of not less than 12 months and shall be automatically renewed for a period of not less than 1 year unless terminated under subparagraph (B).

“(B) TERMINATION.—

“(i) BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may provide for termination of an agreement under this section for a knowing and willful violation of the requirements of the agreement or other good cause shown. Such termination shall not be effective earlier than 30 days after the date of notice to the manufacturer of such termination. The Secretary shall provide, upon request, a manufacturer with a hearing concerning such a termination, and such hearing shall take place prior to the effective date of the termination with sufficient time for such effective date to be repealed if the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(ii) BY A MANUFACTURER.—A manufacturer may terminate an agreement under this section for any reason. Any such termination shall be effective, with respect to a plan year—

“(I) if the termination occurs before January 30 of a plan year, as of the day after the end of the plan year; and

“(II) if the termination occurs on or after January 30 of a plan year, as of the day after the end of the succeeding plan year.

“(iii) EFFECTIVENESS OF TERMINATION.—Any termination under this subparagraph shall not affect discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are due under the agreement before the effective date of its termination.

“(iv) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTY.—The Secretary shall provide notice of such termination to a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3) within not less than 30 days before the effective date of such termination.

“(c) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The duties described in this subsection are the following:

“(1) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—Administering the program, including—

“(A) the determination of the amount of the discounted price of an applicable drug of a manufacturer;

“(B) the establishment of procedures under which discounted prices are provided to applicable beneficiaries at pharmacies or by mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug;

“(C) the establishment of procedures to ensure that, not later than the applicable number of calendar days after the dispensing of an applicable drug by a pharmacy or mail order service, the pharmacy or mail order service is reimbursed for an amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the negotiated price of the applicable drug; and

“(ii) the discounted price of the applicable drug;

“(D) the establishment of procedures to ensure that the discounted price for an applicable drug under this section is applied before any coverage or financial assistance under other health benefit plans or programs that provide coverage or financial assistance for the purchase or provision of prescription drug coverage on behalf of applicable beneficiaries as the Secretary may specify; and

“(E) providing a reasonable dispute resolution mechanism to resolve disagreements between

manufacturers, applicable beneficiaries, and the third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3).

“(2) MONITORING COMPLIANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor compliance by a manufacturer with the terms of an agreement under this section.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—If a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3) determines that the manufacturer is not in compliance with such agreement, the third party shall notify the Secretary of such noncompliance for appropriate enforcement under subsection (e).

“(3) COLLECTION OF DATA FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS.—The Secretary may collect appropriate data from prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans in a timeframe that allows for discounted prices to be provided for applicable drugs under this section.

“(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall provide for the implementation of this section, including the performance of the duties described in subsection (c).

“(2) LIMITATION.—In providing for the implementation of this section, the Secretary shall not receive or distribute any funds of a manufacturer under the program.

“(3) CONTRACT WITH THIRD PARTIES.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with 1 or more third parties to administer the requirements established by the Secretary in order to carry out this section. At a minimum, the contract with a third party under the preceding sentence shall require that the third party—

“(A) receive and transmit information between the Secretary, manufacturers, and other individuals or entities the Secretary determines appropriate;

“(B) receive, distribute, or facilitate the distribution of funds of manufacturers to appropriate individuals or entities in order to meet the obligations of manufacturers under agreements under this section;

“(C) provide adequate and timely information to manufacturers, consistent with the agreement with the manufacturer under this section, as necessary for the manufacturer to fulfill its obligations under this section; and

“(D) permit manufacturers to conduct periodic audits, directly or through contracts, of the data and information used by the third party to determine discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer under the program.

“(4) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish performance requirements for a third party with a contract under paragraph (3) and safeguards to protect the independence and integrity of the activities carried out by the third party under the program under this section.

“(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement the program under this section by program instruction or otherwise.

“(6) ADMINISTRATION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the program under this section.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) AUDITS.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall be subject to periodic audit by the Secretary.

“(2) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may impose a civil money penalty on a manufacturer that fails to provide applicable beneficiaries discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer in accordance with such agreement for each such failure in an amount the Secretary determines is equal to the sum of—

“(i) the amount that the manufacturer would have paid with respect to such discounts under the agreement, which will then be used to pay the discounts which the manufacturer had failed to provide; and

“(ii) 25 percent of such amount.

“(B) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall

apply to a civil money penalty under this paragraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(f) CLARIFICATION REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF OTHER COVERED PART D DRUGS.—Nothing in this section shall prevent an applicable beneficiary from purchasing a covered part D drug that is not an applicable drug (including a generic drug or a drug that is not on the formulary of the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICABLE BENEFICIARY.—The term ‘applicable beneficiary’ means an individual who, on the date of dispensing a covered part D drug—

“(A) is enrolled in a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan;

“(B) is not enrolled in a qualified retiree prescription drug plan; and

“(C) has incurred costs, as determined in accordance with section 1860D-2(b)(4)(C), for covered part D drugs in the year that exceed the annual deductible with respect to such individual for such year, as specified in section 1860D-2(b)(1), section 1860D-14(a)(1)(B), or section 1860D-14(a)(2)(B), as applicable.

“(2) APPLICABLE DRUG.—The term ‘applicable drug’, with respect to an applicable beneficiary—

“(A) means a covered part D drug—

“(i) approved under a new drug application under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or, in the case of a biologic product, licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; and

“(ii) (I) if the PDP sponsor of the prescription drug plan or the MA organization offering the MA-PD plan uses a formulary, which is on the formulary of the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in;

“(II) if the PDP sponsor of the prescription drug plan or the MA organization offering the MA-PD plan does not use a formulary, for which benefits are available under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in; or

“(III) is provided through an exception or appeal; and

“(B) does not include a selected drug (as defined in section 1192(c)) during a price applicability period (as defined in section 1191(b)(2)) with respect to such drug.

“(3) APPLICABLE NUMBER OF CALENDAR DAYS.—The term ‘applicable number of calendar days’ means—

“(A) with respect to claims for reimbursement submitted electronically, 14 days; and

“(B) with respect to claims for reimbursement submitted otherwise, 30 days.

“(4) DISCOUNTED PRICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘discounted price’ means, with respect to an applicable drug of a manufacturer dispensed during a year to an applicable beneficiary—

“(i) who has not incurred costs, as determined in accordance with section 1860D-2(b)(4)(C), for covered part D drugs in the year that are equal to or exceed the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B)(i) for the year, 90 percent of the negotiated price of such drug; and

“(ii) who has incurred such costs, as so determined, in the year that are equal to or exceed such threshold for the year, 70 percent of the negotiated price of such drug.

“(B) CLARIFICATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibility of an applicable beneficiary for payment of a dispensing fee for an applicable drug.

“(C) SPECIAL CASE FOR CERTAIN CLAIMS.—

“(i) CLAIMS SPANNING DEDUCTIBLE.—In the case where the entire amount of the negotiated price of an individual claim for an applicable drug with respect to an applicable beneficiary

does not fall above the annual deductible specified in section 1860D-2(b)(1) for the year, the manufacturer of the applicable drug shall provide the discounted price under this section on only the portion of the negotiated price of the applicable drug that falls above such annual deductible.

“(ii) CLAIMS SPANNING OUT-OF-POCKET THRESHOLD.—In the case where the entire amount of the negotiated price of an individual claim for an applicable drug with respect to an applicable beneficiary does not fall entirely below or entirely above the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B)(i) for the year, the manufacturer of the applicable drug shall provide the discounted price—

“(I) in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i) on the portion of the negotiated price of the applicable drug that falls below such threshold; and

“(II) in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii) on the portion of such price of such drug that falls at or above such threshold.

“(5) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means any entity which is engaged in the production, preparation, propagation, compounding, conversion, or processing of prescription drug products, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of natural origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis. Such term does not include a wholesale distributor of drugs or a retail pharmacy licensed under State law.

“(6) NEGOTIATED PRICE.—The term ‘negotiated price’ has the meaning given such term in section 423.100 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), except that, with respect to an applicable drug, such negotiated price shall not include any dispensing fee for the applicable drug.

“(7) QUALIFIED RETIREE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—The term ‘qualified retiree prescription drug plan’ has the meaning given such term in section 1860D-22(a)(2).”

(2) SUNSET OF MEDICARE COVERAGE GAP DISCOUNT PROGRAM.—Section 1860D-14A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395-114a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Subject to subsection (h), the Secretary”; and

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

“(h) SUNSET OF PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The program shall not apply with respect to applicable drugs dispensed on or after January 1, 2022, and, subject to paragraph (2), agreements under this section shall be terminated as of such date.

“(2) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR APPLICABLE DRUGS DISPENSED PRIOR TO SUNSET.—The provisions of this section (including all responsibilities and duties) shall continue to apply after January 1, 2022, with respect to applicable drugs dispensed prior to such date.”

(3) INCLUSION OF ACTUARIAL VALUE OF MANUFACTURER DISCOUNTS IN BIDS.—Section 1860D-11 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iii)—

(i) by striking “assumptions regarding the reinsurance” and inserting “assumptions regarding—

“(I) the reinsurance”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the manufacturer discounts provided under section 1860D-14C subtracted from the actuarial value to produce such bid; and”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(C)—

(i) by striking “an actuarial valuation of the reinsurance” and inserting “an actuarial valuation of—

“(i) the reinsurance”; and

(ii) in clause (i), as inserted by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by adding “and” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the manufacturer discounts provided under section 1860D-14C;”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1860D-2 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)(I), by striking “, or an increase in the initial” and inserting “or, for a year preceding 2022, an increase in the initial”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “AT INITIAL COVERAGE LIMIT”; and

(ii) by inserting “for a year preceding 2022 or the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in subsection (b)(4)(B) for the year for 2022 and each subsequent year” after “subsection (b)(3) for the year” each place it appears; and

(C) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking “or an initial” and inserting “or, for a year preceding 2022, an initial”.

(2) Section 1860D-4(a)(4)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-104(a)(4)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “the initial” and inserting “for a year preceding 2022, the initial”.

(3) Section 1860D-14(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “The continuation” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the continuation”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by striking “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)” and inserting “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa)”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “The elimination” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the elimination”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “The continuation” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the continuation”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)” and inserting “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa)”.

(4) Section 1860D-21(d)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-131(d)(7)) is amended by striking “section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B)(i)” and inserting “section 1860D-2(b)(4)(C)(i)”.

(5) Section 1860D-22(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-132(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking “the value of any discount” and inserting the following: “the value of—

“(i) for years prior to 2022, any discount”; and

(B) in clause (i), as inserted by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) for 2022 and each subsequent year, any discount provided pursuant to section 1860D-14C.”

(6) Section 1860D-41(a)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-151(a)(6)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “for a year before 2022” after “1860D-2(b)(3)”; and

(B) by inserting “for such year” before the period.

(7) Section 1860D-43 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-153) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) participate in—

“(A) for 2011 through 2021, the Medicare coverage gap discount program under section 1860D-14A; and

“(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the manufacturer discount program under section 1860D-14C;”

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) have entered into and have in effect—

“(A) for 2011 through 2021, an agreement described in subsection (b) of section 1860D-14A with the Secretary; and

“(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year, an agreement described in subsection (b) of section 1860D-14C with the Secretary; and”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) have entered into and have in effect, under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary—

“(A) for 2011 through 2021, a contract with a third party that the Secretary has entered into a contract with under subsection (d)(3) of section 1860D-14A; and

“(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year, a contract with a third party that the Secretary has entered into a contract with under subsection (d)(3) of section 1860D-14C.”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(A), and (3)(A) of subsection (a) shall apply to covered part D drugs dispensed under this part on or after January 1, 2011, and before January 1, 2022, and paragraphs (1)(B), (2)(B), and (3)(B) of such subsection shall apply to covered part D drugs dispensed under this part on or after January 1, 2022.”

(8) Section 1927 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396-8) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(C)(i)(VI), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or under the manufacturer discount program under section 1860D-14C”; and

(B) in subsection (k)(1)(B)(i)(V), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or under section 1860D-14C”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to plan year 2022 and subsequent plan years.

SEC. 302. ALLOWING CERTAIN ENROLLEES OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM TO SPREAD OUT COST-SHARING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

Section 1860D-2(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(b)(2)), as amended by section 301, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D)” and inserting “Subject to subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) ENROLLEE OPTION REGARDING SPREADING COST-SHARING.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation a process under which, with respect to plan year 2022 and subsequent plan years, a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan shall, in the case of a part D eligible individual enrolled with such plan for such plan year who is not a subsidy eligible individual (as defined in section 1860D-14(a)(3)) and with respect to whom the plan projects that the dispensing of the first fill of a covered part D drug to such individual will result in the individual incurring costs that are equal to or above the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in paragraph (4)(B) for such plan year, provide such individual with the option to make the coinsurance payment required under subparagraph (A) (for the portion of such costs that are not above such annual out-of-pocket threshold) in the form of periodic installments over the remainder of such plan year.”

SEC. 303. ESTABLISHMENT OF PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

Section 1860D-4(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-104(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the paragraph (6), as added by section 50354 of division E of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), as paragraph (7); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) APPLICATION OF PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A PDP sponsor that implements incentive payments to a pharmacy or

price concessions paid by a pharmacy based on quality measures shall use measures established or approved by the Secretary under subparagraph (B) with respect to payment for covered part D drugs dispensed by such pharmacy.

“(B) STANDARD PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish or approve standard quality measures from a consensus and evidence-based organization for payments described in subparagraph (A). Such measures shall focus on patient health outcomes and be based on proven criteria measuring pharmacy performance.

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement under subparagraph (A) shall take effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2021, or such earlier date specified by the Secretary if the Secretary determines there are sufficient measures established or approved under subparagraph (B) to meet the requirement under subparagraph (A).”.

TITLE IV—DRUG PRICE TRANSPARENCY
SEC. 401. DRUG PRICE TRANSPARENCY.

Part A of title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 1150C. REPORTING ON DRUG PRICES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means the person—

“(A) that holds the application for a drug approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; or

“(B) who is responsible for setting the wholesale acquisition cost for the drug.

“(2) QUALIFYING DRUG.—The term ‘qualifying drug’ means any drug that is approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act—

“(A) that has a wholesale acquisition cost of \$100 or more, adjusted for inflation occurring after the date of enactment of this section, for a month’s supply or a typical course of treatment that lasts less than a month, and is—

“(i) subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and

“(ii) not a preventative vaccine; and

“(B) for which, during the previous calendar year, at least 1 dollar of the total amount of sales were for individuals enrolled under the Medicare program under title XVIII or under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX or under a waiver of such plan.

“(3) WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST.—The term ‘wholesale acquisition cost’ has the meaning given that term in section 1847A(c)(6)(B).

“(b) REPORT.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—The manufacturer of a qualifying drug shall submit a report to the Secretary if, with respect to the qualifying drug—

“(A) there is an increase in the price of the qualifying drug that results in an increase in the wholesale acquisition cost of that drug that is equal to—

“(i) 10 percent or more within a 12-month period beginning on or after January 1, 2019; or

“(ii) 25 percent or more within a 36-month period beginning on or after January 1, 2019;

“(B) the estimated price of the qualifying drug or spending per individual or per user of such drug (as estimated by the Secretary) for the applicable year (or per course of treatment in such applicable year as determined by the Secretary) is at least \$26,000 beginning on or after January 1, 2021; or

“(C) there was an increase in the price of the qualifying drug that resulted in an increase in the wholesale acquisition cost of that drug that is equal to—

“(i) 10 percent or more within a 12-month period that begins and ends during the 5-year period preceding January 1, 2021; or

“(ii) 25 percent or more within a 36-month period that begins and ends during the 5-year period preceding January 1, 2021.

“(2) REPORT DEADLINE.—Each report described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Secretary—

“(A) in the case of a report with respect to an increase in the price of a qualifying drug that occurs during the period beginning on January 1, 2019, and ending on the day that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 90 days after such date of enactment;

“(B) in the case of a report with respect to an increase in the price of a qualifying drug that occurs after the period described in subparagraph (A), not later than 30 days prior to the planned effective date of such price increase for such qualifying drug;

“(C) in the case of a report with respect to a qualifying drug that meets the criteria under paragraph (1)(B), not later than 30 days after such drug meets such criteria; and

“(D) in the case of a report with respect to an increase in the price of a qualifying drug that occurs during a 12-month or 36-month period described in paragraph (1)(C), not later than April 1, 2021.

“(c) CONTENTS.—A report under subsection (b), consistent with the standard for disclosures described in section 213.3(d) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section), shall, at a minimum, include—

“(1) with respect to the qualifying drug—

“(A) the percentage by which the manufacturer will raise the wholesale acquisition cost of the drug within the 12-month period or 36-month period as described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i), (b)(1)(A)(ii), (b)(1)(C)(i), or (b)(1)(C)(ii), as applicable, and the effective date of such price increase or the cost associated with a qualifying drug if such drug meets the criteria under subsection (b)(1)(B) and the effective date at which such drug meets such criteria;

“(B) an explanation for, and description of, each price increase for such drug that will occur during the 12-month period or the 36-month period described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i), (b)(1)(A)(ii), (b)(1)(C)(i), or (b)(1)(C)(ii), as applicable;

“(C) an explanation for, and description of, the cost associated with a qualifying drug if such drug meets the criteria under subsection (b)(1)(B), as applicable;

“(D) if known and different from the manufacturer of the qualifying drug, the identity of—

“(i) the sponsor or sponsors of any investigational new drug applications under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for clinical investigations with respect to such drug, for which the full reports are submitted as part of the application—

“(I) for approval of the drug under section 505 of such Act; or

“(II) for licensure of the drug under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act; and

“(ii) the sponsor of an application for the drug approved under such section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

“(E) a description of the history of the manufacturer’s price increases for the drug since the approval of the application for the drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the issuance of the license for the drug under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, or since the manufacturer acquired such approved application or license, if applicable;

“(F) the current wholesale acquisition cost of the drug;

“(G) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on—

“(i) materials and manufacturing for such drug;

“(ii) acquiring patents and licensing for such drug; and

“(iii) purchasing or acquiring such drug from another manufacturer, if applicable;

“(H) the percentage of total expenditures of the manufacturer on research and development for such drug that was derived from Federal funds;

“(I) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on research and development for such drug that is necessary to demonstrate that it meets applicable statutory standards for approval under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensure under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, as applicable;

“(J) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on pursuing new or expanded indications or dosage changes for such drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act;

“(K) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on carrying out postmarket requirements related to such drug, including under section 505(o)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

“(L) the total revenue and the net profit generated from the qualifying drug for each calendar year since the approval of the application for the drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the issuance of the license for the drug under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, or since the manufacturer acquired such approved application or license; and

“(M) the total costs associated with marketing and advertising for the qualifying drug;

“(2) with respect to the manufacturer—

“(A) the total revenue and the net profit of the manufacturer for each of the 12-month period described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) or (b)(1)(C)(i) or the 36-month period described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) or (b)(1)(C)(ii), as applicable;

“(B) all stock-based performance metrics used by the manufacturer to determine executive compensation for each of the 12-month periods described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) or (b)(1)(C)(i) or the 36-month periods described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) or (b)(1)(C)(ii), as applicable; and

“(C) any additional information the manufacturer chooses to provide related to drug pricing decisions, such as total expenditures on—

“(i) drug research and development; or

“(ii) clinical trials, including on drugs that failed to receive approval by the Food and Drug Administration; and

“(3) such other related information as the Secretary considers appropriate and as specified by the Secretary.

“(d) INFORMATION PROVIDED.—The manufacturer of a qualifying drug that is required to submit a report under subsection (b), shall ensure that such report and any explanation for, and description of, each price increase described in subsection (c)(1) shall be truthful, not misleading, and accurate.

“(e) CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY.—Any manufacturer of a qualifying drug that fails to submit a report for the drug as required by this section, following notification by the Secretary to the manufacturer that the manufacturer is not in compliance with this section, shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of \$75,000 for each day on which the violation continues.

“(f) FALSE INFORMATION.—Any manufacturer that submits a report for a drug as required by this section that knowingly provides false information in such report is subject to a civil monetary penalty in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for each item of false information.

“(g) PUBLIC POSTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (4), the Secretary shall post each report submitted under subsection (b) on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the day the price increase of a qualifying drug is scheduled to go into effect.

“(2) FORMAT.—In developing the format in which reports will be publicly posted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including beneficiary groups, and

shall seek feedback from consumer advocates and readability experts on the format and presentation of the content of such reports to ensure that such reports are—

“(A) user-friendly to the public; and
“(B) written in plain language that consumers can readily understand.

“(3) LIST.—In addition to the reports submitted under subsection (b), the Secretary shall also post a list of each qualifying drug with respect to which the manufacturer was required to submit such a report in the preceding year and whether such manufacturer was required to submit such report based on a qualifying price increase or whether such drug meets the criteria under subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(4) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall enforce applicable law concerning the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets.

“SEC. 1150D. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Finance of the Senate, and post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a way that is user-friendly to the public and written in plain language that consumers can readily understand, an annual report—

“(1) summarizing the information reported pursuant to section 1150C;

“(2) including copies of the reports and supporting detailed economic analyses submitted pursuant to such section;

“(3) detailing the costs and expenditures incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services in carrying out section 1150C; and

“(4) explaining how the Department of Health and Human Services is improving consumer and provider information about drug value and drug price transparency.

“(b) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall enforce applicable law concerning the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets.”.

TITLE V—PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS FOR MEDICARE LOW-INCOME BENEFICIARIES

SEC. 501. DISSEMINATION TO MEDICARE PART D SUBSIDY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS OF INFORMATION COMPARING PREMIUMS OF CERTAIN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS.

Section 1860D–1(c)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101(c)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) INFORMATION ON PREMIUMS FOR SUBSIDY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For plan year 2022 and each subsequent plan year, the Secretary shall disseminate to each subsidy eligible individual (as defined in section 1860D–14(a)(3)) information under this paragraph comparing premiums that would apply to such individual for prescription drug coverage under LIS benchmark plans, including, in the case of an individual enrolled in a prescription drug plan under this part, information that compares the premium that would apply if such individual were to remain enrolled in such plan to premiums that would apply if the individual were to enroll in other LIS benchmark plans.

“(ii) LIS BENCHMARK PLAN.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘LIS benchmark plan’ means, with respect to an individual, a prescription drug plan under this part that is offered in the region in which the individual resides and—

“(I) that provides for a premium that is not more than the low-income benchmark premium amount (as defined in section 1860D–14(b)(2)) for such region; or

“(II) with respect to which the premium would be waived as de minimis pursuant to section 1860D–14(a)(5) for such individual.”.

SEC. 502. PROVIDING FOR INTELLIGENT ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN SUBSIDY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS AUTO-ENROLLED UNDER MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D–1(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting after “PDP region” the following: “or through use of an intelligent assignment process that is designed to maximize the access of such individual to necessary prescription drugs while minimizing costs to such individual and to the program under this part to the greatest extent possible. In the case the Secretary enrolls such individuals through use of an intelligent assignment process, such process shall take into account the extent to which prescription drugs necessary for the individual are covered in the case of a PDP sponsor of a prescription drug plan that uses a formulary, the use of prior authorization or other restrictions on access to coverage of such prescription drugs by such a sponsor, and the overall quality of a prescription drug plan as measured by quality ratings established by the Secretary”; and

(B) by striking “Nothing in the previous sentence” and inserting “Nothing in this subparagraph”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by inserting after “PDP region” the following: “or through use of an intelligent assignment process that is designed to maximize the access of such individual to necessary prescription drugs while minimizing costs to such individual and to the program under this part to the greatest extent possible. In the case the Secretary enrolls such individuals through use of an intelligent assignment process, such process shall take into account the extent to which prescription drugs necessary for the individual are covered in the case of a PDP sponsor of a prescription drug plan that uses a formulary, the use of prior authorization or other restrictions on access to coverage of such prescription drugs by such a sponsor, and the overall quality of a prescription drug plan as measured by quality ratings established by the Secretary”; and

(B) by striking “Nothing in the previous sentence” and inserting “Nothing in this subparagraph”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning with plan year 2022.

SEC. 503. EXPANDING ELIGIBILITY FOR LOW-INCOME SUBSIDIES UNDER PART D OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1860D–14(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–114(a)), as amended by section 301(d), is further amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “INDIVIDUALS” and all that follows through “LINE” and inserting “CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “INDIVIDUALS WITH CERTAIN LOW INCOMES”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(or, with respect to a plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2022, 150 percent)” after “135 percent”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “OTHER LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “In the case of a subsidy” and inserting “With respect to a plan year beginning before January 1, 2022, in the case of a subsidy”.

SEC. 504. AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LOW-INCOME TERRITORIAL RESIDENTS FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM; SUNSET OF ENHANCED ALLOTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LOW-INCOME TERRITORIAL RESIDENTS FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D–14(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–114(a)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(v)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by inserting after subclause (II) the following new subclause:

“(III) with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2024, shall provide that any part D eligible individual who is enrolled for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan of a territory (as defined in section 1935(f)) under title XIX (or a waiver of such a plan) shall be treated as a subsidy eligible individual described in paragraph (1).”; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The previous sentence shall not apply with respect to eligibility determinations for premium and cost-sharing subsidies under this section made on or after January 1, 2024.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1860D–31(j)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–141(j)(2)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The previous sentence shall not apply with respect to amounts made available to a State under this paragraph on or after January 1, 2024.”.

(b) SUNSET OF ENHANCED ALLOTMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1935(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting after “such State” the following: “before January 1, 2021”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting after “a year” the following: “(before 2024)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “a subsequent year” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2008 through 2023”.

(2) TERRITORY DEFINED.—Section 1935 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) TERRITORY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘territory’ means Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.”.

SEC. 505. AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER PART D OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Clause (v) of section 1860D–14(a)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–114(a)(3)(B)), as amended by section 504, is further amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subclause (III), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subclause (III) the following new subclause:

“(IV) with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2024, shall, notwithstanding the preceding clauses of this subparagraph, provide that any part D eligible individual not described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) who is enrolled, as of the day before the date on which such individual attains the age of 65, for medical assistance under a State plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) pursuant to clause (i)(VIII) or (ii)(XX) of section 1902(a)(10)(A), and who has income below 200 percent of the poverty line applicable to a family of the size involved, shall be treated as a subsidy eligible individual described in paragraph (1) for a limited period of time, as specified by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 506. PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN RULES REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLANS IN DETERMINING THE ELIGIBILITY OF INDIVIDUALS FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER PART D OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1860D-14(a)(3)(C)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)(3)(C)(i)) is amended, by striking “except that support and maintenance furnished in kind shall not be counted as income; and” and inserting “except that—

“(I) support and maintenance furnished in kind shall not be counted as income; and

“(II) for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2024, any distribution or withdrawal from an eligible retirement plan (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 402(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but excluding any defined benefit plan described in clause (iv) or (v) of such subparagraph and any qualified trust (as defined in subparagraph (A) of such section) which is part of such a defined benefit plan) shall be counted as income; and”.

SEC. 507. REDUCING COST-SHARING AND OTHER PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS FOR LOW-INCOME BENEFICIARIES.

(a) INCREASE IN INCOME ELIGIBILITY TO 150 PERCENT OF FPL FOR QUALIFIED MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905(p)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall be at least the percent provided under subparagraph (B) (but not more than 100 percent) of the official poverty line” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “shall be—

“(i) before January 1, 2022, at least the percent provided under subparagraph (B) (but not more than 100 percent) of the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981) applicable to a family of the size involved; and

“(ii) on or after January 1, 2022, equal to 150 percent of the official poverty line (as so defined and revised) applicable to a family of the size involved.”.

(2) NOT COUNTING IN-KIND SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE AS INCOME.—Section 1905(p)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(2)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) In determining income under this subsection, support and maintenance furnished in kind, as described in section 1612(a)(2)(A), shall not be counted as income.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 1902(a)(10)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(E)) is amended—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “for making medical” and inserting “before January 1, 2022, for making medical”; and

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking “subject to sections” and inserting “before January 1, 2022, subject to sections”.

(B) Section 1933 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u-3) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “A State plan” and inserting “Subject to subsection (h), a State plan”; and

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

“(h) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall have no force or effect after December 31, 2021.”.

(b) 100 PERCENT FMAP.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(gg) INCREASED FMAP FOR EXPANDED MEDICARE COST-SHARING POPULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), with respect to expenditures described in paragraph (2) the Federal medical assistance percentage shall be equal to 100 percent.

“(2) EXPENDITURES DESCRIBED.—The expenditures described in this paragraph are expenditures made on or after January 1, 2022, for medical assistance for medicare cost-sharing provided to any individual under clause (i) or (ii) of section 1902(a)(10)(E) who would not have been eligible for medicare cost-sharing under any such clause under the income or resource eligibility standards in effect on October 1, 2018.”.

TITLE VI—PROVIDING FOR DENTAL, VISION, AND HEARING COVERAGE UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

SEC. 601. DENTAL AND ORAL HEALTH CARE.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (GG), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (HH), by striking the period at the end and adding “; and”; and

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

“(II) dental and oral health services (as defined in subsection (kkk))”.

(b) DENTAL AND ORAL HEALTH SERVICES DEFINED.—Section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(kkk) DENTAL AND ORAL HEALTH SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘dental and oral health services’ means items and services (other than such items and services for which payment may be made under part A as inpatient hospital services) that are furnished during 2025 or a subsequent year, for which coverage was not provided under part B as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, and that are—

“(A) the preventive and screening services described in paragraph (2) furnished by a doctor of dental surgery or of dental medicine (as described in subsection (r)(2)) or an oral health professional (as defined in paragraph (4)); or

“(B) the basic treatments specified for such year by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3)(A) and the major treatments specified for such year by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3)(B) furnished by such a doctor or such a professional.

“(2) PREVENTIVE AND SCREENING SERVICES.—The preventive and screening services described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) Oral exams.

“(B) Dental cleanings.

“(C) Dental x-rays performed in the office of a doctor or professional described in paragraph (1)(A).

“(D) Fluoride treatments.

“(3) BASIC AND MAJOR TREATMENTS.—For 2025 and each subsequent year, the Secretary shall specify—

“(A) basic treatments (which may include basic tooth restorations, basic periodontic services, tooth extractions, and oral disease management services); and

“(B) major treatments (which may include major tooth restorations, major periodontic services, bridges, crowns, and root canals); that shall be included as dental and oral health services for such year.

“(4) ORAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL.—The term ‘oral health professional’ means, with respect to dental and oral health services, a health professional who is licensed to furnish such services, acting within the scope of such license, by the State in which such services are furnished.”.

(c) PAYMENT; COINSURANCE; AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (N), by inserting “and dental and oral health services (as defined in section 1861(kkk))” after “section 1861(hh)(1)”; and

(B) by striking “and” before “(CC)”; and

(C) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “; and (DD) with respect to dental and oral health services (as defined in section 1861(kkk)), the amount paid shall be the payment amount specified under section 1834(x)”.

(2) PAYMENT AND LIMITS SPECIFIED.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(x) PAYMENT AND LIMITS FOR DENTAL AND ORAL HEALTH SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The payment amount under this part for dental and oral health services (as defined in section 1861(kkk)) shall be, subject to paragraph (3), the applicable percent (specified in paragraph (2)) of the lesser of the actual charge for the services or the amount determined under the payment basis determined under section 1848. In determining such amounts determined under such payment basis, the Secretary shall consider payment rates paid to dentists for comparable services under State plans under title XIX, under the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, and by other health care payers, such as Medicare Advantage plans under part C.

“(2) APPLICABLE PERCENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percent specified in this paragraph is, with respect to dental and oral health services (as defined in section 1861(kkk)) furnished in a year—

“(A) that are preventive and screening services described in paragraph (2) or basic treatments specified for such year pursuant to paragraph (3)(A) of such section, 80 percent; and

“(B) that are major treatments specified for such year pursuant to paragraph (3)(B) of such section—

“(i) in the case such services are furnished during 2025, 10 percent;

“(ii) in the case such services are furnished during 2026 or a subsequent year before 2029, the applicable percent specified under this subparagraph for the previous year, increased by 10 percentage points; and

“(iii) in the case such services are furnished during 2029 or a subsequent year, 50 percent.

“(3) LIMITATIONS.—With respect to dental and oral health services that are—

“(A) preventive and screening oral exams, payment may be made under this part for not more than two such exams during a 12-month period;

“(B) dental cleanings, payment may be made under this part for not more than two such cleanings during a 12-month period; and

“(C) not described in subparagraph (A) or (B), payment may be made under this part only at such frequencies and under such circumstances determined appropriate by the Secretary.”.

(d) PAYMENT UNDER PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1848(j)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(j)(3)) is amended by inserting “(2)(II),” before “(3)”.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM MIPS.—Section 1848(q)(1)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(q)(1)(C)(ii)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (II), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subclause (III), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(IV) with respect to 2025 and each subsequent year, is a doctor of dental surgery or of dental medicine (as described in section 1861(r)(2)) or is an oral health professional (as defined in section 1861(kkk)(4)).”.

(3) INCLUSION OF ORAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS AS CERTAIN PRACTITIONERS.—Section 1842(b)(18)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(b)(18)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) With respect to 2025 and each subsequent year, an oral health professional (as defined in section 1861(kkk)(4)).”.

(e) DENTURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(s)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(8)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(other than dental)”; and

(B) by inserting “and excluding dental, except for a full or partial set of dentures furnished on or after January 1, 2025” after “colostomy care”.

(2) SPECIAL PAYMENT RULES.—

(A) LIMITATIONS.—Section 1834(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL PAYMENT RULE FOR DENTURES.—Payment may be made under this part with respect to an individual for dentures—

“(A) not more than once during any 5-year period (except in the case that a doctor or professional described in section 1861(kkk)(1)(A) determines such dentures do not fit the individual); and

“(B) only to the extent that such dentures are furnished pursuant to a written order of such a doctor or professional.”.

(B) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(h)(1)(H) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(1)(H)) is amended—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “, DENTURES” after “ORTHOTICS”;

(II) by inserting “, of dentures described in paragraph (2)(D) of such section,” after “2011,”; and

(III) in clause (i), by inserting “, such dentures” after “orthotics”.

(ii) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1847(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) DENTURES.—Dentures described in section 1861(s)(8) for which payment would otherwise be made under section 1834(h).”.

(iii) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ITEMS FROM COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—Section 1847(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) CERTAIN DENTURES.—Those items and services described in paragraph (2)(D) if furnished by a physician or other practitioner (as defined by the Secretary) to the physician’s or practitioner’s own patients as part of the physician’s or practitioner’s professional service.”.

(f) EXCLUSION MODIFICATIONS.—Section 1862(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (O), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (P), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) in the case of dental and oral health services (as defined in section 1861(kkk)) that are preventive and screening services described in paragraph (2) of such section, which are furnished more frequently than provided under section 1834(x)(3) and under circumstances other than circumstances determined appropriate under such section;” and

(2) in paragraph (12), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and except that payment may be made under part B for dental and oral health services that are covered under section 1861(s)(2)(II)”.

(g) CERTAIN NON-APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 1839(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(a)) are amended by adding at the end of each such paragraphs the following: “In applying this paragraph there shall not be taken into account benefits and administrative costs attributable to the amendments made by section 601 (other than subsection (g)) of the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act

and the Government contribution under section 1844(a)(4)”.

(2) PAYMENT.—Section 1844(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; plus”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) a Government contribution equal to the amount that is estimated to be payable for benefits and related administrative costs incurred that are attributable to the amendments made by section 601 (other than subsection (g)) of the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.”.

(h) IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account of—

(A) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025 for purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section; and

(B) such sums as determined appropriate by the Secretary for each subsequent fiscal year for purposes of administering the provisions of such amendments.

(2) AVAILABILITY AND ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.—Funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended and may be used, in addition to the purpose specified in paragraph (1)(A), to implement the amendments made by sections 602 and 603.

SEC. 602. PROVIDING COVERAGE FOR HEARING CARE UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) PROVISION OF AURAL REHABILITATION AND TREATMENT SERVICES BY QUALIFIED AUDIOLOGISTS.—Section 1861(ll)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(ll)(3)) is amended by inserting “(and, beginning January 1, 2023, such aural rehabilitation and treatment services)” after “assessment services”.

(b) COVERAGE OF HEARING AIDS.—

(1) INCLUSION OF HEARING AIDS AS PROSTHETIC DEVICES.—Section 1861(s)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(8)) is amended by inserting “, and including hearing aids furnished on or after January 1, 2023, to individuals diagnosed with profound or severe hearing loss” before the semicolon at the end.

(2) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS FOR HEARING AIDS.—Section 1834(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(A), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) LIMITATIONS FOR HEARING AIDS.—Payment may be made under this part with respect to an individual, with respect to hearing aids furnished on or after January 1, 2023—

“(A) not more than once during a 5-year period;

“(B) only for types of such hearing aids that are not over-the-counter hearing aids (as defined in section 520(q)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) and that are determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

“(C) only if furnished pursuant to a written order of a physician or qualified audiologist (as defined in section 1861(ll)(4)(B)).”.

(3) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(h)(1)(H) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(1)(H)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(i), is further amended—

(i) in the header, by inserting “, HEARING AIDS” after “DENTURES”;

(ii) by inserting “, of hearing aids described in paragraph (2)(E) of such section,” after “paragraph (2)(D) of such section”; and

(iii) in clause (i), by inserting “, such hearing aids” after “such dentures”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(ii), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) HEARING AIDS.—Hearing aids described in section 1861(s)(8) for which payment would otherwise be made under section 1834(h).”.

(ii) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ITEMS FROM COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—Section 1847(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(7)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(iii), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) CERTAIN HEARING AIDS.—Those items and services described in paragraph (2)(E) if furnished by a physician or other practitioner (as defined by the Secretary) to the physician’s or practitioner’s own patients as part of the physician’s or practitioner’s professional service.”.

(4) INCLUSION OF AUDIOLOGISTS AS CERTAIN PRACTITIONERS TO RECEIVE PAYMENT ON AN ASSIGNMENT-RELATED BASIS.—Section 1842(b)(18)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(b)(18)(C)), as amended by section 601(d)(4), is further amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(viii) With respect to 2023 and each subsequent year, a qualified audiologist (as defined in section 1861(ll)(4)(B)).”.

(c) EXCLUSION MODIFICATION.—Section 1862(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)(7)) is amended by inserting “(except such hearing aids or examinations therefor as described in and otherwise allowed under section 1861(s)(8))” after “hearing aids or examinations therefor”.

(d) CERTAIN NON-APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The last sentence of section 1839(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(a)(1)), as added by section 601(g)(1), is amended by striking “section 601 (other than subsection (g))” and inserting “sections 601 (other than subsection (g)), 602 (other than subsection (d))”.

(2) PAYMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 1844(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(a)), as added by section 601(g)(2), is amended by striking “section 601 (other than subsection (g))” and inserting “sections 601 (other than subsection (g)), 602 (other than subsection (d))”.

(e) REPORT; REGULATIONS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study to assess (and submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report on) any program integrity or overutilization risks with respect to allowing qualified audiologists (as defined in paragraph (4)(B) of 1861(ll) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(ll))) to furnish audiology services (as defined in paragraph (3) of such section) to individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.) and enrolled for benefits under part B of such title (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.) without such individuals being referred by a physician (as defined in section 1861(r) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(r))) or practitioner (as described in section 602.32 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations) to such qualified audiologists. In conducting such study, the Inspector General may take into account experiences with audiologists furnishing audiology services to enrollees in other Federal programs, including in a health benefit plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code or in health care benefits under the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code or under chapter 17 of title 38 of such Code.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may promulgate regulations to allow qualified audiologists (as so defined) to furnish audiology services (as so defined) without a referral from a physician or practitioner, consistent with the findings submitted to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(B).

(f) IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account of—

(A) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 for purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section; and

(B) such sums as determined appropriate by the Secretary for each subsequent fiscal year for purposes of administering the provisions of such amendments.

(2) **AVAILABILITY AND ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended and may be used, in addition to the purpose specified in paragraph (1)(A), to implement the amendments made by sections 601 and 603.

SEC. 603. PROVIDING COVERAGE FOR VISION CARE UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) **COVERAGE.**—Section 1861(s)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)), as amended by section 601(a), is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (HH), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (II), by striking the period at the end and adding “; and”; and

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

“(JJ) vision services (as defined in subsection (III));”

(b) **VISION SERVICES DEFINED.**—Section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x), as amended by section 601(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(III) **VISION SERVICES.**—The term ‘vision services’ means—

“(1) routine eye examinations to determine the refractive state of the eyes, including procedures performed during the course of such examination; and

“(2) contact lens fitting services;

furnished on or after January 1, 2023, by or under the direct supervision of an optometrist or ophthalmologist who is legally authorized to furnish such examinations, procedures, or fitting services (as applicable) under State law (or the State regulatory mechanism provided by State law) of the State in which the examinations, procedures, or fitting services are furnished.”

(c) **PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m), as amended by section 601(c)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(y) **LIMITATION FOR VISION SERVICES.**—With respect to vision services (as defined in section 1861(III)) and an individual, payment may be made under this part for only 1 routine eye examination described in paragraph (1) of such section and 1 contact lens fitting service described in paragraph (2) of such section during a 2-year period.”

(d) **PAYMENT UNDER PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.**—Section 1848(j)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(j)(3)), as amended by section 601(d)(1), is further amended by inserting “(2)(JJ),” before “(3)”.

(e) **COVERAGE OF CONVENTIONAL EYEGLASSES AND CONTACT LENSES.**—Section 1861(s)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(8)), as amended by section 602(b)(1), is further amended by striking “, and including one pair of conventional eyeglasses or contact lenses furnished subsequent to each cataract surgery with insertion of an intraocular lens” and inserting “, including one pair of conventional eyeglasses or contact lenses furnished subsequent to each cataract surgery with insertion of an intraocular lens, if furnished before January 1, 2023, includ-

ing conventional eyeglasses or contact lenses, whether or not furnished subsequent to such a surgery, if furnished on or after January 1, 2024”.

(f) SPECIAL PAYMENT RULES FOR EYEGLASSES AND CONTACT LENSES.—

(1) **LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1834(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(A) and section 602(b)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) **PAYMENT LIMITATIONS FOR EYEGLASSES AND CONTACT LENSES.—**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to eyeglasses and contact lenses furnished to an individual on or after January 1, 2023, subject to subparagraph (B), payment may be made under this part only—

“(i) during a 2-year period, for either 1 pair of eyeglasses (including lenses and frames) or not more than a 2-year supply of contact lenses that is provided in not more than 180-day increments;

“(ii) with respect to amounts attributable to the lenses and frames of such a pair of eyeglasses or amounts attributable to such a 2-year supply of contact lenses, in an amount not greater than—

“(I) for a pair of eyeglasses furnished in, or a 2-year supply of contact lenses beginning in, 2023—

“(aa) \$85 for the lenses of such pair of eyeglasses and \$85 for the frames of such pair of eyeglasses; or

“(bb) \$85 for such 2-year supply of contact lenses; and

“(II) for the lenses and frames of a pair of eyeglasses furnished in, or a 2-year supply of contact lenses beginning in, a subsequent year, the dollar amounts specified under this subparagraph for the previous year, increased by the percentage change in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12-month period ending with June of the previous year;

“(iii) for types of eyeglass lenses, and for types of contact lenses, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

“(iv) if furnished pursuant to a written order of a physician described in section 1861(III); and

“(v) if during the 2-year period described in clause (i), the individual did not already receive (as described in subparagraph (B)) one pair of conventional eyeglasses or contact lenses subsequent to a cataract surgery with insertion of an intraocular lens furnished during such period.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—With respect to a 2-year period described in subparagraph (A)(i), in the case of an individual who receives cataract surgery with insertion of an intraocular lens, notwithstanding subparagraph (A), payment may be made under this part for one pair of conventional eyeglasses or contact lenses furnished subsequent to such cataract surgery during such period.”

(2) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1834(h)(1)(H) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(1)(H)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(i) and section 602(b)(3)(A), is further amended—

(i) in the header by inserting “, EYEGLASSES, AND CONTACT LENSES” after “HEARING AIDS”;

(ii) by inserting “and of eyeglasses and contact lenses described in paragraph (2)(F) of such section,” after “paragraph (2)(E) of such section,”; and

(iii) in clause (i), by inserting “, or such eyeglasses and contact lenses” after “such hearing aids”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1847(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(ii) and section 602(b)(3)(B)(i), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) **EYEGLASSES AND CONTACT LENSES.**—Eyeglasses and contact lenses described in section

1861(s)(8) for which payment would otherwise be made under section 1834(h).”

(ii) **EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ITEMS FROM COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.**—Section 1847(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(7)), as amended by section 601(e)(2)(B)(iii) and section 602(b)(3)(B)(ii), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) **CERTAIN EYEGLASSES AND CONTACT LENSES.**—Those items and services described in paragraph (2)(F) if furnished by a physician or other practitioner (as defined by the Secretary) to the physician’s or practitioner’s own patients as part of the physician’s or practitioner’s professional service.”

(g) **EXCLUSION MODIFICATIONS.**—Section 1862(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)), as amended by section 601(f), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (P), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (Q), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(R) in the case of vision services (as defined in section 1861(III)) that are routine eye examinations and contact lens fitting services (as described in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of such section), which are furnished more frequently than once during a 2-year period;” and

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting “(other than such an examination that is a vision service that is covered under section 1861(s)(2)(JJ))” after “eye examinations”; and

(B) by inserting “(other than such a procedure that is a vision service that is covered under section 1861(s)(2)(JJ))” after “refractive state of the eyes”.

(h) CERTAIN NON-APPLICATION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The last sentence of section 1839(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(a)(1)), as added by section 601(g)(1) and amended by section 602(d)(1), is further amended by inserting “, and 603 (other than subsection (h))” after “602 (other than subsection (d))”.

(2) **PAYMENT.**—Paragraph (4) of section 1844(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(a)), as added by section 601(g)(2) and amended by section 602(d)(2), is further amended by inserting “, and 603 (other than subsection (h))” after “602 (other than subsection (d))”.

(i) IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account of—

(A) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 for purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section; and

(B) such sums as determined appropriate by the Secretary for each subsequent fiscal year for purposes of administering the provisions of such amendments.

(2) **AVAILABILITY AND ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended and may be used, in addition to the purpose specified in paragraph (1)(A), to implement the amendments made by sections 601 and 602.

TITLE VII—NIH, FDA, AND OPIOIDS FUNDING**Subtitle A—Biomedical Innovation Expansion****SEC. 701. NIH INNOVATION INITIATIVES.****(a) NIH INNOVATION ACCOUNT.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1001(b) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114-255) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING AND ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—**

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds made available under paragraph (2), there are authorized to be appropriated, and are hereby appropriated, to the Account, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended without further appropriation, the following:

- “(i) For fiscal year 2021, \$255,400,000.
- “(ii) For fiscal year 2022, \$260,400,000.
- “(iii) For fiscal year 2023, \$163,400,000.
- “(iv) For fiscal year 2024, \$547,000,000.
- “(v) For fiscal year 2025, \$848,000,000.
- “(vi) For fiscal year 2026, \$842,400,000.
- “(vii) For fiscal year 2027, \$1,089,600,000.
- “(viii) For fiscal year 2028, \$1,115,600,000.
- “(ix) For fiscal year 2029, \$1,170,600,000.
- “(x) For fiscal year 2030, \$1,207,600,000.

“(B) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—Of the total amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030, a total amount not to exceed the following shall be made available for the following categories of NIH Innovation Projects:

“(i) For projects described in paragraph (4)(A), an amount not to exceed a total of \$2,070,600,000 as follows:

“(I) For each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022, \$50,000,000.

“(II) For fiscal year 2024, \$100,000,000.

“(III) For each of fiscal years 2025 and 2026, \$300,000,000.

“(IV) For each of fiscal years 2027 through 2029, \$317,000,000.

“(V) For fiscal year 2030, \$319,600,000.

“(ii) For projects described in paragraph (4)(B), an amount not to exceed a total of \$2,041,900,000 as follows:

“(I) For each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022, \$50,000,000.

“(II) For fiscal year 2024, \$128,000,000.

“(III) For fiscal year 2025, \$209,000,000.

“(IV) For fiscal year 2026, \$100,000,000.

“(V) For fiscal year 2027, \$325,000,000.

“(VI) For fiscal year 2028, \$350,000,000.

“(VII) For fiscal year 2029, \$400,000,000.

“(VIII) For fiscal year 2030, \$429,900,000.

“(iii) For projects described in paragraph (4)(C), an amount not to exceed a total of \$1,558,400,000 as follows:

“(I) For each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025, \$151,200,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030, \$251,200,000.

“(iv) For projects described in paragraph (4)(D), an amount not to exceed \$15,400,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

“(C) ADDITIONAL NIH INNOVATION PROJECTS.—In addition to funding NIH Innovation Projects pursuant to subparagraph (B), of the total amounts made available under subparagraph (A), a total amount not to exceed the following shall be made available for the following categories of NIH Innovation Projects:

“(i) To support research related to combating antimicrobial resistance and antibiotic resistant bacteria, including research into new treatments, diagnostics, and vaccines, research, in consultation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, into stewardship, and the development of strategies, in coordination with the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to support commercialization of new antibiotics, not to exceed a total of 1,144,500,000, as follows:

“(I) For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024, \$100,000,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2025 and 2026, \$120,000,000.

“(III) For each of fiscal years 2027 through 2029, \$125,000,000.

“(IV) For fiscal year 2030, \$129,500,000.

“(ii) To support research and research activities related to rare diseases or conditions, including studies or analyses that help to better understand the natural history of a rare disease or condition and translational studies related to rare diseases or conditions, not to exceed a total of \$530,600,000, as follows:

“(I) For fiscal year 2021, \$40,000,000.

“(II) For fiscal year 2022, \$45,000,000.

“(III) For fiscal year 2023, \$48,000,000.

“(IV) For each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025, \$52,400,000.

“(V) For fiscal year 2026, \$55,800,000.

“(VI) For fiscal year 2027, \$56,000,000.

“(VII) For fiscal year 2028, \$57,000,000.

“(VIII) For each of fiscal years 2029 and 2030, \$62,000,000.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1001 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (b)(4)” and inserting “subsections (b)(4) and (b)(5)”;:

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”; and

(C) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii), by inserting “or pursuant to subsection (b)(5)” after “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(D) in subsection (d), by inserting “or pursuant to subsection (b)(5)” after “subsection (b)(3)”.

(b) WORKPLAN.—Section 1001(c)(1) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) UPDATES.—The Director of NIH shall, after seeking recommendations in accordance with the process described in subparagraph (C), update the work plan submitted under this subsection for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030 to reflect the amendments made to this section by the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.”.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 1001(c)(2)(A) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by striking “2027” and inserting “2030”.

(d) SUNSET.—Section 1001(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by striking “September 30, 2026” and inserting “September 30, 2030”.

SEC. 702. NIH CLINICAL TRIAL.

Part A of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 281 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 4040. CLINICAL TRIAL ACCELERATION PILOT INITIATIVE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, establish and implement a pilot program to award multi-year contracts to eligible entities to support phase II clinical trials and phase III clinical trials—

“(1) to promote innovation in treatments and technologies supporting the advanced research and development and production of high need cures; and

“(2) to provide support for the development of medical products and therapies.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive assistance under the pilot program established under subsection (a), an entity shall—

“(1) be seeking to market a medical product or therapy that is the subject of clinical trial or trials to be supported using such assistance;

“(2) be a public or private entity, which may include a private or public research institution, a contract research organization, an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), a medical center, a biotechnology company, or an academic research institution; and

“(3) comply with requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of this Act at all stages of development, manufacturing, review, approval, and safety surveillance of a medical product.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of National Institutes of Health, shall—

“(1) in establishing the pilot program under subsection (a), consult with—

“(A) the Director of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences and the other national research institutes in considering their requests for new or expanded clinical trial support efforts; and

“(B) the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and any other head of a Federal agency as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to ensure coordination and efficiently advance clinical trial activities;

“(2) in implementing the pilot program under subsection (a), consider consulting with patients and patient advocates; and

“(3) in awarding contracts under the pilot program under subsection (a), consider—

“(A) the expected health impacts of the clinical trial or trials to be supported under the contract; and

“(B) the degree to which the medical product or therapy that is the subject of such clinical trial or trials is a high need cure.

“(d) EXCLUSION.—A contract may not be awarded under the pilot program under subsection (a) if the drug that is the subject of the clinical trial or trials to be supported under the contract is a drug designated under section 526 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as a drug for a rare disease or condition.

“(e) NIH CLINICAL TRIAL ACCELERATOR ACCOUNT.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury an account, to be known as the ‘NIH Clinical Trial Accelerator Account’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Account’), for purposes of carrying out this section.

“(2) TRANSFER OF DIRECT SPENDING SAVINGS.—There shall be transferred to the Account from the general fund of the Treasury, \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, to be available until expended without further appropriation.

“(3) WORK PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate a work plan that includes the proposed implementation of this section and the proposed allocation of funds in the Account.

“(f) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate a report on—

“(1) the implementation of this section;

“(2) any available results on phase II clinical trials and phase III clinical trials supported under this section during such fiscal year; and

“(3) the extent to which Federal funds are obligated to support such clinical trials, including the specific amount of such support and awards pursuant to an allocation from the Account under subsection (e).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) PHASE II CLINICAL TRIAL.—The term ‘phase II clinical trial’ means a phase II clinical investigation, as described in section 312.21 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(2) PHASE III CLINICAL TRIALS.—The term ‘phase III clinical trial’ means a phase III clinical investigation, as described in section 312.21 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(3) HIGH NEED CURE.—The term ‘high need cure’ has the meaning given such term in section 480(a)(3).”.

Subtitle B—Investing in Safety and Innovation

SEC. 711. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.

(a) FDA INNOVATION ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1002(b) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING AND ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds made available under paragraph (2), there are authorized to be appropriated, and are hereby appropriated, to the Account, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended without further appropriation, the following:

“(i) For fiscal year 2020, \$417,500,000.

“(ii) For each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022, \$157,500,000.

“(iii) For each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025, \$152,500,000.

“(iv) For each of fiscal years 2026 through 2029, \$202,500,000.

“(B) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Of the total amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2029, a total amount not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each such fiscal year, shall be made available for the activities under subtitles A through F (including the amendments made by such subtitles) of title III of this Act and section 1014 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 3073 of this Act.

“(C) ADDITIONAL FDA ACTIVITIES.—In addition to funding activities pursuant to subparagraph (B), of the total amounts made available under subparagraph (A), a total amount not to exceed the following shall be made available for the following categories of activities:

“(i) For modernization of the technical infrastructure of the Food and Drug Administration, including enhancements such as interoperability across the agency, and additional capabilities to develop an advanced information technology infrastructure to support the agency’s regulatory mission:

“(I) For fiscal year 2020, \$180,000,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2029, \$60,000,000.

“(ii) For support for continuous manufacturing of drugs and biological products, including complex biological products such as regenerative medicine therapies, through grants to institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations and other appropriate mechanisms, for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, \$20,000,000.

“(iii) For support for the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to engage experts, such as through the formation and operation of public-private partnerships or other appropriate collaborative efforts, to advance the development and delivery of individualized human gene therapy products:

“(I) For fiscal year 2020, \$50,000,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2029, \$10,000,000.

“(iv) For support for inspections, enforcement, and quality surveillance activities across the Food and Drug Administration, including foreign and domestic inspections across products, for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, \$20,000,000.

“(v) For support for activities of the Food and Drug Administration related to customs and border protection to provide improvements to technologies, inspection capacity, and sites of import (including international mail facilities) in which the Food and Drug Administration operates, for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, \$10,000,000.

“(vi) To further advance the development of a coordinated postmarket surveillance system for all medical products, including drugs, biological products, and devices, linked to electronic health records in furtherance of the Food and Drug Administration’s postmarket surveillance capabilities:

“(I) For fiscal year 2020, \$112,500,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2029, \$12,500,000.

“(vii) For support for Food and Drug Administration activities to keep pace with the pro-

jected product development of regenerative therapies, including cellular and somatic cell gene therapy products:

“(I) For each of fiscal years 2020 through 2022, \$10,000,000.

“(II) For each of fiscal years 2023 through 2029, \$5,000,000.

“(viii) For carrying out section 714A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379d–3a; relating to hiring authority for scientific, technical, and professional personnel), for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, \$2,500,000.

“(ix) For the Food and Drug Administration to support improvements to the technological infrastructure for reporting and analysis of adverse events associated with the use of drugs and biological products, for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, \$12,500,000.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1002 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or pursuant to subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(5) to carry out the activities described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of such subsection”; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by inserting “or pursuant to subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(5)” after “subsection (b)(3)”; and

(ii) by striking “subsection (b)(4)” and inserting “subsections (b)(4) and (b)(5)”.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 1002(c)(2)(A) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2026” and inserting “2030”.

(c) SUNSET.—Section 1002(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by striking “September 30, 2025” and inserting “September 30, 2030”.

Subtitle C—Opioid Epidemic Response SEC. 721. OPIOID EPIDEMIC RESPONSE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall use any funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) to carry out the programs and activities described in subsection (c) to address the opioid and substance use disorder epidemic. Such funds shall be in addition to any funds which are otherwise available to carry out such programs and activities.

(b) OPIOID EPIDEMIC RESPONSE FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Treasury an account, to be known as the Opioid Epidemic Response Fund (referred to in this section as the “Fund”), for purposes of funding the programs and activities described in subsection (c).

(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, to the Fund, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated \$1,980,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available by paragraph (2) shall be made available to the agencies specified in subsection (c) in accordance with such subsection. Amounts made available to an agency pursuant to the preceding sentence for a fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

(c) PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Of the total amount in the Fund for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, such amount shall be allocated as follows:

(1) SAMHSA.—For the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to carry out programs and activities pursuant to section 722, \$1,500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(2) CDC.—For the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to carry out programs and activities pursuant to section 723, \$120,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(3) FDA.—For the Food and Drug Administration to carry out programs and activities pursu-

ant to section 724, \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(4) NIH.—For the National Institutes of Health to carry out programs and activities pursuant to section 725, \$240,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(5) HRSA.—For the Health Resources and Services Administration to carry out programs and activities pursuant to section 726, \$90,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(6) ACF.—For the Administration for Children and Families to carry out programs and activities pursuant to section 727, \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(d) ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.—

(1) WORK PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, a work plan including the proposed allocation of funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 and the contents described in subparagraph (B).

(B) CONTENTS.—The work plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the amount of money to be obligated or expended out of the Fund in each fiscal year for each program and activity described in subsection (c); and

(ii) a description and justification of each such program and activity.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than October 1 of each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, a report including—

(A) the amount of money obligated or expended out of the Fund in the prior fiscal year for each program and activity described in subsection (c);

(B) a description of all programs and activities using funds made available pursuant to subsection (b); and

(C) how the programs and activities are responding to the opioid and substance use disorder epidemic.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding any authority in this subtitle or any appropriations Act, any funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) may not be used for any purpose other than the programs and activities described in subsection (c).

SEC. 722. SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The entirety of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(1) shall be for the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use to continue to award the State Opioid Response Grants funded by the heading “Substance Abuse And Mental Health Services Administration—Substance Abuse Treatment” in title II of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141). Subject to subsections (b) and (c), such grants shall be awarded in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as were applicable to such grants for fiscal year 2018.

(b) REQUIREMENT THAT TREATMENT BE EVIDENCE-BASED.—As a condition on receipt of a grant pursuant to subsection (a), a grantee shall agree that—

(1) treatments, practices, or interventions funded through the grant will be evidence-based; and

(2) such treatments, practices, and interventions will include medication-assisted treatment for individuals diagnosed with opioid use disorder, using drugs only if the drugs have been approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

(c) RESERVATIONS.—Of the amount made available pursuant to section 731(c)(1) for a fiscal year—

(1) not less than \$75,000,000 shall be reserved to make grants under subsection (a) to Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations; and

(2) not less than \$50,000,000 shall be reserved to make grants under subsection (a) to political subdivisions of States, such as counties, cities, or towns.

SEC. 723. CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

(a) ADDRESSING OPIOID USE DISORDER.—The entirety of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(2) shall be for the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, pursuant to applicable authorities in the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), to continue and expand programs of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to address opioid and substance use disorder, including by—

(1) improving the timeliness and quality of data on the opioid use disorder epidemic, including improvement of—

(A) data on fatal and nonfatal overdoses;

(B) syndromic surveillance;

(C) data on long-term sequelae (including neonatal abstinence syndrome); and

(D) cause of death reporting related to substance abuse or opioid overdose;

(2) expanding and strengthening evidence-based prevention and education strategies;

(3) supporting responsible prescribing practices, including through development and dissemination of prescriber guidelines;

(4) improving access to and use of effective prevention, treatment, and recovery support, including through grants and the provision of technical assistance to States and localities;

(5) strengthening partnerships with first responders, including to protect their safety;

(6) considering the needs of vulnerable populations;

(7) addressing infectious diseases linked to the opioid crisis;

(8) strengthening prescription drug monitoring programs; and

(9) providing financial and technical assistance to State and local health department efforts to treat and prevent substance use disorder.

(b) LIMITATION.—Of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(2) for carrying out this section, not more than 20 percent may be used for intramural purposes.

SEC. 724. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.

The entirety of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(3) shall be for the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, pursuant to applicable authorities in the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) or the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) and other applicable law, to support widespread innovation in non-opioid and non-addictive medical products for pain treatment, access to opioid addiction treatments, appropriate use of approved opioids, and efforts to reduce illicit importation of opioids. Such support may include the following:

(1) Facilitating the development of non-opioid and non-addictive pain treatments.

(2) Advancing guidance documents for sponsors of non-opioid pain products.

(3) Developing evidence to inform the potential for nonprescription overdose therapies.

(4) Examining expanded labeling indications for medication-assisted treatment.

(5) Conducting public education and outreach, including public workshops or public meetings, regarding the benefits of medication-assisted treatment, including all drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and device treatment options approved or cleared by the Food and Drug Administration.

(6) Exploring the expansion and possible mandatory nature of prescriber education regarding pain management and appropriate opioid prescribing through authorities under section 505-1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1).

(7) Examining options to limit the duration of opioid prescriptions for acute pain, including through packaging options.

(8) Increasing staff and infrastructure capacity to inspect and analyze packages at international mail facilities and pursue criminal investigations.

SEC. 725. NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

The entirety of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(4) shall be for the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to applicable authorities in the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), to carry out activities related to—

(1) accelerating research for addressing the opioid use disorder epidemic, including developing non-opioid medications and interventions, including non-addictive medications, to manage pain, as well as developing medications and interventions to treat and to prevent substance use disorders;

(2) conducting and supporting research on which treatments (in terms of pain management as well as treating and preventing substance use disorders) are optimal for which patients; and

(3) conducting and supporting research on creating longer-lasting or faster-acting antidotes for opioid overdose, particularly in response to the prevalence of fentanyl and carfentanyl overdoses.

SEC. 726. HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

The entirety of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(5) shall be for the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, pursuant to applicable authorities in titles III, VII, and VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.), to carry out activities that increase the availability and capacity of the behavioral health workforce. Such activities shall include providing loan repayment assistance for substance use disorder treatment providers.

SEC. 727. ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.

Of the funds made available pursuant to section 721(c)(6) for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, \$20,000,000 for each such fiscal year shall be for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out title I of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.).

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. GUARANTEED ISSUE OF CERTAIN MEDIGAP POLICIES.

(a) GUARANTEED ISSUE OF MEDIGAP POLICIES TO ALL MEDIGAP-ELIGIBLE MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1882(s) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “65 years of age or older and is enrolled for benefits under part B” and inserting “entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under part A and enrolled for benefits under part B”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking “who is 65 years of age or older as of the date of issuance and”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), by striking “is 65 years of age or older and”;

(D) in paragraph (3)(B)(vi), by striking “at age 65”.

(2) ADDITIONAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

(A) ONE-TIME ENROLLMENT PERIOD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a specified individual, the Secretary shall establish a one-time enrollment period described in clause (iii) during which such an individual may enroll in any medicare supplemental policy of the individual's choosing.

(ii) APPLICATION.—The provisions of—

(I) paragraph (2) of section 1882(s) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)) shall apply with respect to a specified individual who is described in subclause (I) of subparagraph (B)(iii) as if references in such paragraph (2) to the 6 month period described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph were references to the one-time enrollment period established under clause (i); and

(II) paragraph (3) of such section shall apply with respect to a specified individual who is described in subclause (II) of subparagraph (B)(iii) as if references in such paragraph (3) to the period specified in subparagraph (E) of such paragraph were references to the one-time enrollment period established under clause (i).

(iii) PERIOD.—The enrollment period established under clause (i) shall be the 6-month period beginning on January 1, 2024.

(B) SPECIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “specified individual” means an individual who—

(i) is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.) pursuant to section 226(b) or section 226A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426(b); 426-1);

(ii) is enrolled for benefits under part B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.); and

(iii) (I) would not, but for the amendments made by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) and the provisions of this paragraph (if such provisions applied to such individual), be eligible for the guaranteed issue of a medicare supplemental policy under paragraph (2) of section 1882(s) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)); or

(II) would not, but for the amendments made by subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) and the provisions of this paragraph (if such provisions applied to such individual), be eligible for the guaranteed issue of a medicare supplemental policy under paragraph (3) of such section.

(C) OUTREACH PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop an outreach plan to notify specified individuals of the one-time enrollment period established under subparagraph (A).

(ii) CONSULTATION.—In implementing the outreach plan developed under clause (i), the Secretary shall consult with consumer advocates, brokers, insurers, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and State Health Insurance Assistance Programs.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to medicare supplemental policies effective on or after January 1, 2024.

(b) GUARANTEED ISSUE OF MEDIGAP POLICIES FOR MEDICARE ADVANTAGE ENROLLEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1882(s)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)(3)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) The individual—

“(I) was enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan under part C for not less than 12 months;

“(II) subsequently disenrolled from such plan;

“(III) elects to receive benefits under this title through the original Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B; and

“(IV) has not previously elected to receive benefits under this title through the original Medicare fee-for-service program pursuant to disenrollment from a Medicare Advantage plan under part C.”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C)(iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) Subject to subsection (v)(1), for purposes of an individual described in clause (vi) or (vii) of subparagraph (B), a medicare supplemental policy described in this subparagraph shall include any medicare supplemental policy.”; and (C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new clause—

“(vi) in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B)(vii), the annual, coordinated election period (as defined in section 1851(e)(3)(B)) or a continuous open enrollment period (as defined in section 1851(e)(2)) during which the individual disenrolls from a Medicare Advantage plan under part C.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to medicare supplemental policies effective on or after January 1, 2024.

SEC. 802. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PDP SPONSORS REGARDING POINT-OF-SALE REJECTIONS UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

Section 1860D-4(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-104(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING POINT-OF-SALE REJECTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2020, a PDP sponsor offering a prescription drug plan shall submit to the Secretary, in a form and manner specified by the Secretary, information on point-of-sale rejections made during a period of time occurring in such plan year (as specified by the Secretary), including each of the following:

“(i) The reason for each point-of-sale rejection.

“(ii) Identifying information for each drug with respect to which a point-of-sale rejection was made.

“(iii) With respect to applicable types of point-of-sale rejections (as specified by the Secretary), each of the following:

“(I) Whether such a rejection was consistent with the formulary of the plan (as approved by the Secretary).

“(II) Whether a coverage determination or appeal of a coverage determination was requested for the drug with respect to which such a rejection was made.

“(III) The outcome of any such coverage determination or appeal of a coverage determination.

“(IV) The length of time between when such a rejection was made and when the drug with respect to which such rejection was made is dispensed, as applicable.

“(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the public website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services information submitted under subparagraph (A).

“(C) USE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary may use information submitted under subparagraph (A), as determined appropriate, in developing measures for the 5-star rating system under section 1853(o)(4).

“(D) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement this paragraph through program instruction or otherwise.

“(E) FUNDING.—The are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 such sums as may be necessary to implement this paragraph.”.

SEC. 803. PROVIDING ACCESS TO ANNUAL MEDICARE NOTIFICATIONS IN MULTIPLE LANGUAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1804 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b-2) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) The notice provided under subsection (a) shall be translated into languages in addition to

English and Spanish. In carrying out the previous sentence, the Secretary shall prioritize translation of the notice into languages in which documents provided by the Commissioner of Social Security are translated and language that are the most frequently requested for translation for purposes of applying for old-age insurance benefits under title II.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to notices distributed prior to each Medicare open enrollment period beginning after January 1, 2020.

SEC. 804. TEMPORARY INCREASE IN MEDICARE PART B PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

Section 1847A(b)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving the margin of each such redesignated clause 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking “PRODUCT.—The amount” and inserting the following: “PRODUCT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amount”; and

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

“(B) TEMPORARY PAYMENT INCREASE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualifying biosimilar biological product that is furnished during the applicable 5-year period for such product, the amount specified in this paragraph for such product with respect to such period is the sum determined under subparagraph (A), except that clause (ii) of such subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘8 percent’ for ‘6 percent’.

“(ii) APPLICABLE 5-YEAR PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the applicable 5-year period for a biosimilar biological product is—

“(I) in the case of such a product for which payment was made under this paragraph as of December 31, 2019, the 5-year period beginning on January 1, 2020; and

“(II) in the case of such a product for which payment is first made under this paragraph during a calendar quarter during the period beginning January 1, 2020, and ending December 31, 2024, the 5-year period beginning on the first day of such calendar quarter during which such payment is first made.

“(iii) QUALIFYING BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘qualifying biosimilar biological product’ means a biosimilar biological product described in paragraph (1)(C) with respect to which—

“(I) in the case of a product described in clause (ii)(I), the average sales price is not more than the average sales price for the reference biological product; and

“(II) in the case of a product described in clause (ii)(II), the wholesale acquisition cost is not more than the wholesale acquisition cost for the reference biological product.”.

SEC. 805. WAIVING MEDICARE COINSURANCE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING TESTS.

Section 1833(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “section 1834(0)” and inserting “section 1834(o)”; and

(2) by moving such second sentence 2 ems to the left; and

(3) by inserting the following third sentence following such second sentence: “For services furnished on or after January 1, 2021, paragraph (1)(Y) shall apply with respect to a colorectal cancer screening test regardless of the code that is billed for the establishment of a diagnosis as a result of the test, or for the removal of tissue or other matter or other procedure that is furnished in connection with, as a result of, and in the same clinical encounter as the screening test.”.

SEC. 806. MEDICARE COVERAGE OF CERTAIN LYMPHEDEMA COMPRESSION TREATMENT ITEMS.

(a) COVERAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x), as amended by section 601 and section 603, is further amended—

(A) in subsection (s)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (II), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (JJ), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(KK) lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in subsection (mmm));”;

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

“(mmm) LYMPHEDEMA COMPRESSION TREATMENT ITEMS.—The term ‘lymphedema compression treatment items’ means compression garments, devices, bandaging systems, components, and supplies, including multilayer compression bandaging systems, standard fit gradient compression garments, and other compression garments, devices, bandaging systems, components, or supplies (as determined by the Secretary), that are—

“(1) furnished on or after January 1, 2022, to an individual with a diagnosis of lymphedema for the treatment of such condition;

“(2) primarily and customarily used in the medical treatment of lymphedema, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(3) prescribed by a physician (or a physician assistant, nurse practitioner, or a clinical nurse specialist (as those terms are defined in section 1861(aa)(5)) to the extent authorized under State law).”.

(2) PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)(1)), as amended by section 601(c)(1), is further amended—

(i) by striking “and” before “(DD)”; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, and (EE) with respect to lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in section 1861(mmm)), the amount paid shall be equal to 80 percent of the lesser of the actual charge or the amount determined under the payment basis determined under section 1834(z).”.

(B) PAYMENT BASIS AND LIMITATIONS.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m), as amended by sections 601(c)(2) and 603(c), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(z) PAYMENT FOR LYMPHEDEMA COMPRESSION TREATMENT ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine an appropriate payment basis for lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in section 1861(mmm)). In making such a determination, the Secretary may take into account payment rates for such items under State plans (or waivers of such plans) under title XIX, the Veterans Health Administration, and group health plans and health insurance coverage (as such terms are defined in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act), and such other information as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(2) FREQUENCY LIMITATION.—No payment may be made under this part for lymphedema compression treatment items furnished other than at such frequency as the Secretary may establish.

“(3) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—In the case of lymphedema compression treatment items that are included in a competitive acquisition program in a competitive acquisition area under section 1847(a)—

“(A) the payment basis under this subsection for such items furnished in such area shall be the payment basis determined under such competitive acquisition program; and

“(B) the Secretary may use information on the payment determined under such competitive acquisition programs to adjust the payment amount otherwise determined under this subsection for an area that is not a competitive acquisition area under section 1847, and in the

case of such adjustment, paragraphs (8) and (9) of section 1842(b) shall not be applied.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) EXCLUSIONS.—Section 1862(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)(1)), as amended by section 601(f) and section 603(g), is further amended—

(i) in subparagraph (Q), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (R), by striking the semicolon and inserting “, and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(S) in the case of lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in section 1861(mmm)), which are furnished more frequently than is established pursuant to section 1834(z)(2).”.

(B) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)), as amended by sections 601(e)(2)(B)(ii), 602(b)(3)(B)(i), and 603(f)(2)(B), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) LYMPHEDEMA COMPRESSION TREATMENT ITEMS.—Lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in section 1861(mmm)) for which payment would otherwise be made under section 1834(z).”.

(b) INCLUSION IN REQUIREMENTS FOR SUPPLIERS OF MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES.—Section 1834(j)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(j)(5)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) lymphedema compression treatment items (as defined in section 1861(mmm)).”.

(c) STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall conduct a study on the implementation of Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items under the amendments made by this Act. Such study shall include an evaluation of the following:

(A) Medicare beneficiary utilization of items and services under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act as a result of the implementation of such amendments.

(B) Whether the Secretary has determined, pursuant to section 1861(mmm) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a)(1), that lymphedema compression treatment items other than compression bandaging systems and standard fit gradient compression garments are covered under such section.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2024, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 807. PHYSICIAN FEE UPDATE.

Section 1848(d)(19) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(d)(19)) is amended to read as follows:

“(19) UPDATE FOR 2020 THROUGH 2025.—The update to the single conversion factor established in paragraph (1)(C)—

“(A) for each of 2020 through 2022 shall be 0.5 percent; and

“(B) for each of 2023 through 2025 shall be 0.0 percent.”.

SEC. 808. ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER FUNDING.

Section 10503 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) ADDITIONAL ENHANCED FUNDING; CAPITAL PROJECTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the CHC Fund—

“(1) to be transferred to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide additional enhanced funding for the community health center program under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act, \$1,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025; and

“(2) to be transferred to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for capital projects of the community health center program under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act, \$5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.”.

SEC. 809. GRANTS TO IMPROVE TRAUMA SUPPORT SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS.

(a) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, is authorized to award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, Indian Tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) or their tribal educational agencies, a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Education, a Regional Corporation, or a Native Hawaiian educational organization, for the purpose of increasing student access to evidence-based trauma support services and mental health care by developing innovative initiatives, activities, or programs to link local school systems with local trauma-informed support and mental health systems, including those under the Indian Health Service.

(b) DURATION.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded or entered into under this section, the period during which payments under such grant, contract, or agreement are made to the recipient may not exceed 4 years.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall use amounts made available through such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement for evidence-based activities, which shall include any of the following:

(1) Collaborative efforts between school-based service systems and trauma-informed support and mental health service systems to provide, develop, or improve prevention, screening, referral, and treatment and support services to students, such as providing trauma screenings to identify students in need of specialized support.

(2) To implement schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports, or other trauma-informed models of support.

(3) To provide professional development to teachers, teacher assistants, school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and mental health professionals that—

(A) fosters safe and stable learning environments that prevent and mitigate the effects of trauma, including through social and emotional learning;

(B) improves school capacity to identify, refer, and provide services to students in need of trauma support or behavioral health services; or

(C) reflects the best practices for trauma-informed identification, referral, and support developed by the Interagency Task Force on Trauma-Informed Care.

(4) Services at a full-service community school that focuses on trauma-informed supports, which may include a full-time site coordinator, or other activities consistent with section 4625 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7275).

(5) Engaging families and communities in efforts to increase awareness of child and youth trauma, which may include sharing best practices with law enforcement regarding trauma-informed care and working with mental health professionals to provide interventions, as well as longer term coordinated care within the community for children and youth who have experienced trauma and their families.

(6) To provide technical assistance to school systems and mental health agencies.

(7) To evaluate the effectiveness of the program carried out under this section in increasing student access to evidence-based trauma support services and mental health care.

(8) To establish partnerships with or provide subgrants to Head Start agencies (including Early Head Start agencies), public and private preschool programs, child care programs (including home-based providers), or other entities described in subsection (a), to include such entities described in this paragraph in the evidence-based trauma initiatives, activities, support services, and mental health systems established under this section in order to provide, develop, or improve prevention, screening, referral, and treatment and support services to young children and their families.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, an entity described in subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, which shall include the following:

(1) A description of the innovative initiatives, activities, or programs to be funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, including how such program will increase access to evidence-based trauma support services and mental health care for students, and, as applicable, the families of such students.

(2) A description of how the program will provide linguistically appropriate and culturally competent services.

(3) A description of how the program will support students and the school in improving the school climate in order to support an environment conducive to learning.

(4) An assurance that—

(A) persons providing services under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement are adequately trained to provide such services; and

(B) teachers, school leaders, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, representatives of local Indian Tribes or tribal organizations as appropriate, other school personnel, and parents or guardians of students participating in services under this section will be engaged and involved in the design and implementation of the services.

(5) A description of how the applicant will support and integrate existing school-based services with the program in order to provide mental health services for students, as appropriate.

(6) A description of the entities in the community with which the applicant will partner or to which the applicant will provide subgrants in accordance with subsection (c)(8).

(e) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—

(1) LOCAL INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—To ensure the provision of the services described in subsection (c), a recipient of a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, or their designee, shall establish a local interagency agreement among local educational agencies, agencies responsible for early childhood education programs, Head Start agencies (including Early Head Start agencies), juvenile justice authorities, mental health agencies, child welfare agencies, and other relevant agencies, authorities, or entities in the community that will be involved in the provision of such services.

(2) CONTENTS.—In ensuring the provision of the services described in subsection (c), the local interagency agreement shall specify with respect to each agency, authority, or entity that is a party to such agreement—

(A) the financial responsibility for the services;

(B) the conditions and terms of responsibility for the services, including quality, accountability, and coordination of the services; and

(C) the conditions and terms of reimbursement among such agencies, authorities, or entities, including procedures for dispute resolution.

(f) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 3 percent of the funds made available under subsection (l) for each fiscal year to—

(1) conduct a rigorous, independent evaluation of the activities funded under this section; and

(2) disseminate and promote the utilization of evidence-based practices regarding trauma support services and mental health care.

(g) **DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements awarded or entered into under this section are equitably distributed among the geographical regions of the United States and among tribal, urban, suburban, and rural populations.

(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to prohibit an entity involved with a program carried out under this section from reporting a crime that is committed by a student to appropriate authorities; or

(2) to prevent Federal, State, and tribal law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal, tribal, and State law to crimes committed by a student.

(i) **SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.**—Any services provided through programs carried out under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, existing mental health services, including any special education and related services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

(j) **CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall, in a timely manner, meaningfully consult with Indian Tribes and their representatives to ensure notice of eligibility.

(k) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.**—The term “elementary school” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **EVIDENCE-BASED.**—The term “evidence-based” has the meaning given such term in section 8101(21)(A)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)(A)(i)).

(3) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION.**—The term “Native Hawaiian educational organization” has the meaning given such term in section 6207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517).

(4) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “local educational agency” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(5) **REGIONAL CORPORATION.**—The term “Regional Corporation” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

(6) **SCHOOL.**—The term “school” means a public elementary school or public secondary school.

(7) **SCHOOL LEADER.**—The term “school leader” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(8) **SECONDARY SCHOOL.**—The term “secondary school” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

(10) **SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL.**—The term “specialized instructional support personnel” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(11) **STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “State educational agency” has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(l) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated, and

there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out this section, \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

SEC. 810. PATHWAY TO HEALTH CAREERS ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Pathways to Health Careers Act”.

(b) **EXTENSION THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2020 OF FUNDING FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO ADDRESS HEALTH PROFESSIONS WORKFORCE NEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2008(c)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397g(c)(1)) is amended by striking “2019.” and inserting “2020, and to provide technical assistance and cover administrative costs associated with implementing the successor to this section \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.”.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF OTHER FUNDS.**—Upon the date of the enactment of this section—

(A) amounts expended pursuant to section 1501 of division B of Public Law 116–59, or any other prior law making amounts available for fiscal year 2020 for activities authorized by section 2008 of the Social Security Act, shall be charged to the appropriation made by subsection (c)(1) of such section 2008 for fiscal year 2020 (not including the amount for technical assistance and administrative costs); and

(B) if such enactment occurs on or before November 21, 2019, the availability of funds appropriated in, and the authority provided under, such section 1501 shall terminate.

(c) **CAREER PATHWAYS THROUGH HEALTH PROFESSION OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.**—Effective October 1, 2020, section 2008 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397g) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2008. CAREER PATHWAYS THROUGH HEALTH PROFESSION OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.

“(a) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section for a project shall submit to the Secretary an application for the grant, that includes the following:

“(1) A description of how the applicant will use a career pathways approach to train eligible individuals for health professions that pay well or will put eligible individuals on a career path to an occupation that pays well, under the project.

“(2) A description of the adult basic education and literacy activities, work readiness activities, training activities, and case management and career coaching services that the applicant will use to assist eligible individuals to gain work experience, connection to employers, and job placement, and a description of the plan for recruiting, hiring, and training staff to provide the case management, mentoring, and career coaching services, under the project directly or through local governmental, apprenticeship, educational, or charitable institutions.

“(3) In the case of an application for a grant under this section for a demonstration project described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I)—

“(A) a demonstration that the State in which the demonstration project is to be conducted has in effect policies or laws that permit certain allied health and behavioral health care credentials to be awarded to people with certain arrest or conviction records (which policies or laws shall include appeals processes, waivers, certificates, and other opportunities to demonstrate rehabilitation to obtain credentials, licensure, and approval to work in the proposed health careers), and a plan described in the application that will use a career pathway to assist participants with such a record in acquiring credentials, licensing, and employment in the specified careers;

“(B) a discussion of how the project or future strategic hiring decisions will demonstrate the experience and expertise of the project in working with job seekers who have arrest or conviction records or employers with experience working with people with arrest or conviction records;

“(C) an identification of promising innovations or best practices that can be used to provide the training;

“(D) a proof of concept or demonstration that the applicant has done sufficient research on workforce shortage or in-demand jobs for which people with certain types of arrest or conviction records can be hired;

“(E) a plan for recruiting students who are eligible individuals into the project; and

“(F) a plan for providing post-employment support and ongoing training as part of a career pathway under the project.

“(4) In the case of an application for a grant under this section for a demonstration project described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(II)—

“(A) a description of the partnerships, strategic staff hiring decisions, tailored program activities, or other programmatic elements of the project, such as training plans for doulas and other community health workers and training plans for midwives and other allied health professions, that are designed to support a career pathway in pregnancy, birth, or post-partum services; and

“(B) a demonstration that the State in which the demonstration project is to be conducted recognizes doulas or midwives, as the case may be.

“(5) A demonstration that the applicant has experience working with low-income populations, or a description of the plan of the applicant to work with a partner organization that has the experience.

“(6) A plan for providing post-employment support and ongoing training as part of a career pathway under the project.

“(7) A description of the support services that the applicant will provide under the project, including a plan for how child care and transportation support services will be guaranteed and, if the applicant will provide a cash stipend or wage supplement, how the stipend or supplement would be calculated and distributed.

“(8) A certification by the applicant that the project development included—

“(A) consultation with a local workforce development board established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act;

“(B) consideration of apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship models registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (also known as the ‘National Apprenticeship Act’);

“(C) consideration of career pathway programs in the State in which the project is to be conducted; and

“(D) a review of the State plan under section 102 or 103 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

“(9) A description of the availability and relevance of recent labor market information and other pertinent evidence of in-demand jobs or worker shortages.

“(10) A certification that the applicant will directly provide or contract for the training services described in the application.

“(11) A commitment by the applicant that, if the grant is made to the applicant, the applicant will—

“(A) during the planning period for the project, provide the Secretary with any information needed by the Secretary to establish adequate data reporting and administrative structure for the project;

“(B) hire a person to direct the project not later than the end of the planning period applicable to the project;

“(C) accept all technical assistance offered by the Secretary with respect to the grant;

“(D) participate in such in-person grantee conferences as are regularly scheduled by the Secretary;

“(E) provide all data required by the Secretary under subsection (g); and

“(F) notify the local disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists under section 4103A of title 38, United States Code, and the local veterans’ employment representatives under section 4104 of such title, of the grantee’s outreach plan

for advertising training opportunities to potential participants in the project.

“(b) PREFERENCES IN CONSIDERING APPLICATIONS.—In considering applications for a grant under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to—

“(1) applications submitted by applicants to whom a grant was made under this section or any predecessor to this section;

“(2) applications submitted by applicants who have business and community partners in each of the following categories:

“(A) State and local government agencies and social service providers, including a State or local entity that administers a State program funded under part A of this title;

“(B) institutions of higher education, apprenticeship programs, and local workforce development boards established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; and

“(C) health care employers, health care industry or sector partnerships, labor unions, and labor-management partnerships;

“(3) applications that include opportunities for mentoring or peer support, and make career coaching available, as part of the case management plan;

“(4) applications which describe a project that will serve a rural area in which—

“(A) the community in which the individuals to be enrolled in the project reside is located;

“(B) the project will be conducted; or

“(C) an employer partnership that has committed to hiring individuals who successfully complete all activities under the project is located;

“(5) applications that include a commitment to providing project participants with a cash stipend or wage supplement; and

“(6) applications which have an emergency cash fund to assist project participants financially in emergency situations.

“(c) GRANTS.—

“(1) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—

“(A) GRANT AUTHORITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, may make a grant in accordance with this paragraph to an eligible entity whose application for the grant is approved by the Secretary, to conduct a project designed to train low-income individuals for allied health professions, health information technology, physicians assistants, nursing assistants, registered nurse, advanced practice nurse, and other professions considered part of a health care career pathway model.

“(ii) GUARANTEE OF GRANTEEES IN EACH STATE AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—For each grant cycle, the Secretary shall award a grant under this paragraph to at least 2 eligible entities in each State that is not a territory, to the extent there are a sufficient number of applications submitted by the entities that meet the requirements applicable with respect to such a grant. If, for a grant cycle, there are fewer than 2 such eligible entities in a State, the Secretary shall include that information in the report required by subsection (g)(2) that covers the fiscal year.

“(B) GUARANTEE OF GRANTS FOR INDIAN POPULATIONS.—From the amount reserved under subsection (i)(2)(B) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall award a grant under this paragraph to at least 10 eligible entities that are an Indian tribe, a tribal organization, or a tribal college or university, to the extent there are a sufficient number of applications submitted by the entities that meet the requirements applicable with respect to such a grant.

“(C) GUARANTEE OF GRANTEEES IN THE TERRITORIES.—From the amount reserved under subsection (i)(2)(C) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall award a grant under this paragraph to at least 2 eligible entities that are located in a territory, to the extent there are a sufficient number of applications submitted by

the entities that meet the requirements applicable with respect to such a grant.

“(2) GRANTS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

“(A) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education (and, with respect to demonstration projects of the type described in subparagraph (B)(i)(I), the Attorney General) shall make a grant in accordance with this subsection to an eligible entity whose application for the grant is approved by the Secretary, to conduct a demonstration project that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph are the following:

“(i) TYPE OF PROJECT.—The demonstration project shall be of 1 of the following types:

“(I) INDIVIDUALS WITH ARREST OR CONVICTION RECORDS DEMONSTRATION.—The demonstration project shall be of a type designed to provide education and training for eligible individuals with arrest or conviction records to enter and follow a career pathway in the health professions through occupations that pay well and are expected to experience a labor shortage or be in high demand.

“(II) PREGNANCY AND CHILDBIRTH CAREER PATHWAY DEMONSTRATION.—The demonstration project shall be of a type designed to provide education and training for eligible individuals to enter and follow a career pathway in the field of pregnancy, childbirth, or post-partum, in a State that recognizes doulas or midwives and that provides payment for services provided by doulas or midwives, as the case may be, under private or public health insurance plans.

“(ii) DURATION.—The demonstration project shall be conducted for not less than 5 years.

“(C) MINIMUM ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR EACH TYPE OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

“(i) INDIVIDUALS WITH ARREST OR CONVICTION RECORDS DEMONSTRATIONS.—Not less than 25 percent of the amounts made available for grants under this paragraph shall be used to make grants for demonstration projects of the type described in subparagraph (B)(i)(I).

“(ii) PREGNANCY AND CHILDBIRTH CAREER PATHWAY DEMONSTRATIONS.—Not less than 25 percent of the amounts made available for grants under this paragraph shall be used to make grants for demonstration projects of the type described in subparagraph (B)(i)(II).

“(3) GRANT CYCLE.—The grant cycle under this section shall be not less than 5 years, with a planning period of not more than the 1st 12 months of the grant cycle. During the planning period, the amount of the grant shall be in such lesser amount as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) USE OF GRANT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An entity to which a grant is made under this section shall use the grant in accordance with the approved application for the grant.

“(2) SUPPORT TO BE PROVIDED.—

“(A) REQUIRED SUPPORT.—A project for which a grant is made under this section shall include the following:

“(i) An assessment for adult basic skill competency, and provision of adult basic skills education if necessary for lower-skilled eligible individuals to enroll in the project and go on to enter and complete post-secondary training, through means including the following:

“(I) Establishing a network of partners that offer pre-training activities for project participants who need to improve basic academic skills or English language proficiency before entering a health occupational training career pathway program.

“(II) Offering resources to enable project participants to continue advancing adult basic skill proficiency while enrolled in a career pathway program.

“(III) Embedding adult basic skill maintenance as part of ongoing post-graduation career coaching and mentoring.

“(ii) A guarantee that child care is an available and affordable support service for project

participants through means such as the following;

“(I) Referral to, and assistance with, enrollment in a subsidized child care program.

“(II) Direct payment to a child care provider if a slot in a subsidized child care program is not available or reasonably accessible.

“(III) Payment of co-payments or associated fees for child care.

“(iii) Case management plans that include career coaching (with the option to offer appropriate peer support and mentoring opportunities to help develop soft skills and social capital), which may be offered on an ongoing basis before, during, and after initial training as part of a career pathway model.

“(iv) A plan to provide project participants with transportation through means such as the following:

“(I) Referral to, and assistance with enrollment in, a subsidized transportation program.

“(II) If a subsidized transportation program is not reasonably available, direct payments to subsidize transportation costs.

For purposes of this clause, the term ‘transportation’ includes public transit, or gasoline for a personal vehicle if public transit is not reasonably accessible or available.

“(v) In the case of a demonstration project of the type described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I), access to legal assistance for project participants for the purpose of addressing arrest or conviction records and associated workforce barriers.

“(B) ALLOWED SUPPORT.—The goods and services provided under a project for which a grant is made under this section may include the following:

“(i) A cash stipend that is at least monthly.

“(ii) A reserve fund for financial assistance to project participants in emergency situations.

“(iii) Tuition, and training materials such as books, software, uniforms, shoes, and hair nets.

“(iv) In-kind resource donations such as interview clothing and conference attendance fees.

“(v) Assistance with accessing and completing high school equivalency or adult basic education courses as necessary to achieve success in the project and make progress toward career goals.

“(vi) Assistance with programs and activities, including legal assistance, deemed necessary to address arrest or conviction records as an employment barrier.

“(vii) Other support services as deemed necessary for family well-being, success in the project, and progress toward career goals.

“(C) TREATMENT OF SUPPORT FOR PURPOSES OF MEANS-TESTED PROGRAMS.—Any goods or services provided to an eligible individual participating in a project for which a grant is made under this section shall not be considered income, and shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the eligibility of the individual for, or amount of benefits to be provided to the individual, under any means-tested program.

“(3) TRAINING.—The number of hours of training provided to an eligible individual under a project for which a grant is made under this section, for a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential, which is awarded in recognition of attainment of measurable technical or occupational skills necessary to gain employment or advance within an occupation (including a certificate awarded by a local workforce development board established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act), shall be—

“(A) not less than the number of hours of training required for certification in that level of skill by the State in which the project is conducted; or

“(B) if there is no such requirement, such number of hours of training as the Secretary finds is necessary to achieve that skill level.

“(4) INCOME LIMITATION.—An entity to which a grant is made under this section shall not use

the grant to provide support to a person who is not an eligible individual.

“(5) **INCLUSION OF TANF RECIPIENTS.**—In the case of a project for which a grant is made under this section that is conducted in a State that has a program funded under part A of title IV, at least 10 percent of the eligible individuals to whom support is provided under the project shall meet the income eligibility requirements under that State program, without regard to whether the individuals receive benefits or services directly under that State program.

“(6) **PROHIBITION.**—An entity to which a grant is made under this section shall not use the grant for purposes of entertainment, except that case management and career coaching services may include celebrations of specific career-based milestones such as completing a semester, graduation, or job placement.

“(e) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance—

“(A) to assist eligible entities in applying for grants under this section;

“(B) that is tailored to meet the needs of grantees at each stage of the administration of projects for which grants are made under this section;

“(C) that is tailored to meet the specific needs of Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal colleges and universities;

“(D) that is tailored to meet the specific needs of the territories;

“(E) that is tailored to meet the specific needs of eligible entities in carrying out demonstration projects for which a grant is made under this section; and

“(F) to facilitate the exchange of information among eligible entities regarding best practices and promising practices used in the projects.

“(2) **CONTINUATION OF PEER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONFERENCES.**—The Secretary shall continue to hold peer technical assistance conferences for entities to which a grant is made under this section or was made under the immediate predecessor of this section.

“(f) **EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, by grant, contract, or interagency agreement, conduct rigorous and well-designed evaluations of the demonstration projects for which a grant is made under this section.

“(2) **REQUIREMENT APPLICABLE TO INDIVIDUALS WITH ARREST OR CONVICTION RECORDS DEMONSTRATION.**—In the case of a project of the type described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I), the evaluation shall include identification of successful activities for creating opportunities for developing and sustaining, particularly with respect to low-income individuals with arrest or conviction records, a health professions workforce that has accessible entry points, that meets high standards for education, training, certification, and professional development, and that provides increased wages and affordable benefits, including health care coverage, that are responsive to the needs of the workforce.

“(3) **REQUIREMENT APPLICABLE TO PREGNANCY AND CHILDBIRTH CAREER PATHWAY DEMONSTRATION.**—In the case of a project of the type described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(II), the evaluation shall include identification of successful activities for creating opportunities for developing and sustaining, particularly with respect to low-income individuals and other entry-level workers, a career pathway that has accessible entry points, that meets high standards for education, training, certification, and professional development, and that provides increased wages and affordable benefits, including health care coverage, that are responsive to the needs of the birth, pregnancy, and post-partum workforce.

“(4) **RULE OF INTERPRETATION.**—Evaluations conducted pursuant to this subsection may include a randomized controlled trial, but this subsection shall not be interpreted to require an evaluation to include such a trial.

“(g) **REPORTS.**—

“(1) **TO THE SECRETARY.**—An eligible entity awarded a grant to conduct a project under this section shall submit interim reports to the Secretary on the activities carried out under the project, and, on the conclusion of the project, a final report on the activities. Each such report shall include data on participant outcomes related to earnings, employment in health professions, graduation rate, graduation timeliness, credential attainment, participant demographics, and other data specified by the Secretary.

“(2) **TO THE CONGRESS.**—During each Congress, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report—

“(A) on the demographics of the participants in the projects for which a grant is made under this section;

“(B) on the rate of which project participants completed all activities under the projects;

“(C) on the employment credentials acquired by project participants;

“(D) on the employment of project participants on completion of activities under the projects, and the earnings of project participants at entry into employment;

“(E) on best practices and promising practices used in the projects;

“(F) on the nature of any technical assistance provided to grantees under this section;

“(G) on, with respect to the period since the period covered in the most recent prior report submitted under this paragraph—

“(i) the number of applications submitted under this section, with a separate statement of the number of applications referred to in subsection (b)(5);

“(ii) the number of applications that were approved, with a separate statement of the number of such applications referred to in subsection (b)(5); and

“(iii) a description of how grants were made in any case described in the last sentence of subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii); and

“(H) that includes an assessment of the effectiveness of the projects with respect to addressing health professions workforce shortages or in-demand jobs.

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSION.**—The term ‘allied health profession’ has the meaning given in section 799B(5) of the Public Health Service Act.

“(2) **CAREER PATHWAY.**—The term ‘career pathway’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(7) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

“(3) **DOULA.**—The term ‘doula’ means an individual who—

“(A) is certified by an organization that has been established for not less than 5 years and that requires the completion of continuing education to maintain the certification, to provide non-medical advice, information, emotional support, and physical comfort to an individual during the individual’s pregnancy, childbirth, and post-partum period; and

“(B) maintains the certification by completing the required continuing education.

“(4) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term ‘eligible entity’ means any of the following entities that demonstrates in an application submitted under this section that the entity has the capacity to fully develop and administer the project described in the application:

“(A) A local workforce development board established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

“(B) A State or territory, a political subdivision of a State or territory, or an agency of a State, territory, or such a political subdivision, including a State or local entity that administers a State program funded under part A of this title.

“(C) An Indian tribe, a tribal organization, or a tribal college or university.

“(D) An institution of higher education (as defined in the Higher Education Act of 1965).

“(E) A hospital (as defined in section 1861(e)).

“(F) A high-quality skilled nursing facility.

“(G) A Federally qualified health center (as defined in section 1861(aa)(4)).

“(H) A nonprofit organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a labor organization, or an entity with shared labor-management oversight, that has a demonstrated history of providing health profession training to eligible individuals.

“(I) In the case of a demonstration project of the type provided for in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(II) of this section, an entity recognized by a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization as qualified to train doulas or midwives, if midwives or doulas, as the case may be, are permitted to practice in the State involved.

“(J) An opioid treatment program (as defined in section 1861(jjj)(2)), and other high quality comprehensive addiction care providers.

“(5) **ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.**—The term ‘eligible individual’ means an individual whose family income does not exceed 200 percent of the Federal poverty level.

“(6) **FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL.**—The term ‘Federal poverty level’ means the poverty line (as defined in section 673(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, including any revision required by such section applicable to a family of the size involved).

“(7) **INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.**—The terms ‘Indian tribe’ and ‘tribal organization’ have the meaning given the terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

“(8) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 or 102(a)(1)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(9) **TERRITORY.**—The term ‘territory’ means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

“(10) **TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.**—The term ‘tribal college or university’ has the meaning given the term in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(i) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$425,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

“(2) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—Of the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

“(A) 75 percent shall be available for grants under subsection (c)(1)(A);

“(B) 4 percent shall be reserved for grants under subsection (c)(1)(B);

“(C) 5 percent shall be reserved for grants under subsection (c)(1)(C);

“(D) 6 percent shall be available for demonstration project grants under subsection (c)(2);

“(E) 6 percent, plus all amounts referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of this paragraph that remain unused after all grant awards are made for the fiscal year, shall be available for the provision of technical assistance and associated staffing; and

“(F) 4 percent shall be available for studying the effects of the demonstration and non-demonstration projects for which a grant is made under this section, and for associated staffing, for the purpose of supporting the rigorous evaluation of the demonstration projects, and supporting the continued study of the short-, medium-, and long-term effects of all such projects, including the effectiveness of new or added elements of the non-demonstration projects.

“(j) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF PRECEDING SECTIONS OF THIS SUBTITLE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the preceding sections of this subtitle shall not apply to a grant awarded under this section.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON USE OF GRANTS.—Section 2005(a) (other than paragraphs (2), (3), (5), (6), and (8)) shall apply to a grant awarded under this section to the same extent and in the same manner as such section applies to payments to States under this subtitle.”.

SEC. 811. HOME VISITING TO REDUCE MATERNAL MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Home Visiting to Reduce Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Act”.

(b) **INCREASE IN TRIBAL SET-ASIDE PERCENTAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 511(j)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711(j)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “3” and inserting “6”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2020.

(c) **INCREASE IN FUNDING.**—Section 511(j)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 711(j)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (G); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (H) and inserting the following:

“(H) \$400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020;

“(I) \$600,000,000 for fiscal year 2021; and

“(J) \$800,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.”.

(d) **USE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.**—Section 511(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 711(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES TO ADDRESS HIGH RATES OF MATERNAL MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY, SUPPORT UNMET NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT, OR INCREASE ALLOCATIONS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES BASED ON RELATIVE POPULATION OR POVERTY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that any amounts exceeding \$400,000,000 that are used for grants under this subsection for a fiscal year are used to—

“(A) provide additional funding priority to States, tribes, and territories to address high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity;

“(B) address unmet needs identified by a needs assessment conducted under subsection (b); or

“(C) increase the amounts allocated under this section to States and to Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa, based on the proportion of children who have not attained 5 years of age and are living in poverty.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116–334. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116–334.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enactment clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D

Subtitle A—Medicare Part B Provisions

Sec. 101. Improvements to Medicare site-of-service transparency.

Sec. 102. Requiring manufacturers of certain single-dose container or single-use package drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide refunds with respect to discarded amounts of such drugs.

Sec. 103. Providing for variation in payment for certain drugs covered under part B of the Medicare program.

Sec. 104. Establishment of maximum add-on payment for drugs and biologicals.

Sec. 105. Treatment of drug administration services furnished by certain excepted off-campus outpatient departments of a provider.

Subtitle B—Drug Price Transparency

Sec. 111. Reporting on explanation for drug price increases.

Sec. 112. Public disclosure of drug discounts.

Sec. 113. Study of pharmaceutical supply chain intermediaries and merger activity.

Sec. 114. Requiring certain manufacturers to report drug pricing information with respect to drugs under the Medicare program.

Sec. 115. Making prescription drug marketing sample information reported by manufacturers available to certain individuals and entities.

Sec. 116. Requiring prescription drug plan sponsors to include real-time benefit information as part of such sponsor’s electronic prescription program under the Medicare program.

Sec. 117. Sense of Congress regarding the need to expand commercially available drug pricing comparison platforms.

Sec. 118. Technical corrections.

Subtitle C—Medicare Part D Benefit Redesign

Sec. 121. Medicare Part D Benefit Redesign.

Subtitle D—Other Medicare Part D Provisions

Sec. 131. Transitional coverage and retroactive Medicare Part D coverage for certain low-income beneficiaries.

Sec. 132. Allowing the offering of additional prescription drug plans under Medicare part D.

Sec. 133. Allowing certain enrollees of prescription drugs plans and MA-PD plans under Medicare program to spread out cost-sharing under certain circumstances.

Sec. 134. Establishing a monthly cap on beneficiary incurred costs for insulin products and supplies under a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan.

Sec. 135. Growth rate of Medicare part D out-of-pocket cost threshold.

Subtitle E—MedPAC

Sec. 141. Providing the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug payment information, including certain rebate information.

TITLE II—MEDICAID

Sec. 201. Sunset of limit on maximum rebate amount for single source drugs and innovator multiple source drugs.

Sec. 202. Medicaid pharmacy and therapeutics committee improvements.

Sec. 203. GAO report on conflicts of interest in State Medicaid program drug use review boards and pharmacy and therapeutics (P&T) committees.

Sec. 204. Ensuring the accuracy of manufacturer price and drug product information under the Medicaid drug rebate program.

Sec. 205. Improving transparency and preventing the use of abusive spread pricing and related practices in Medicaid.

Sec. 206. T-MSIS drug data analytics reports.

Sec. 207. Risk-sharing value-based payment agreements for covered outpatient drugs under Medicaid.

Sec. 208. Applying Medicaid drug rebate requirement to drugs provided as part of outpatient hospital services.

TITLE III—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Subtitle A—CREATES Act

Sec. 301. Actions for delays of generic drugs and biosimilar biological products.

Sec. 302. Reqs approval process for subsequent filers.

Sec. 303. Rule of construction.

Subtitle B—Pay-for-Delay

Sec. 311. Unlawful agreements.

Sec. 312. Notice and certification of agreements.

Sec. 313. Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity period.

Sec. 314. Commission litigation authority.

Sec. 315. Statute of limitations.

Subtitle C—BLOCKING Act

Sec. 321. Change conditions of first generic exclusivity to spur access and competition.

Subtitle D—Purple Book

Sec. 331. Public Listing.

Sec. 332. Review and report on types of Information To be listed.

Subtitle E—Orange Book

Sec. 341. Orange Book.

Sec. 342. GAO report to Congress.

Subtitle F—Advancing Education on Biosimilars

Sec. 351. Education on biological products.

Subtitle G—Streamlining Transition of Biological Products

Sec. 361. Streamlining the transition of biological products.

Subtitle H—Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform

Sec. 370. Short title; references in subtitle.

PART 1—OTC DRUG REVIEW

Sec. 371. Regulation of certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application.

Sec. 372. Misbranding.

Sec. 373. Drugs excluded from the over-the-counter drug review.

Sec. 374. Treatment of Sunscreen Innovation Act.

Sec. 375. Annual update to Congress on appropriate pediatric indication for certain OTC cough and cold drugs.

Sec. 376. Technical corrections.

PART 2—USER FEES

- Sec. 381. Short title; finding.
 Sec. 382. Fees relating to over-the-counter drugs.
 Subtitle I—Other Provisions
 Sec. 391. Protecting access to biological products.
 Sec. 392. Orphan drug clarification.
 Sec. 393. Conditions of use for biosimilar biological products.
 Sec. 394. Clarifying the meaning of new chemical entity.

TITLE IV—REVENUE PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Permanent extension of reduction in medical expense deduction floor.
 Sec. 402. Safe harbor for high deductible health plans without deductible for insulin.
 Sec. 403. Inclusion of certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 501. Payment for biosimilar biological products during initial period.
 Sec. 502. GAO study and report on average sales price.
 Sec. 503. Requiring prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans to report potential fraud, waste, and abuse to the Secretary of HHS.
 Sec. 504. Establishment of pharmacy quality measures under Medicare part D.
 Sec. 505. Improving coordination between the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.
 Sec. 506. Patient consultation in Medicare national and local coverage determinations in order to mitigate barriers to inclusion of such perspectives.
 Sec. 507. MedPAC report on shifting coverage of certain Medicare part B drugs to Medicare part D.
 Sec. 508. Requirement that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.
 Sec. 509. Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator at the Office of the United States Trade Representative.
 Sec. 510. Waiving Medicare coinsurance for colorectal cancer screening tests.

TITLE I—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D

Subtitle A—Medicare Part B Provisions

SEC. 101. IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE SITE-OF-SERVICE TRANSPARENCY.

Section 1834(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(t)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1)—
 (A) in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “SITE PAYMENT”;
 (B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—
 (i) by striking “or to” and inserting “, to”;
 (ii) by inserting “, or to a physician for services furnished in a physician’s office” and “surgical center”; and
 (iii) by inserting “(or 2021 with respect to a physician for services furnished in a physician’s office)” after “2018”; and
 (C) in subparagraph (A)—
 (i) by striking “and the” and inserting “, the”; and
 (ii) by inserting “, and the physician fee schedule under section 1848 (with respect to the practice expense component of such payment amount)” after “such section”;
 (2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) PHYSICIAN PAYMENT.—Beginning in 2021, the Secretary shall expand the information included on the Internet website described in paragraph (1) to include—

“(A) the amount paid to a physician under section 1848 for an item or service for the settings described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) the estimated amount of beneficiary liability applicable to the item or service.”.

SEC. 102. REQUIRING MANUFACTURERS OF CERTAIN SINGLE-DOSE CONTAINER OR SINGLE-USE PACKAGE DRUGS PAYABLE UNDER PART B OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE REFUNDS WITH RESPECT TO DISCARDED AMOUNTS OF SUCH DRUGS.

Section 1847A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395-3a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) REFUND FOR CERTAIN DISCARDED SINGLE-DOSE CONTAINER OR SINGLE-USE PACKAGE DRUGS.—

“(1) SECRETARIAL PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each calendar quarter beginning on or after July 1, 2021, the Secretary shall, with respect to a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug (as defined in paragraph (8)), report to each manufacturer (as defined in subsection (c)(6)(A)) of such refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug the following for the calendar quarter:

“(i) Subject to subparagraph (C), information on the total number of units of the billing and payment code of such drug, if any, that were discarded during such quarter, as determined using a mechanism such as the JW modifier used as of the date of enactment of this subsection (or any such successor modifier that includes such data as determined appropriate by the Secretary).

“(ii) The refund amount that the manufacturer is liable for pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(B) DETERMINATION OF DISCARDED AMOUNTS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), with respect to a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug furnished during a quarter, the amount of such drug that was discarded shall be determined based on the amount of such drug that was unused and discarded for each drug on the date of service.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF UNITS OF PACKAGED DRUGS.—The total number of units of the billing and payment code of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug of a manufacturer furnished during a calendar quarter for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), and the determination of the estimated total allowed charges for the drug in the quarter for purposes of paragraph (3)(A)(ii), shall not include such units that are packaged into the payment amount for an item or service and are not separately payable.

“(2) MANUFACTURER REQUIREMENT.—For each calendar quarter beginning on or after July 1, 2021, the manufacturer of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug shall, for such drug, provide to the Secretary a refund that is equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3) for such drug for such quarter.

“(3) REFUND AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the refund specified in this paragraph is, with respect to a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug of a manufacturer assigned to a billing and payment code for a calendar quarter beginning on or after July 1, 2021, an amount equal to the estimated amount (if any) by which—

“(i) the product of—

“(I) the total number of units of the billing and payment code for such drug that were

discarded during such quarter (as determined under paragraph (1)); and

“(II)(aa) in the case of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug that is a single source drug or biological, the amount determined for such drug under subsection (b)(4); or

“(bb) in the case of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug that is a biosimilar biological product, the average sales price determined under subsection (b)(8)(A); exceeds

“(ii) an amount equal to the applicable percentage (as defined in subparagraph (B)) of the estimated total allowed charges for such drug during the quarter.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE DEFINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the term ‘applicable percentage’ means—

“(I) subject to subclause (II), 10 percent; and

“(II) if applicable, in the case of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug described in clause (ii), a percentage specified by the Secretary pursuant to such clause.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF DRUGS THAT HAVE UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES.—In the case of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug that has unique circumstances involving similar loss of product as that described in paragraph (8)(B), the Secretary, through notice and comment rulemaking, may increase the applicable percentage otherwise applicable under clause (i)(I) as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(4) FREQUENCY.—Amounts required to be refunded pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be paid in regular intervals (as determined appropriate by the Secretary).

“(5) REFUND DEPOSITS.—Amounts paid as refunds pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be deposited into the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1841.

“(6) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) AUDITS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURER AUDITS.—Each manufacturer of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug that is required to provide a refund under this subsection shall be subject to periodic audit with respect to such drug and such refunds by the Secretary.

“(ii) PROVIDER AUDITS.—The Secretary shall conduct periodic audits of claims submitted under this part with respect to refundable single-dose container or single-use package drugs in accordance with the authority under section 1833(e) to ensure compliance with the requirements applicable under this subsection.

“(B) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall impose a civil money penalty on a manufacturer of a refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug who has failed to comply with the requirement under paragraph (2) for such drug for a calendar quarter in an amount equal to the sum of—

“(I) the amount that the manufacturer would have paid under such paragraph with respect to such drug for such quarter; and

“(II) 25 percent of such amount.

“(ii) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subparagraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(7) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement this subsection through notice and comment rulemaking.

“(8) DEFINITION OF REFUNDABLE SINGLE-DOSE CONTAINER OR SINGLE-USE PACKAGE DRUG.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in this subsection, the term ‘refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug’ means a single source drug or biological (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(D)) or a biosimilar biological product (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(H)) for which payment is established under this part and that is furnished from a single-dose container or single-use package.”

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘refundable single-dose container or single-use package drug’ does not include—

“(i) a drug or biological that is either a radiopharmaceutical or an imaging agent;

“(ii) a drug or biological for which dosage and administration instructions approved by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs require filtration during the drug preparation process, prior to dilution and administration, and require that any unused portion of such drug after the filtration process be discarded after the completion of such filtration process; or

“(iii) a drug or biological approved by the Food and Drug Administration on or after the date of enactment of this subsection and with respect to which payment has been made under this part for less than 18 months.”.

SEC. 103. PROVIDING FOR VARIATION IN PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN DRUGS COVERED UNDER PART B OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847A(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after “or 106 percent” the following: “(or, for a multiple source drug (other than autologous cellular immunotherapy) furnished on or after January 1, 2021, the applicable percent specified in paragraph (9)(A) for the drug and quarter involved)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), by inserting after “106 percent” the following: “(or, for a single source drug or biological (other than autologous cellular immunotherapy) furnished on or after January 1, 2021, the applicable percent specified in paragraph (9)(A) for the drug or biological and quarter involved)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) APPLICATION OF VARIABLE PERCENTAGES BASED ON PERCENTILE RANKING OF PER BENEFICIARY ALLOWED CHARGES.—

“(A) APPLICABLE PERCENT TO BE APPLIED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii), with respect to a drug or biological furnished in a calendar quarter beginning on or after January 1, 2021, if the Secretary determines that the percentile rank of a drug or biological under subparagraph (B)(i)(III), with respect to per beneficiary allowed charges for all such drugs or biologicals, is—

“(I) at least equal to the 85th percentile, the applicable percent for the drug for such quarter under this subparagraph is 104 percent;

“(II) at least equal to the 70th percentile, but less than the 85th percentile, such applicable percent is 106 percent;

“(III) at least equal to the 50th percentile, but less than the 70th percentile, such applicable percent is 108 percent; or

“(IV) less than the 50th percentile, such applicable percent is 110 percent.

“(ii) CASES WHERE DATA NOT SUFFICIENTLY AVAILABLE TO COMPUTE PER BENEFICIARY ALLOWED CHARGES.—Subject to clause (iii), in the case of a drug or biological furnished for which the amount of payment is determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) and not under subsection (c)(4), for calendar quarters during a period in which data are not sufficiently available to compute a per beneficiary allowed charges for the drug

or biological, the applicable percent is 106 percent.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF PERCENTILE RANK OF PER BENEFICIARY ALLOWED CHARGES OF DRUGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a calendar quarter beginning on or after January 1, 2021, for drugs and biologicals for which the amount of payment is determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), except for drugs or biologicals for which data are not sufficiently available, the Secretary shall—

“(I) compute the per beneficiary allowed charges (as defined in subparagraph (C)) for each such drug or biological;

“(II) adjust such per beneficiary allowed charges for the quarter, to the extent provided under subparagraph (D); and

“(III) array such adjusted per beneficiary allowed charges for all such drugs or biologicals from high to low and rank such drugs or biologicals by percentile of such arrayed per beneficiary allowed charges.

“(ii) FREQUENCY.—The Secretary shall make the computations under clause (i)(I) every 6 months (or, if necessary, as determined by the Secretary, every 9 or 12 months) and such computations shall apply to succeeding calendar quarters until a new computation has been made.

“(iii) APPLICABLE DATA PERIOD.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable data period’ means the most recent period for which the data necessary for making the computations under clause (i) are available, as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) PER BENEFICIARY ALLOWED CHARGES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘per beneficiary allowed charges’ means, with respect to a drug or biological for which the amount of payment is determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1)—

“(i) the allowed charges for the drug or biological for which payment is so made for the applicable data period, as estimated by the Secretary; divided by

“(ii) the number of individuals for whom any payment for the drug or biological was made under paragraph (1) for the applicable data period, as estimated by the Secretary.

“(D) ADJUSTMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES IN AVERAGE SALES PRICE.—In applying this paragraph for a particular calendar quarter, the Secretary shall adjust the per beneficiary allowed charges for a drug or biological by multiplying such per beneficiary allowed charges under subparagraph (C) for the applicable data period by the ratio of—

“(i) the average sales price for the drug or biological for the most recent calendar quarter used under subsection (c)(5)(B); to

“(ii) the average sales price for the drug or biological for the calendar quarter (or the weighted average for the quarters involved) included in the applicable data period.”.

(b) APPLICATION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW PROVISIONS.—Section 1847A(g) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(6) the determination of per beneficiary allowed charges of drugs or biologicals and ranking of such charges under subsection (b)(9).”.

SEC. 104. ESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM ADD-ON PAYMENT FOR DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a), as amended by section 103, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “para-

graph (7)” and inserting “paragraphs (7) and (10)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) MAXIMUM ADD-ON PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining the payment amount under the provisions of subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, subsection (c)(4)(A)(ii), or subsection (d)(3)(C) for a drug or biological furnished on or after January 1, 2021, if the applicable add-on payment (as defined in subparagraph (B)) for each drug or biological on a claim for a date of service exceeds the maximum add-on payment amount specified under subparagraph (C) for the drug or biological, then the payment amount otherwise determined for the drug or biological under those provisions, as applicable, shall be reduced by the amount of such excess.

“(B) APPLICABLE ADD-ON PAYMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘applicable add-on payment’ means the following amounts, determined without regard to the application of subparagraph (A):

“(i) In the case of a multiple source drug, an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amount that would otherwise be applied under paragraph (1)(A); and

“(II) the amount that would be applied under such paragraph if ‘100 percent’ were substituted for the applicable percent (as defined in paragraph (9)) for such drug.

“(ii) In the case of a single source drug or biological, an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amount that would otherwise be applied under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(II) the amount that would be applied under such paragraph if ‘100 percent’ were substituted for the applicable percent (as defined in paragraph (9)) for such drug or biological.

“(iii) In the case of a biosimilar biological product, the amount otherwise determined under paragraph (8)(B).

“(iv) In the case of a drug or biological during the initial period described in subsection (c)(4)(A), an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amount that would otherwise be applied under subsection (c)(4)(A)(ii); and

“(II) the amount that would be applied under such subsection if ‘100 percent’ were substituted, as applicable, for—

“(aa) ‘103 percent’ in subclause (I) of such subsection; or

“(bb) any percent in excess of 100 percent applied under subclause (II) of such subsection.

“(v) In the case of a drug or biological to which subsection (d)(3)(C) applies, an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amount that would otherwise be applied under such subsection; and

“(II) the amount that would be applied under such subsection if ‘100 percent’ were substituted, as applicable, for—

“(aa) any percent in excess of 100 percent applied under clause (i) of such subsection; or

“(bb) ‘103 percent’ in clause (ii) of such subsection.

“(C) MAXIMUM ADD-ON PAYMENT AMOUNT SPECIFIED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the maximum add-on payment amount specified in this subparagraph is—

“(i) with respect to a drug or biological (other than autologous cellular immunotherapy)—

“(I) for each of 2021 through 2028, \$1,000; and

“(II) for a subsequent year, the amount specified in this subparagraph for the preceding year increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (all items; United States

city average) for the 12-month period ending with June of the previous year; or

“(ii) with respect to a drug or biological consisting of autologous cellular immunotherapy—

“(I) for each of 2021 through 2028, \$2,000; and

“(II) for a subsequent year, the amount specified in this subparagraph for the preceding year increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (all items; United States city average) for the 12-month period ending with June of the previous year.

Any amount determined under this subparagraph that is not a multiple of \$10 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10.”

(2) in subsection (c)(4)(A)(ii), by striking “in the case” and inserting “subject to subsection (b)(10), in the case”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SEPARATELY PAYABLE DRUGS.—

(1) OPPS.—Section 1833(t)(14) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)(14)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii)(II), by inserting “, subject to subparagraph (I)” after “are not available”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) APPLICATION OF MAXIMUM ADD-ON PAYMENT FOR SEPARATELY PAYABLE DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.—In establishing the amount of payment under subparagraph (A) for a specified covered outpatient drug that is furnished as part of a covered OPD service (or group of services) on or after January 1, 2021, if such payment is determined based on the average price for the year established under section 1847A pursuant to clause (iii)(II) of such subparagraph, the provisions of subsection (b)(10) of section 1847A shall apply to the amount of payment so established in the same manner as such provisions apply to the amount of payment under section 1847A.”

(2) ASC.—Section 1833(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(i)(2)(D)) is amended—

(A) by moving clause (v) 6 ems to the left;

(B) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

“(vi) If there is a separate payment under the system described in clause (i) for a drug or biological furnished on or after January 1, 2021, the provisions of subsection (t)(14)(I) shall apply to the establishment of the amount of payment for the drug or biological under such system in the same manner in which such provisions apply to the establishment of the amount of payment under subsection (t)(14)(A).”

SEC. 105. TREATMENT OF DRUG ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FURNISHED BY CERTAIN EXCEPTED OFF-CAMPUS OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENTS OF A PROVIDER.

Section 1833(t)(16) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)(16)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) SPECIAL PAYMENT RULE FOR DRUG ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FURNISHED BY AN EXCEPTED DEPARTMENT OF A PROVIDER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a covered OPD service that is a drug administration service (as defined by the Secretary) furnished by a department of a provider described in clause (ii) or (iv) of paragraph (21)(B), the payment amount for such service furnished on or after January 1, 2021, shall be the same payment amount (as determined in paragraph (21)(C)) that would apply if the drug administration service was furnished by an off-campus outpatient department of a provider (as defined in paragraph (21)(B)).

“(ii) APPLICATION WITHOUT REGARD TO BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—The reductions made under this subparagraph—

“(I) shall not be considered an adjustment under paragraph (2)(E); and

“(II) shall not be implemented in a budget neutral manner.”

Subtitle B—Drug Price Transparency

SEC. 111. REPORTING ON EXPLANATION FOR DRUG PRICE INCREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART W—DRUG PRICE REPORTING; DRUG VALUE FUND

“SEC. 3990O. REPORTING ON EXPLANATION FOR DRUG PRICE INCREASES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means the person—

“(A) that holds the application for a drug approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of this Act; or

“(B) who is responsible for setting the wholesale acquisition cost for the drug.

“(2) QUALIFYING DRUG.—The term ‘qualifying drug’ means any drug that is approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of this Act—

“(A) that has a wholesale acquisition cost of \$100 or more, adjusted for inflation occurring after the date of enactment of this section, for a month’s supply or a typical course of treatment that lasts less than a month, and is—

“(i) subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

“(ii) administered or otherwise dispensed to treat a disease or condition affecting more than 200,000 persons in the United States; and

“(iii) not a vaccine; and

“(B) for which, during the previous calendar year, at least 1 dollar of the total amount of sales were for individuals enrolled under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or under a waiver of such plan.

“(3) WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST.—The term ‘wholesale acquisition cost’ has the meaning given that term in section 1847A(c)(6)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(6)(B)).

“(b) REPORT.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—The manufacturer of a qualifying drug shall submit a report to the Secretary—

“(A) for each increase in the price of a qualifying drug that results in an increase in the wholesale acquisition cost of that drug that is equal to—

“(i) 10 percent or more within a single calendar year beginning on or after January 1, 2019; or

“(ii) 25 percent or more within three consecutive calendar years for which the first such calendar year begins on or after January 1, 2019; and

“(B) in the case that the qualifying drug is first covered under title XVIII with respect to an applicable year, if the estimated cost or spending under such title per individual or per user of such drug (as estimated by the Secretary) for such applicable year (or per course of treatment in such applicable year, as defined by the Secretary) is at least \$26,000.

“(2) REPORT DEADLINE.—Each report described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Secretary—

“(A) in the case of a report with respect to an increase in the price of a qualifying drug

that occurs during the period beginning on January 1, 2019, and ending on the day that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, not later than 90 days after such date of enactment;

“(B) in the case of a report with respect to an increase in the price of a qualifying drug that occurs after the period described in subparagraph (A), not later than 30 days prior to the planned effective date of such price increase for such qualifying drug; and

“(C) in the case of a report with respect to a qualifying drug that meets the criteria described in paragraph (1)(B), not later than 30 days after such drug meets such criteria.

“(c) CONTENTS.—A report under subsection (b), consistent with the standard for disclosures described in section 213.3(d) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section), shall, at a minimum, include—

“(1) with respect to the qualifying drug—

“(A) the percentage by which the manufacturer will raise the wholesale acquisition cost of the drug within the calendar year or three consecutive calendar years as described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or (b)(1)(B), if applicable, and the effective date of such price increase;

“(B) an explanation for, and description of, each price increase for such drug that will occur during the calendar year period described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or the three consecutive calendar year period described in subsection (b)(1)(B), as applicable;

“(C) if known and different from the manufacturer of the qualifying drug, the identity of—

“(i) the sponsor or sponsors of any investigational new drug applications under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for clinical investigations with respect to such drug, for which the full reports are submitted as part of the application—

“(I) for approval of the drug under section 505 of such Act; or

“(II) for licensure of the drug under section 351 of this Act; and

“(ii) the sponsor of an application for the drug approved under such section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of this Act;

“(D) a description of the history of the manufacturer’s price increases for the drug since the approval of the application for the drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the issuance of the license for the drug under section 351 of this Act, or since the manufacturer acquired such approved application or license, if applicable;

“(E) the current wholesale acquisition cost of the drug;

“(F) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on—

“(i) materials and manufacturing for such drug; and

“(ii) acquiring patents and licensing for such drug;

“(G) the percentage of total expenditures of the manufacturer on research and development for such drug that was derived from Federal funds;

“(H) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on research and development for such drug that is necessary to demonstrate that it meets applicable statutory standards for approval under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensure under section 351 of this Act, as applicable;

“(I) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on pursuing new or expanded indications or dosage changes for such drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of this Act;

“(J) the total expenditures of the manufacturer on carrying out postmarket requirements related to such drug, including under section 505(o)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

“(K) the total revenue and the net profit generated from the qualifying drug for each calendar year since the approval of the application for the drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the issuance of the license for the drug under section 351, or since the manufacturer acquired such approved application or license; and

“(L) the total costs associated with marketing and advertising for the qualifying drug;

“(2) with respect to the manufacturer—

“(A) the total revenue and the net profit of the manufacturer for each of the 1-year period described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or the 3-year period described in subsection (b)(1)(B), as applicable;

“(B) all stock-based performance metrics used by the manufacturer to determine executive compensation for each of the 1-year period described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or the 3-year period described in subsection (b)(1)(B), as applicable; and

“(C) any additional information the manufacturer chooses to provide related to drug pricing decisions, such as total expenditures on—

“(i) drug research and development; or

“(ii) clinical trials, including on drugs that failed to receive approval by the Food and Drug Administration; and

“(3) such other related information as the Secretary considers appropriate and as specified by the Secretary through notice-and-comment rulemaking.

“(d) INFORMATION PROVIDED.—The manufacturer of a qualifying drug that is required to submit a report under subsection (b), shall ensure that such report and any explanation for, and description of, each price increase described in subsection (c)(1)(B) shall be truthful, not misleading, and accurate.

“(e) CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY.—Any manufacturer of a qualifying drug that fails to submit a report for the drug as required by this section, following notification by the Secretary to the manufacturer that the manufacturer is not in compliance with this section, shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of \$75,000 for each day on which the violation continues.

“(f) FALSE INFORMATION.—Any manufacturer that submits a report for a drug as required by this section that knowingly provides false information in such report is subject to a civil monetary penalty in an amount not to exceed \$75,000 for each item of false information.

“(g) PUBLIC POSTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall post each report submitted under subsection (b) on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the day the price increase of a qualifying drug is scheduled to go into effect.

“(2) FORMAT.—In developing the format in which reports will be publicly posted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including beneficiary groups, and shall seek feedback from consumer advocates and readability experts on the format and presentation of the content of such reports to ensure that such reports are—

“(A) user-friendly to the public; and

“(B) written in plain language that consumers can readily understand.

“(3) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information submitted by a manufacturer that is prohibited

from disclosure by applicable laws concerning the protection of trade secrets, commercial information, and other information covered under such laws.

“SEC. 39900-1. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a way that is user-friendly to the public and written in plain language that consumers can readily understand, an annual report—

“(1) summarizing the information reported pursuant to section 39900;

“(2) including copies of the reports and supporting detailed economic analyses submitted pursuant to such section;

“(3) detailing the costs and expenditures incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services in carrying out section 39900; and

“(4) explaining how the Department of Health and Human Services is improving consumer and provider information about drug value and drug price transparency.

“(b) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information submitted by a manufacturer that is prohibited from disclosure by applicable laws concerning the protection of trade secrets, commercial information, and other information covered under such laws.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 112. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF DRUG DISCOUNTS.

Section 1150A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-23) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(other than as permitted under subsection (e))” after “disclosed by the Secretary”; and

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

“(e) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to allow the comparison of PBMs’ ability to negotiate rebates, discounts, direct and indirect remuneration fees, administrative fees, and price concessions and the amount of such rebates, discounts, direct and indirect remuneration fees, administrative fees, and price concessions that are passed through to plan sponsors, beginning January 1, 2020, the Secretary shall make available on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services the information with respect to the second preceding calendar year provided to the Secretary on generic dispensing rates (as described in paragraph (1) of subsection (b)) and information provided to the Secretary under paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection that, as determined by the Secretary, is with respect to each PBM.

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure the following:

“(A) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The information described in such paragraph is displayed in a manner that prevents the disclosure of information, with respect to an individual drug or an individual plan, on rebates, discounts, direct and indirect remuneration fees, administrative fees, and price concessions.

“(B) CLASS OF DRUG.—The information described in such paragraph is made available by class of drug, using an existing classification system, but only if the class contains such number of drugs, as specified by the Secretary (but not fewer than three drugs), to ensure confidentiality of proprietary information or other information that is prevented to be disclosed under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 113. STUDY OF PHARMACEUTICAL SUPPLY CHAIN INTERMEDIARIES AND MERGER ACTIVITY.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(1) addresses at minimum—

(A) whether pharmacy benefit managers—

(i) charge payers a higher price than the reimbursement rate at which the pharmacy benefit managers reimburse competing pharmacies;

(ii) steer patients for anticompetitive purposes to any pharmacies, including retail, mail-order, or any other type of pharmacy, in which the pharmacy benefit manager has an ownership interest;

(iii) audit or review proprietary data, including acquisition costs, patient information, or dispensing information, of competing pharmacies that can be used for anticompetitive purposes; or

(iv) use formulary designs to increase the market share of higher cost prescription drugs and depress the market share of lower cost prescription drugs (each net of rebates and discounts);

(B) how companies and payers assess the benefits, costs, and risks of contracting with intermediaries, including pharmacy services administrative organizations, and whether more information about the roles of intermediaries should be available to consumers and payers; and

(C) whether there are any specific legal or regulatory obstacles the Commission currently faces in ensuring a competitive and transparent marketplace in the pharmaceutical supply chain, including the pharmacy benefit manager marketplace and pharmacy services administrative organizations; and

(2) provides—

(A) observations or conclusions drawn from the November 2017 roundtable entitled “Understanding Competition in Prescription Drug Markets: Entry and Supply Chain Dynamics”, and any similar efforts;

(B) specific actions the Commission intends to take as a result of the November 2017 roundtable, and any similar efforts, including a detailed description of relevant forthcoming actions, additional research or roundtable discussions, consumer education efforts, or enforcement actions; and

(C) policy or legislative recommendations to—

(i) improve transparency and competition in the pharmaceutical supply chain;

(ii) prevent and deter anticompetitive behavior in the pharmaceutical supply chain; and

(iii) best ensure that consumers benefit from any cost savings or efficiencies that may result from mergers and consolidations.

(b) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an interim report on the progress of the report required by subsection (a), along with preliminary findings and conclusions based on information collected to that date.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

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

SEC. 114. REQUIRING CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS TO REPORT DRUG PRICING INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “or subsection (f)(2), as applicable” before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or subsection (f)(2), as applicable,” before “determined by”; and

(C) in paragraph (6)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “or subsection (f)(2), as applicable,” before “determined by”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “For requirements” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For requirements”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) MANUFACTURERS WITHOUT A REBATE AGREEMENT UNDER TITLE XIX.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the manufacturer of a drug or biological described in subparagraph (C), (E), or (G) of section 1842(o)(1) or in section 1881(b)(14)(B) that is payable under this part has not entered into and does not have in effect a rebate agreement described in subsection (b) of section 1927, for calendar quarters beginning on or after January 1, 2020, such manufacturer shall report to the Secretary the information described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(iii) of such section 1927 with respect to such drug or biological in a time and manner specified by the Secretary. For purposes of applying this paragraph, a drug or biological described in the previous sentence includes items, services, supplies, and products that are payable under this part as a drug or biological.

“(B) AUDIT.—Information reported under subparagraph (A) is subject to audit by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services.

“(C) VERIFICATION.—The Secretary may survey wholesalers and manufacturers that directly distribute drugs described in subparagraph (A), when necessary, to verify manufacturer prices and manufacturer’s average sales prices (including wholesale acquisition cost) if required to make payment reported under subparagraph (A). The Secretary may impose a civil monetary penalty in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 on a wholesaler, manufacturer, or direct seller, if the wholesaler, manufacturer, or direct seller of such a drug refuses a request for information about charges or prices by the Secretary in connection with a survey under this subparagraph or knowingly provides false information. The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) (with respect to amounts of penalties or additional assessments) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subparagraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(D) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, information disclosed by manufacturers or wholesalers under this paragraph (other than the wholesale acquisition cost for purposes of carrying out this section) is confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Secretary in a form which discloses the identity of a specific manufacturer or wholesaler or prices charged for drugs by such manufacturer or wholesaler, except—

“(i) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section (including the determination and implementation of

the payment amount), or to carry out section 1847B;

“(ii) to permit the Comptroller General of the United States to review the information provided; and

“(iii) to permit the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to review the information provided.”.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 1847A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “MISREPRESENTATION”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)”;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) FAILURE TO PROVIDE TIMELY INFORMATION.—If the Secretary determines that a manufacturer described in subsection (f)(2) has failed to report on information described in section 1927(b)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to a drug or biological in accordance with such subsection, the Secretary shall apply a civil money penalty in an amount of \$10,000 for each day the manufacturer has failed to report such information and such amount shall be paid to the Treasury.

“(C) FALSE INFORMATION.—Any manufacturer required to submit information under subsection (f)(2) that knowingly provides false information is subject to a civil money penalty in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for each item of false information. Such civil money penalties are in addition to other penalties as may be prescribed by law.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(6)(A), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, except that, for purposes of subsection (f)(2), the Secretary may, if the Secretary determines appropriate, exclude repackagers of a drug or biological from such term.”.

(c) MANUFACTURERS WITH A REBATE AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(b)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–8(b)(3)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For purposes of applying clause (iii), a drug or biological described in the flush matter following such clause includes items, services, supplies, and products that are payable under this part as a drug or biological.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1927(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–8(b)(3)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking “section 1881(b)(13)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 1881(b)(14)(B)”.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2021, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall assess and submit to Congress a report on the accuracy of average sales price information submitted by manufacturers under section 1847A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a). Such report shall include any recommendations on how to improve the accuracy of such information.

SEC. 115. MAKING PRESCRIPTION DRUG MARKETING SAMPLE INFORMATION REPORTED BY MANUFACTURERS AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1128H of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

“(b) DATA SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into agreements with the specified data sharing individuals and entities described in paragraph (2) under which—

“(A) upon request of such an individual or entity, as applicable, the Secretary makes available to such individual or entity the information submitted under subsection (a) by manufacturers and authorized distributors of record; and

“(B) such individual or entity agrees to not disclose publicly or to another individual or entity any information that identifies a particular practitioner or health care facility.

“(2) SPECIFIED DATA SHARING INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the specified data sharing individuals and entities described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) OVERSIGHT AGENCIES.—Health oversight agencies (as defined in section 164.501 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations), including the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission.

“(B) RESEARCHERS.—Individuals who conduct scientific research (as defined in section 164.501 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations) in relevant areas as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) PAYERS.—Private and public health care payers, including group health plans, health insurance coverage offered by health insurance issuers, Federal health programs, and State health programs.

“(3) EXEMPTION FROM FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—Except as described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may not be compelled to disclose the information submitted under subsection (a) to any individual or entity. For purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), this paragraph shall be considered a statute described in subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section.

“(c) PENALTIES.—

“(1) DATA SHARING AGREEMENTS.—Subject to paragraph (3), any specified data sharing individual or entity described in subsection (b)(2) that violates the terms of a data sharing agreement the individual or entity has with the Secretary under subsection (b)(1) shall be subject to a civil money penalty of not less than \$1,000, but not more than \$10,000, for each such violation. Such penalty shall be imposed and collected in the same manner as civil money penalties under subsection (a) of section 1128A are imposed and collected under that section.

“(2) FAILURE TO REPORT.—Subject to paragraph (3), any manufacturer or authorized distributor of record of an applicable drug under subsection (a) that fails to submit information required under such subsection in a timely manner in accordance with rules or regulations promulgated to carry out such subsection shall be subject to a civil money penalty of not less than \$1,000, but not more than \$10,000, for each such failure. Such penalty shall be imposed and collected in the same manner as civil money penalties under subsection (a) of section 1128A are imposed and collected under that section.

“(3) LIMITATION.—The total amount of civil money penalties imposed under paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to a year and an individual or entity described in paragraph (1) or a manufacturer or distributor described in paragraph (2), respectively, shall not exceed \$150,000.

“(d) DRUG SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1 of each year (beginning with 2021), the Secretary shall maintain a list containing information related to the distribution of samples of applicable drugs. Such list shall provide

the following information with respect to the preceding year:

“(A) The name of the manufacturer or authorized distributor of record of an applicable drug for which samples were requested or distributed under this section.

“(B) The quantity and class of drug samples requested.

“(C) The quantity and class of drug samples distributed.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the information in such list available to the public on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.”

(b) FDA MAINTENANCE OF INFORMATION.—The Food and Drug Administration shall maintain information available to affected reporting companies to ensure their ability to fully comply with the requirements of section 1128H of the Social Security Act.

(c) PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLES OF OPIOIDS.—Section 503(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(d)) is amended—

(1) by moving the margin of paragraph (4) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) No person may distribute a drug sample of a drug that is—

“(A) an applicable drug (as defined in section 1128H(e) of the Social Security Act);

“(B) a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act) for which the findings required under section 202(b)(2) of such Act have been made; and

“(C) approved under section 505 for use in the management or treatment of pain (other than for the management or treatment of a substance use disorder).”

(d) MEDPAC REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study on the impact of drug samples on provider prescribing practices and health care costs and may, as the Commission deems appropriate, make recommendations on such study.

SEC. 116. REQUIRING PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN SPONSORS TO INCLUDE REAL-TIME BENEFIT INFORMATION AS PART OF SUCH SPONSOR'S ELECTRONIC PRESCRIPTION PROGRAM UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1860D-4(e)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-104(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “To the extent” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (F), to the extent”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) REAL-TIME BENEFIT INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2021, the program shall implement real-time benefit tools that are capable of integrating with a prescribing health care professional's electronic prescribing or electronic health record system for the transmission of formulary and benefit information in real time to prescribing health care professionals. With respect to a covered part D drug, such tools shall be capable of transmitting such information specific to an individual enrolled in a prescription drug plan. Such information shall include the following:

“(I) A list of any clinically-appropriate alternatives to such drug included in the formulary of such plan.

“(II) Cost-sharing information for such drug and such alternatives, including a description of any variance in cost-sharing based on the pharmacy dispensing such drug or such alternatives.

“(III) Information relating to whether such drug is included in the formulary of such plan and any prior authorization or other utilization management requirements appli-

cable to such drug and such alternatives so included.

“(ii) ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION.—The provisions of subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (ii) of subparagraph (E) shall apply to an electronic transmission described in clause (i) in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to an electronic transmission described in clause (i) of such subparagraph.

“(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR 2021.—The program shall be deemed to be in compliance with clause (i) for 2021 if the program complies with the provisions of section 423.160(b)(7) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), for such year.

“(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as to allow a real-time benefits tool to steer an individual, without the consent of the individual, to a particular pharmacy or pharmacy setting over their preferred pharmacy setting nor prohibit the designation of a preferred pharmacy under such tool.”

SEC. 117. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED TO EXPAND COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE DRUG PRICING COMPARISON PLATFORMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) commercially available drug pricing comparison platforms can, at no cost, help patients find the lowest price for their medications at their local pharmacy;

(2) such platforms should be integrated, to the maximum extent possible, in the health care delivery ecosystem; and

(3) pharmacy benefit managers should work to disclose generic and brand name drug prices to such platforms to ensure that—

(A) patients can benefit from the lowest possible price available to them; and

(B) overall drug prices can be reduced as more educated purchasing decisions are made based on price transparency.

SEC. 118. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3022(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj-52(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICATION OF AUTHORITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—In carrying out this subsection, the Inspector General shall have the same authorities as provided under section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114-255).

Subtitle C—Medicare Part D Benefit Redesign

SEC. 121. MEDICARE PART D BENEFIT REDESIGN.

(a) BENEFIT STRUCTURE REDESIGN.—Section 1860D-2(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022 and for costs above the annual deductible specified in paragraph (1) and up to the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in paragraph (4)(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year” after “paragraph (3)”; and

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting after “25 percent” the following: “(or, for 2022 and each subsequent year, 15 percent)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “paragraph (4),”; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(III), by striking “and each subsequent year” and inserting “and 2021”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “paragraph (4),”; and

(II) in subclause (I)(bb), by striking “a year after 2018” and inserting “each of years 2018 through 2021”; and

(i) in clause (ii)(V), by striking “2019 and each subsequent year” and inserting “each of years 2019 through 2021”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “and (4),”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “for a subsequent year” and inserting “for each of years 2007 through 2021”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(II) in the matter preceding item (aa), as redesignated by subclause (I), by striking “is equal to the greater of—” and inserting “is equal to—

“(I) for a year preceding 2022, the greater of—

(III) by striking the period at the end of item (bb), as redesignated by subclause (I), and inserting “; and”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) for 2022 and each succeeding year, \$0.”; and

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “clause (i)(I)” and inserting “clause (i)(I)(aa)”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall continue to calculate the dollar amounts specified in clause (i)(I)(aa), including with the adjustment under this clause, after 2021 for purposes of section 1860D-14(a)(1)(D)(iii).”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (V), by striking “or” at the end;

(II) in subclause (VI)—

(aa) by striking “for a subsequent year” and inserting “for 2021”; and

(bb) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(III) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(VII) for 2022, is equal to \$3,100; or

“(VIII) for a subsequent year, is equal to the amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year, increased by the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (6) for the year involved.”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “clause (i)(II)” and inserting “clause (i)”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “and for amounts” and inserting “and for a year preceding 2022 for amounts”; and

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking “In applying” and inserting “For each of 2011 through 2021, in applying”.

(b) DECREASING REINSURANCE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—Section 1860D-15(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-115(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “equal to 80 percent” and inserting “equal to—

“(A) for a year preceding 2022, 80 percent”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), as added by paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(B) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the sum of—

“(i) an amount equal to 20 percent of the allowable reinsurance costs (as specified in paragraph (2)) attributable to that portion of gross covered prescription drug costs as specified in paragraph (3) incurred in the coverage year after such individual has incurred

costs that exceed the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B) with respect to applicable drugs (as defined in section 1860D-14B(g)(2)); and

“(ii) an amount equal to 30 percent of the allowable reinsurance costs (as specified in paragraph (2)) attributable to that portion of gross covered prescription drug costs as specified in paragraph (3) incurred in the coverage year after such individual has incurred costs that exceed the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B) with respect to covered part D drugs that are not applicable drugs (as so defined).”

(c) MANUFACTURER DISCOUNT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1860D-14A (42 U.S.C. 1495w-114) the following new section:

“SEC. 1860D-14B. MANUFACTURER DISCOUNT PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a manufacturer discount program (in this section referred to as the ‘program’). Under the program, the Secretary shall enter into agreements described in subsection (b) with manufacturers and provide for the performance of the duties described in subsection (c). The Secretary shall establish a model agreement for use under the program by not later than January 1, 2021, in consultation with manufacturers, and allow for comment on such model agreement.

“(b) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) AGREEMENT.—An agreement under this section shall require the manufacturer to provide applicable beneficiaries access to discounted prices for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.

“(B) PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED PRICES AT THE POINT-OF-SALE.—The discounted prices described in subparagraph (A) shall be provided to the applicable beneficiary at the pharmacy or by the mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug.

“(2) PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE DATA.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall collect and have available appropriate data, as determined by the Secretary, to ensure that it can demonstrate to the Secretary compliance with the requirements under the program.

“(3) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall comply with requirements imposed by the Secretary or a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3), as applicable, for purposes of administering the program, including any determination under subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(1) or procedures established under such subsection (c)(1).

“(4) LENGTH OF AGREEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An agreement under this section shall be effective for an initial period of not less than 12 months and shall be automatically renewed for a period of not less than 1 year unless terminated under subparagraph (B).

“(B) TERMINATION.—

“(i) BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may provide for termination of an agreement under this section for a knowing and willful violation of the requirements of the agreement or other good cause shown. Such termination shall not be effective earlier than 30 days after the date of notice to the manufacturer of such termination. The Secretary shall provide, upon request, a manufacturer with a hearing concerning such a termination, and such hearing shall take place prior to the effective date of the termination with sufficient time for such effective date to be repealed if the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(ii) BY A MANUFACTURER.—A manufacturer may terminate an agreement under this section for any reason. Any such termination shall be effective, with respect to a plan year—

“(I) if the termination occurs before January 30 of a plan year, as of the day after the end of the plan year; and

“(II) if the termination occurs on or after January 30 of a plan year, as of the day after the end of the succeeding plan year.

“(iii) EFFECTIVENESS OF TERMINATION.—Any termination under this subparagraph shall not affect discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer that are due under the agreement before the effective date of its termination.

“(iv) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTY.—The Secretary shall provide notice of such termination to a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3) within not less than 30 days before the effective date of such termination.

“(5) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AGREEMENT.—An agreement under this section shall take effect on a date determined appropriate by the Secretary, which may be at the start of a calendar quarter.

“(c) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The duties described in this subsection are the following:

“(1) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—Administering the program, including—

“(A) the determination of the amount of the discounted price of an applicable drug of a manufacturer;

“(B) the establishment of procedures under which discounted prices are provided to applicable beneficiaries at pharmacies or by mail order service at the point-of-sale of an applicable drug;

“(C) the establishment of procedures to ensure that, not later than the applicable number of calendar days after the dispensing of an applicable drug by a pharmacy or mail order service, the pharmacy or mail order service is reimbursed for an amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the negotiated price of the applicable drug; and

“(ii) the discounted price of the applicable drug;

“(D) the establishment of procedures to ensure that the discounted price for an applicable drug under this section is applied before any coverage or financial assistance under other health benefit plans or programs that provide coverage or financial assistance for the purchase or provision of prescription drug coverage on behalf of applicable beneficiaries as the Secretary may specify; and

“(E) providing a reasonable dispute resolution mechanism to resolve disagreements between manufacturers, applicable beneficiaries, and the third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3).

“(2) MONITORING COMPLIANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor compliance by a manufacturer with the terms of an agreement under this section.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—If a third party with a contract under subsection (d)(3) determines that the manufacturer is not in compliance with such agreement, the third party shall notify the Secretary of such noncompliance for appropriate enforcement under subsection (e).

“(3) COLLECTION OF DATA FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS.—The Secretary may collect appropriate data from prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans in a timeframe that allows for discounted prices to be provided for applicable drugs under this section.

“(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall provide for the implementation of this section, including the per-

formance of the duties described in subsection (c).

“(2) LIMITATION.—In providing for the implementation of this section, the Secretary shall not receive or distribute any funds of a manufacturer under the program.

“(3) CONTRACT WITH THIRD PARTIES.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with 1 or more third parties to administer the requirements established by the Secretary in order to carry out this section. At a minimum, the contract with a third party under the preceding sentence shall require that the third party—

“(A) receive and transmit information between the Secretary, manufacturers, and other individuals or entities the Secretary determines appropriate;

“(B) receive, distribute, or facilitate the distribution of funds of manufacturers to appropriate individuals or entities in order to meet the obligations of manufacturers under agreements under this section;

“(C) provide adequate and timely information to manufacturers, consistent with the agreement with the manufacturer under this section, as necessary for the manufacturer to fulfill its obligations under this section; and

“(D) permit manufacturers to conduct periodic audits, directly or through contracts, of the data and information used by the third party to determine discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer under the program.

“(4) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish performance requirements for a third party with a contract under paragraph (3) and safeguards to protect the independence and integrity of the activities carried out by the third party under the program under this section.

“(5) ADMINISTRATION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the program under this section.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) AUDITS.—Each manufacturer with an agreement in effect under this section shall be subject to periodic audit by the Secretary.

“(2) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall impose a civil money penalty on a manufacturer that fails to provide applicable beneficiaries discounts for applicable drugs of the manufacturer in accordance with such agreement for each such failure in an amount the Secretary determines is commensurate with the sum of—

“(i) the amount that the manufacturer would have paid with respect to such discounts under the agreement, which will then be used to pay the discounts which the manufacturer had failed to provide; and

“(ii) 25 percent of such amount.

“(B) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this paragraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(f) CLARIFICATION REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF OTHER COVERED PART D DRUGS.—Nothing in this section shall prevent an applicable beneficiary from purchasing a covered part D drug that is not on the formulary of the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICABLE BENEFICIARY.—The term ‘applicable beneficiary’ means an individual who, on the date of dispensing a covered part D drug—

“(A) is enrolled in a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan;

“(B) is not enrolled in a qualified retiree prescription drug plan; and

“(C) has incurred costs for covered part D drugs in the year that are equal to or exceed

the annual deductible specified in section 1860D-2(b)(1) for such year.

“(2) APPLICABLE DRUG.—The term ‘applicable drug’ means, with respect to an applicable beneficiary, a covered part D drug—

“(A) approved under a new drug application under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or, in the case of a biologic product, licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (including a product licensed under subsection (k) of such section); and

“(B)(i) if the PDP sponsor of the prescription drug plan or the MA organization offering the MA-PD plan uses a formulary, which is on the formulary of the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in;

“(ii) if the PDP sponsor of the prescription drug plan or the MA organization offering the MA-PD plan does not use a formulary, for which benefits are available under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan that the applicable beneficiary is enrolled in; or

“(iii) is provided through an exception or appeal.

“(3) APPLICABLE NUMBER OF CALENDAR DAYS.—The term ‘applicable number of calendar days’ means—

“(A) with respect to claims for reimbursement submitted electronically, 14 days; and

“(B) with respect to claims for reimbursement submitted otherwise, 30 days.

“(4) DISCOUNTED PRICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘discounted price’ means, with respect to an applicable drug of a manufacturer furnished during a year to an applicable beneficiary, 90 percent of the negotiated price of such drug.

“(B) CLARIFICATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibility of an applicable beneficiary for payment of a dispensing fee for an applicable drug.

“(C) SPECIAL CASE FOR CLAIMS SPANNING DEDUCTIBLE.—In the case where the entire amount of the negotiated price of an individual claim for an applicable drug with respect to an applicable beneficiary does not fall at or above the annual deductible specified in section 1860D-2(b)(1) for the year, the manufacturer of the applicable drug shall provide the discounted price under this section on only the portion of the negotiated price of the applicable drug that falls at or above such annual deductible.

“(5) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means any entity which is engaged in the production, preparation, propagation, compounding, conversion, or processing of prescription drug products, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of natural origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis. Such term does not include a wholesale distributor of drugs or a retail pharmacy licensed under State law.

“(6) NEGOTIATED PRICE.—The term ‘negotiated price’ has the meaning given such term in section 1860D-2(d)(1)(B), except that such negotiated price shall not include any dispensing fee for an applicable drug.

“(7) QUALIFIED RETIREE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—The term ‘qualified retiree prescription drug plan’ has the meaning given such term in section 11860D-22(a)(2).”

(2) SUNSET OF MEDICARE COVERAGE GAP DISCOUNT PROGRAM.—Section 1860D-14A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395-114a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Subject to subsection (h), the Secretary”; and

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

“(h) SUNSET OF PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The program shall not apply to applicable drugs dispensed on or after January 1, 2022, and, subject to paragraph (2), agreements under this section shall be terminated as of such date.

“(2) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR APPLICABLE DRUGS DISPENSED PRIOR TO SUNSET.—The provisions of this section (including all responsibilities and duties) shall continue to apply after January 1, 2022, with respect to applicable drugs dispensed prior to such date.”

(3) INCLUSION OF ACTUARIAL VALUE OF MANUFACTURER DISCOUNTS IN BIDS.—Section 1860D-11 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iii)—

(i) by striking “assumptions regarding the reinsurance” and inserting “assumptions regarding—

“(I) the reinsurance”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the manufacturer discounts provided under section 1860D-14B subtracted from the actuarial value to produce such bid; and”

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(C)—

(i) by striking “an actuarial valuation of the reinsurance” and inserting “an actuarial valuation of—

“(i) the reinsurance”; and

(ii) in clause (i), as added by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by adding “and” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) for 2022 and each subsequent year, the manufacturer discounts provided under section 1860D-14B;”

(d) DETERMINATION OF ALLOWABLE REINSURANCE COSTS.—Section 1860D-15(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-115(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “COSTS.—For purposes” and inserting “COSTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for purposes”.

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) INCLUSION OF MANUFACTURER DISCOUNTS ON APPLICABLE DRUGS.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (A), the term ‘allowable reinsurance costs’ shall include the portion of the negotiated price (as defined in section 1860D-14B(g)(6)) of an applicable drug (as defined in section 1860D-14(g)(2)) that was paid by a manufacturer under the manufacturer discount program under section 1860D-14B.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “For purposes” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (2)(B), for purposes”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting “or, in the case of an applicable drug, by a manufacturer” after “by the individual or under the plan”.

(e) UPDATING RISK ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGIES TO ACCOUNT FOR PART D MODERNIZATION REDESIGN.—Section 1860D-15(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-115(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) UPDATING RISK ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGIES TO ACCOUNT FOR PART D MODERNIZATION REDESIGN.—The Secretary shall update the risk adjustment model used to adjust bid amounts pursuant to this subsection as appropriate to take into account changes in benefits under this part pursuant to the amendments made by section 121 of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019.”

(f) CONDITIONS FOR COVERAGE OF DRUGS UNDER THIS PART.—Section 1860D-43 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-153) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) participate in the manufacturer discount program under section 1860D-14B;

“(5) have entered into and have in effect an agreement described in subsection (b) of such section 1860D-14B with the Secretary; and

“(6) have entered into and have in effect, under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, a contract with a third party that the Secretary has entered into a contract with under subsection (d)(3) of such section 1860D-14B.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) shall apply to covered part D drugs dispensed under this part on or after January 1, 2011, and before January 1, 2022, and paragraphs (4) through (6) of such subsection shall apply to covered part D drugs dispensed on or after January 1, 2022.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the Secretary determines that in the period beginning on January 1, 2011, and ending on December 31, 2011 (with respect to paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a)) or the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending December 31, 2022 (with respect to paragraphs (4) through (6) of such subsection), there were extenuating circumstances.”

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1860D-2 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)(I), by striking “, or an increase in the initial” and inserting “or for a year preceding 2022 an increase in the initial”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “AT INITIAL COVERAGE LIMIT”; and

(ii) by inserting “for a year preceding 2022 or the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in subsection (b)(4)(B) for the year for 2022 and each subsequent year” after “subsection (b)(3) for the year” each place it appears; and

(C) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking “or an initial” and inserting “or for a year preceding 2022, an initial”.

(2) Section 1860D-4(a)(4)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-104(a)(4)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “the initial” and inserting “for a year preceding 2022, the initial”.

(3) Section 1860D-14(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “The continuation” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the continuation”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by striking “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)” and inserting “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa)”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “The elimination” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the elimination”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “The continuation” and inserting “For a year preceding 2022, the continuation”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by inserting “for a year preceding 2022,” after “subsection (c)”; and

(II) by striking “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)” and inserting “1860D-2(b)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa)”.

(4) Section 1860D-21(d)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-131(d)(7)) is amended by striking “section 1860D-2(b)(4)(B)(i)” and inserting “section 1860D-2(b)(4)(C)(i)”.

(5) Section 1860D-22(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-132(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking “the value of any discount” and inserting the following: “the value of—

“(i) for years prior to 2022, any discount”;

(B) in clause (i), as inserted by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) for 2022 and each subsequent year, any discount provided pursuant to section 1860D-14B.”.

(6) Section 1860D-41(a)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-151(a)(6)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “for a year before 2022” after “1860D-2(b)(3)”; and

(B) by inserting “for such year” before the period.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan year 2022 and subsequent plan years.

Subtitle D—Other Medicare Part D Provisions

SEC. 131. TRANSITIONAL COVERAGE AND RETROACTIVE MEDICARE PART D COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN LOW-INCOME BENEFICIARIES.

Section 1860D-14 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) LIMITED INCOME NEWLY ELIGIBLE TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary shall carry out a program to provide transitional coverage for covered part D drugs for LI NET eligible individuals in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) LI NET ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘LI NET eligible individual’ means a part D eligible individual who—

“(A) meets the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii) of subsection (a)(3)(A); and

“(B) has not yet enrolled in a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, or, who has so enrolled, but with respect to whom coverage under such plan has not yet taken effect.

“(3) TRANSITIONAL COVERAGE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘transitional coverage’ means, with respect to an LI NET eligible individual—

“(A) immediate access to covered part D drugs at the point-of-sale during the period that begins on the first day of the month such individual is determined to meet the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii) of subsection (a)(3)(A) and ends on the date that coverage under a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan takes effect with respect to such individual; and

“(B) in the case of an LI NET eligible individual who is a full-benefit dual eligible individual (as defined in section 1935(c)(6)) or a recipient of supplemental security income benefits under title XVI, retroactive coverage (in the form of reimbursement of the amounts that would have been paid under this part had such individual been enrolled in a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan) of covered part D drugs purchased by such individual during the period that begins on the date that is the later of—

“(i) the date that such individual was first eligible for a low-income subsidy under this part; or

“(ii) the date that is 36 months prior to the date such individual enrolls in a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan, and ends on the date that coverage under such plan takes effect.

“(4) PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—

“(A) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT.—The Secretary shall, to the extent feasible, administer the program under this subsection through a contract with a single program administrator.

“(B) BENEFIT DESIGN.—The Secretary shall ensure that the transitional coverage provided to LI NET eligible individuals under this subsection—

“(i) provides access to all covered part D drugs under an open formulary;

“(ii) permits all pharmacies determined by the Secretary to be in good standing to process claims under the program;

“(iii) is consistent with such requirements as the Secretary considers necessary to improve patient safety and ensure appropriate dispensing of medication; and

“(iv) meets such other requirements as the Secretary may establish.

“(5) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF THIS TITLE; WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions shall not apply with respect to the program under this subsection:

“(i) Paragraphs (1) and (3)(B) of section 1860D-4(a) (relating to dissemination of general information; availability of information on changes in formulary through the internet).

“(ii) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1860D-4(b)(3) (relating to requirements on development and application of formularies; formulary development).

“(iii) Paragraphs (1)(C) and (2) of section 1860D-4(c) (relating to medication therapy management program).

“(B) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive such other requirements of title XI and this title as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the program established under this subsection.”.

SEC. 132. ALLOWING THE OFFERING OF ADDITIONAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

(a) RESCINDING AND ISSUANCE OF NEW GUIDANCE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall—

(1) rescind sections of any sub-regulatory guidance that limit the number of prescription drug plans in each PDP region that may be offered by a PDP sponsor under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.); and

(2) issue new guidance specifying that a PDP sponsor may offer up to 4 (or a greater number if determined appropriate by the Secretary) prescription drug plans in each PDP region, except in cases where the PDP sponsor may offer up to 2 additional plans in a PDP region pursuant to section 1860D-11(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111(d)(4)), as added by subsection (b).

(b) OFFERING OF ADDITIONAL PLANS.—Section 1860D-11(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) OFFERING OF ADDITIONAL PLANS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For plan year 2022 and each subsequent plan year, a PDP sponsor may offer up to 2 additional prescription drug plans in a PDP region (in addition to any limit established by the Secretary under this part) provided that the PDP sponsor complies with subparagraph (B) with respect to at least one such prescription drug plan.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In order to be eligible to offer up to 2 additional plans in a PDP region pursuant to subparagraph (A), a PDP sponsor must ensure that, with respect to at least one such prescription drug plan, the sponsor or any entity that provides pharmacy benefits management services under a contract with any such sponsor or plan does not receive direct or indirect remuneration,

as defined in section 423.308 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), unless at least 25 percent of the aggregate reductions in price or other remuneration received by the PDP sponsor or entity from drug manufacturers with respect to the plan and plan year—

“(i) are reflected at the point-of-sale to the enrollee; or

“(ii) are used to reduce total beneficiary cost-sharing estimated by the PDP sponsor for prescription drug coverage under the plan in the annual bid submitted by the PDP sponsor under section 1860D-11(b).

(C) DEFINITION OF REDUCTIONS IN PRICE.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term ‘reductions in price’ refers only to collectible amounts, as determined by the Secretary, which excludes amounts which after adjudication and reconciliation with pharmacies and manufacturers are duplicate in nature, contrary to other contractual clauses, or otherwise ineligible (such as due to beneficiary disenrollment or coordination of benefits).”.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the provisions of, or amendments made by, this section shall be construed as limiting the ability of the Secretary to increase any limit otherwise applicable on the number of prescription drug plans that a PDP sponsor may offer, at the discretion of the PDP sponsor, in a PDP region under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.).

SEC. 133. ALLOWING CERTAIN ENROLLEES OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM TO SPREAD OUT COST-SHARING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) STANDARD PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Section 1860D-2(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(b)(2)), as amended by section 121, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D)” and inserting “Subject to subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) ENROLLEE OPTION REGARDING SPREADING COST-SHARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation a process under which, with respect to plan year 2022 and subsequent plan years, a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan shall, in the case of a part D eligible individual enrolled with such plan for such plan year with respect to whom the plan projects that the dispensing of a covered part D drug to such individual will result in the individual incurring costs within a 30-day period that are equal to a significant percentage (as specified by the Secretary pursuant to such regulation) of the annual out-of-pocket threshold specified in paragraph (4)(B) for such plan year, provide such individual with the option to make the coinsurance payment required under subparagraph (A) for such costs in the form of equal monthly installments over the remainder of such plan year.

“(ii) SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS.—In specifying a significant percentage pursuant to the regulation established by the Secretary under clause (i), the Secretary may not specify a percentage that is less than 30 percent or greater than 100 percent.”.

(b) ALTERNATIVE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Section 1860D-2(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) SAME ENROLLEE OPTION REGARDING SPREADING COST-SHARING.—For plan year 2022 and subsequent plan years, the coverage provides the enrollee option regarding spreading

cost-sharing described in and required under subsection (b)(2)(E).”

SEC. 134. ESTABLISHING A MONTHLY CAP ON BENEFICIARY INCURRED COSTS FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS AND SUPPLIES UNDER A PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OR MA-PD PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D–2 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–102), as amended by sections 121 and 133, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (E)” and inserting “(E), and (F)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and (D)” and inserting “(D), and (F)”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) CAP ON INCURRED COSTS FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS AND SUPPLIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The coverage provides benefits, for costs above the annual deductible specified in paragraph (1) and up to the annual out-of-pocket threshold described in paragraph (4)(B) and with respect to a month (beginning with January of 2022), with cost sharing that is equal to \$0 for a specified covered part D drug (as defined in clause (iii)) furnished to an individual who has incurred costs during such month with respect to specified covered part D drugs equal to—

“(I) for months occurring in 2022, \$50; or

“(II) for months occurring in a subsequent year, the amount applicable under this clause for months occurring in the year preceding such subsequent year, increased by the annual percentage increase specified in paragraph (6) for such subsequent year and rounded to the nearest dollar.

“(ii) APPLICATION.—The provisions of clauses (i) through (iii) of paragraph (4)(C) shall apply with respect to the determination of the incurred costs for specified covered part D drugs for purposes of clause (i) in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to the determination of incurred costs for covered part D drugs for purposes of paragraph (4)(A).

“(iii) SPECIFIED COVERED PART D DRUG.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘specified covered part D drug’ means a covered part D drug that is—

“(I) insulin; or

“(II) a medical supply associated with the injection of insulin (as defined in regulations of the Secretary promulgated pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B)).”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) SAME PROTECTION WITH RESPECT TO EXPENDITURES FOR INSULIN AND CERTAIN MEDICAL SUPPLIES.—The coverage provides the coverage required under subsection (b)(2)(F).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D–14(a)(1)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–114(a)(1)(D)), as amended by section 121, is further amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “section 1860D–2(b)(2)” and inserting “section 1860D–2(b)(2)(A)”; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “section 1860D–2(b)(2)” and inserting “section 1860D–2(b)(2)(A)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to plan year 2022 and each subsequent plan year.

SEC. 135. GROWTH RATE OF MEDICARE PART D OUT-OF-POCKET COST THRESHOLD.

(a) PROVIDING MEDICARE PART D BENEFICIARIES WITH CERTAIN 2020 OFFSET PAYMENTS.—Section 1860D–2(b)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–102(b)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 2020 OFFSET PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (iv), the Secretary shall provide for payment from the Medicare Prescription Drug Account as follows:

“(I) In the case of a specified individual (as defined in clause (ii)(I)) who as of the last day of a calendar quarter in 2020 has incurred costs for covered part D drugs so that the individual has exceeded the annual out-of-pocket threshold applied under subparagraph (B)(i)(V) for 2020, payment to the individual by not later than 15th day of the third month following the end of such quarter of the amount by which such threshold so applied exceeded the target threshold for 2020.

“(II) In the case of a specified individual who is not described in subclause (I) and who as of the last day of 2020 has incurred costs for covered part D drugs so that the individual has exceeded the target threshold for 2020, payment to the individual by not later than December 31, 2021 of the amount by which such incurred costs exceeded the target threshold for 2020.

“(ii) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph:

“(I) SPECIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘specified individual’ means an individual who—

“(aa) is enrolled in a prescription drug plan or an MA–PD plan;

“(bb) is not enrolled in a qualified retiree prescription drug plan; and

“(cc) is not entitled to an income-related subsidy under section 1860D–14(a).

“(II) TARGET THRESHOLD FOR 2020.—the term ‘target threshold for 2020’ means the annual out-of-pocket threshold that would have been applied under subparagraph (B)(i) for 2020 if such threshold had been determined in accordance with subclause (IV) of such subparagraph instead of subclause (V) of such subparagraph.

“(iii) NOTIFICATION.—In the case of any specified individual who during 2020 has incurred costs for covered part D drugs so that the individual has exceeded the target threshold for 2020, the Secretary shall, not later than September 30, 2021, provide to such individual a notification informing such individual of such individual’s right to a payment described in clause (i) and the estimated timing of such payment.

“(iv) CLARIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide only 1 payment under this subparagraph with respect to any individual.

“(v) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary may implement this subparagraph by program instruction or otherwise.”

(b) REDUCED GROWTH RATE FOR 2021 OF MEDICARE PART D OUT-OF-POCKET COST THRESHOLD.—Section 1860D–2(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–102(b)(4)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (V), by striking at the end “or”;

(2) by redesignating subclause (VI) as subclause (VIII); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (V) the following new subclauses:

“(VI) for 2021, is equal to the amount that would have been applied under this subparagraph for 2020 if such amount had been determined in accordance with subclause (IV) instead of subclause (V), increased by the lesser of—

“(aa) the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (7) for 2021, plus 2 percentage points; or

“(bb) the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (6) for 2021;

“(VII) for 2022, is equal to the amount that would have been applied under this subparagraph for 2022 if the amendments made by section 1101(d)(1) of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and by section 135 of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019 had not been enacted; or”.

Subtitle E—MedPAC

SEC. 141. PROVIDING THE MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION AND MEDICAID AND CHIP PAYMENT AND ACCESS COMMISSION WITH ACCESS TO CERTAIN DRUG PAYMENT INFORMATION, INCLUDING CERTAIN REBATE INFORMATION.

(a) ACCESS TO CERTAIN PART D PAYMENT DATA.—Section 1860D–15(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–115(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

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

(C) by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) by the Executive Director of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission for purposes of monitoring, making recommendations, and analysis of the program under this title and by the Executive Director of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission for purposes of monitoring, making recommendations, and analysis of the Medicaid program established under title XIX and the Children’s Health Insurance Program under title XXI.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Executive Directors described in paragraph (2)(C) shall not disclose any of the following information disclosed to such Executive Directors or obtained by such Executive Directors pursuant to such paragraph, with respect to a prescription drug plan offered by a PDP sponsor:

“(A) The specific amounts or the identity of the source of any rebates, price concessions, or other forms of direct or indirect remuneration under such prescription drug plan.

“(B) Information submitted with the bid submitted under section 1860D–11 by such PDP sponsor.

“(C) In the case of such information from prescription drug event records, in a form that would not be permitted under section 423.505(m) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, if made by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.”

(b) ACCESS TO CERTAIN REBATE AND PAYMENT DATA UNDER MEDICARE AND MEDICAID.—Section 1927(b)(3)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–8(b)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) in the matter before clause (i), by striking “subsection (a)(6)(A)(ii)” and inserting “subsection (a)(6)(A)”; and

(2) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”;

(4) by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

“(vii) to permit the Executive Director of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Executive Director of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission to review the information provided.”;

(5) in the matter at the end, by striking “1860D–4(c)(2)(E)” and inserting “1860D–4(c)(2)(G)”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Any information disclosed to the Executive Director of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission or the Executive Director of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission pursuant to this subparagraph shall not be disclosed by either such Executive Director in a form which discloses the identity of a specific manufacturer or wholesaler or prices charged for drugs by such manufacturer or wholesaler.”

TITLE II—MEDICAID

SEC. 201. SUNSET OF LIMIT ON MAXIMUM REBATE AMOUNT FOR SINGLE SOURCE DRUGS AND INNOVATOR MULTIPLE SOURCE DRUGS.

Section 1927(c)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(c)(2)(D)) is amended by inserting after “December 31, 2009,” the following: “and before January 1, 2023.”

SEC. 202. MEDICAID PHARMACY AND THERAPEUTICS COMMITTEE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1927(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A)(i) The formulary is developed and reviewed by a pharmacy and therapeutics committee consisting of physicians, pharmacists, and other appropriate individuals appointed by the Governor of the State.

“(ii) Subject to clause (vi), the State establishes and implements a conflict of interest policy for the pharmacy and therapeutics committee that—

“(I) is publicly accessible;

“(II) requires all committee members to complete, on at least an annual basis, a disclosure of relationships, associations, and financial dealings that may affect their independence of judgement in committee matters; and

“(III) contains clear processes, such as recusal from voting or discussion, for those members who report a conflict of interest, along with appropriate processes to address any instance where a member fails to report a conflict of interest.

“(iii) The membership of the pharmacy and therapeutics committee—

“(I) includes at least 1 actively practicing physician and at least 1 actively practicing pharmacist, each of whom—

“(aa) is independent and free of conflict with respect to manufacturers and Medicaid participating plans or subcontractors, including pharmacy benefit managers; and

“(bb) has expertise in the care of 1 or more Medicaid-specific populations such as elderly or disabled individuals, children with complex medical needs, or low-income individuals with chronic illnesses; and

“(II) is made publicly available.

“(iv) At the option of the State, the State’s drug use review board established under subsection (g)(3) may serve as the pharmacy and therapeutics committee provided the State ensures that such board meets the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii).

“(v) The State reviews and has final approval of the formulary established by the pharmacy and therapeutics committee.

“(vi) If the Secretary determines it appropriate or necessary based on the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States in the report submitted to Congress under section 203 of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019, the Secretary shall issue guidance that States must follow for establishing conflict of interest policies for the pharmacy and therapeutics committee in accordance with the requirements of clause (ii), including appropriate standards and requirements for identifying, addressing, and reporting on conflicts of interest.”

(b) APPLICATION TO MEDICAID MANAGED CARE ORGANIZATIONS.—Clause (xiii) of section 1903(m)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and (III)” and inserting “(III)”;

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and (IV) any formulary used by the entity for covered outpatient drugs dispensed to individuals eligible for medical assistance who are enrolled with the entity is

developed and reviewed by a pharmacy and therapeutics committee that meets the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 1927(d)(4)(A).”; and

(3) by moving the left margin 2 ems to the left.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. GAO REPORT ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN STATE MEDICAID PROGRAM DRUG USE REVIEW BOARDS AND PHARMACY AND THERAPEUTICS (P&T) COMMITTEES.

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an investigation of potential or existing conflicts of interest among members of State Medicaid program State drug use review boards (in this section referred to as “DUR Boards”) and pharmacy and therapeutics committees (in this section referred to as “P&T Committees”).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the investigation conducted under subsection (a) that includes the following:

(1) A description outlining how DUR Boards and P&T Committees operate in States, including details with respect to—

(A) the structure and operation of DUR Boards and statewide P&T Committees;

(B) States that operate separate P&T Committees for their fee-for-service Medicaid program and their Medicaid managed care organizations or other Medicaid managed care arrangements (collectively referred to in this section as “Medicaid MCOs”); and

(C) States that allow Medicaid MCOs to have their own P&T Committees and the extent to which pharmacy benefit managers administer or participate in such P&T Committees.

(2) A description outlining the differences between DUR Boards established in accordance with section 1927(g)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r(g)(3)) and P&T Committees.

(3) A description outlining the tools P&T Committees may use to determine Medicaid drug coverage and utilization management policies.

(4) An analysis of whether and how States or P&T Committees establish participation and independence requirements for DUR Boards and P&T Committees, including with respect to entities with connections with drug manufacturers, State Medicaid programs, managed care organizations, and other entities or individuals in the pharmaceutical industry.

(5) A description outlining how States, DUR Boards, or P&T Committees define conflicts of interest.

(6) A description of how DUR Boards and P&T Committees address conflicts of interest, including who is responsible for implementing such policies.

(7) A description of the tools, if any, States use to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest on DUR Boards and P&T Committees.

(8) An analysis of the effectiveness of tools States use to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest on DUR Boards and P&T Committees and, if applicable, recommendations as to how such tools could be improved.

(9) A review of strategies States may use to guard against conflicts of interest on DUR Boards and P&T Committees and to ensure compliance with the requirements of titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq., 1396 et seq.) and access to effective, clinically appropriate, and medically necessary drug treatments for Med-

icaid beneficiaries, including recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

SEC. 204. ENSURING THE ACCURACY OF MANUFACTURER PRICE AND DRUG PRODUCT INFORMATION UNDER THE MEDICAID DRUG REBATE PROGRAM.

(a) AUDIT OF MANUFACTURER PRICE AND DRUG PRODUCT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1927(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) AUDITS AND SURVEYS OF MANUFACTURER PRICE AND DRUG PRODUCT INFORMATION.—

“(i) AUDITS.—The Secretary shall conduct ongoing audits of the price and drug product information reported by manufacturers under subparagraph (A) for the most recently ended rebate period to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of such information. In conducting such audits, the Secretary may employ evaluations, surveys, statistical sampling, predictive analytics and other relevant tools and methods.

“(ii) VERIFICATIONS SURVEYS OF AVERAGE MANUFACTURER PRICE AND MANUFACTURER’S AVERAGE SALES PRICE.—In addition to the audits required under clause (i), the Secretary may survey wholesalers and manufacturers (including manufacturers that directly distribute their covered outpatient drugs (in this subparagraph referred to as ‘direct sellers’)), when necessary, to verify manufacturer prices and manufacturer’s average sales prices (including wholesale acquisition cost) to make payment reported under subparagraph (A).

“(iii) PENALTIES.—In addition to other penalties as may be prescribed by law, including under subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, the Secretary may impose a civil monetary penalty in an amount not to exceed \$185,000 on an annual basis on a wholesaler, manufacturer, or direct seller, if the wholesaler, manufacturer, or direct seller of a covered outpatient drug refuses a request for information about charges or prices by the Secretary in connection with an audit or survey under this subparagraph or knowingly provides false information. The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) (with respect to amounts of penalties or additional assessments) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this clause in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(iv) REPORTS.—

“(I) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall, not later than 18 months after date of enactment of this subparagraph, submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate regarding additional regulatory or statutory changes that may be required in order to ensure accurate and timely reporting and oversight of manufacturer price and drug product information, including whether changes should be made to reasonable assumption requirements to ensure such assumptions are reasonable and accurate or whether another methodology for ensuring accurate and timely reporting of price and drug product information should be considered to ensure the integrity of the drug rebate program under this section.

“(II) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on at least an annual basis, submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate summarizing the results of the audits and surveys conducted under this subparagraph

during the period that is the subject of the report.

“(III) CONTENT.—Each report submitted under subclause (II) shall, with respect to the period that is the subject of the report, include summaries of—

“(aa) error rates in the price, drug product, and other relevant information supplied by manufacturers under subparagraph (A);

“(bb) the timeliness with which manufacturers, wholesalers, and direct sellers provide information required under subparagraph (A) or under clause (i) or (ii) of this subparagraph;

“(cc) the number of manufacturers, wholesalers, and direct sellers and drug products audited under this subparagraph;

“(dd) the types of price and drug product information reviewed under the audits conducted under this subparagraph;

“(ee) the tools and methodologies employed in such audits;

“(ff) the findings of such audits, including which manufacturers, if any, were penalized under this subparagraph; and

“(gg) such other relevant information as the Secretary shall deem appropriate.

“(IV) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—In preparing a report required under subclause (II), the Secretary shall redact such proprietary information as the Secretary determines appropriate to prevent disclosure of, and to safeguard, such information.

“(v) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subparagraph, there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal quarter that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INCREASED PENALTY FOR LATE REPORTING OF INFORMATION.—Section 1927(b)(3)(C)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)(C)(i)) is amended by striking “increased by \$10,000 for each day in which such information has not been provided and such amount shall be paid to the Treasury” and inserting “, for each covered outpatient drug with respect to which such information is not provided, \$50,000 for the first day that such information is not provided on a timely basis and \$19,000 for each subsequent day that such information is not provided”.

(2) INCREASED PENALTY FOR KNOWINGLY REPORTING FALSE INFORMATION.—Section 1927(b)(3)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking “\$100,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal quarter that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY AND PREVENTING THE USE OF ABUSIVE SPREAD PRICING AND RELATED PRACTICES IN MEDICAID.

(a) PASS-THROUGH PRICING REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) PASS-THROUGH PRICING REQUIRED.—A contract between the State and a pharmacy benefit manager (referred to in this paragraph as a ‘PBM’), or a contract between the State and a managed care entity or other specified entity (as such terms are defined in section 1903(m)(9)(D)) that includes provisions making the entity responsible for coverage of covered outpatient drugs dispensed to individuals enrolled with the entity, shall require that payment for such drugs and related administrative services (as applicable),

including payments made by a PBM on behalf of the State or entity, is based on a pass-through pricing model under which—

“(A) any payment made by the entity of the PBM (as applicable) for such a drug—

“(i) is limited to—

“(I) ingredient cost; and

“(II) a professional dispensing fee that is not less than the professional dispensing fee that the State plan or waiver would pay if the plan or waiver was making the payment directly;

“(ii) is passed through in its entirety by the entity or PBM to the pharmacy that dispenses the drug; and

“(iii) is made in a manner that is consistent with section 1902(a)(30)(A) and sections 447.512, 447.514, and 447.518 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) as if such requirements applied directly to the entity or the PBM;

“(B) payment to the entity or the PBM (as applicable) for administrative services performed by the entity or PBM is limited to a reasonable administrative fee that covers the reasonable cost of providing such services;

“(C) the entity or the PBM (as applicable) shall make available to the State, and the Secretary upon request, all costs and payments related to covered outpatient drugs and accompanying administrative services incurred, received, or made by the entity or the PBM, including ingredient costs, professional dispensing fees, administrative fees, post-sale and post-invoice fees. Discounts, or related adjustments such as direct and indirect remuneration fees, and any and all remuneration; and

“(D) any form of spread pricing whereby any amount charged or claimed by the entity or the PBM (as applicable) is in excess of the amount paid to the pharmacies on behalf of the entity, including any post-sale or post-invoice fees, discounts, or related adjustments such as direct and indirect remuneration fees or assessments (after allowing for a reasonable administrative fee as described in subparagraph (B)) is not allowable for purposes of claiming Federal matching payments under this title.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (xiii) of section 1903(m)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)(2)(A)), as amended by section 202, is further amended—

(A) by striking “and (IV)” and inserting “(IV)”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (V) pharmacy benefit management services provided by the entity, or provided by a pharmacy benefit manager on behalf of the entity under a contract or other arrangement between the entity and the pharmacy benefit manager, shall comply with the requirements of section 1927(e)(6)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection apply to contracts between States and managed care entities, other specified entities, or pharmacy benefits managers that are entered into or renewed on or after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SURVEY OF RETAIL PRICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1)(A)(i) and all that precedes it through “(1)” and inserting the following:

“(1) SURVEY OF RETAIL PRICES.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of retail community drug prices, to include at least the national average drug acquisition cost, as follows:

“(A) USE OF VENDOR.—The Secretary may contract services for—

“(i) with respect to retail community pharmacies, the determination on a monthly basis of retail survey prices of the national average drug acquisition cost for covered outpatient drugs for such pharmacies, net of all discounts and rebates (to the extent any information with respect to such discounts and rebates is available), the average reimbursement received for such drugs by such pharmacies from all sources of payment, including third parties, and, to the extent available, the usual and customary charges to consumers for such drugs; and”;

(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following:

“(F) SURVEY REPORTING.—In order to meet the requirement of section 1902(a)(54), a State shall require that any retail community pharmacy in the State that receives any payment, administrative fee, discount, or rebate related to the dispensing of covered outpatient drugs to individuals receiving benefits under this title, regardless of whether such payment, fee, discount, or rebate is received from the State or a managed care entity directly or from a pharmacy benefit manager or another entity that has a contract with the State or a managed care entity, shall respond to surveys of retail prices conducted under this subsection.

“(G) SURVEY INFORMATION.—Information on retail community prices obtained under this paragraph shall be made publicly available and shall include at least the following:

“(i) The monthly response rate of the survey including a list of pharmacies not in compliance with subparagraph (F).

“(ii) The sampling frame and number of pharmacies sampled monthly.

“(iii) Characteristics of reporting pharmacies, including type (such as independent or chain), geographic or regional location, and dispensing volume.

“(iv) Reporting of a separate national average drug acquisition cost for each drug for independent retail pharmacies and chain operated pharmacies.

“(v) Information on price concessions including on and off invoice discounts, rebates, and other price concessions.

“(vi) Information on average professional dispensing fees paid.

“(H) PENALTIES.—

“(i) FAILURE TO PROVIDE TIMELY INFORMATION.—A retail community pharmacy that fails to respond to a survey conducted under this subsection on a timely basis may be subject to a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$10,000 for each day in which such information has not been provided.

“(ii) FALSE INFORMATION.—A retail community pharmacy that knowingly provides false information in response to a survey conducted under this subsection may be subject to a civil money penalty in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for each item of false information.

“(iii) OTHER PENALTIES.—Any civil money penalties imposed under this subparagraph shall be in addition to other penalties as may be prescribed by law. The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subparagraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceedings under section 1128A(a).

“(I) REPORT ON SPECIALTY PHARMACIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress examining specialty drug coverage and reimbursement under this title.

“(ii) CONTENT OF REPORT.—Such report shall include a description of how State Medicaid programs define specialty drugs, how much State Medicaid programs pay for specialty drugs, how States and managed care plans determine payment for specialty drugs,

the settings in which specialty drugs are dispensed (such as retail community pharmacies or specialty pharmacies), whether acquisition costs for specialty drugs are captured in the national average drug acquisition cost survey, and recommendations as to whether specialty pharmacies should be included in the survey of retail prices to ensure national average drug acquisition costs capture drugs sold at specialty pharmacies and how such specialty pharmacies should be defined.”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, including payments rates under Medicaid managed care plans,” after “under this title”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and the basis for such dispensing fees” before the semicolon; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter,” after “2010”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on the 1st day of the 1st quarter that begins on or after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) MANUFACTURER REPORTING OF WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST.—Section 1927(b)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)), as amended by section 141, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subclause (II), by adding “and” after the semicolon;

(C) by moving the left margins of subclause (I) and (II) 2 ems to the right; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) in the case of rebate periods that begin on or after the date of enactment of this subclause, on the wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for covered outpatient drugs for the rebate period under the agreement (including for all such drugs that are sold under a new drug application approved under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act);”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “and clause (vii) of this subparagraph” after “1847A”;

(B) in clause (vi), by striking “and” after the comma;

(C) in clause (vii), by striking the period and inserting “, and”;

(D) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) to the Secretary to disclose (through a website accessible to the public) the most recently reported wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for each covered outpatient drug (including for all such drugs that are sold under a new drug application approved under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), as reported under subparagraph (A)(i)(III).”

SEC. 206. T-MSIS DRUG DATA ANALYTICS REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1 of each calendar year beginning with calendar year 2021, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall publish on a website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that is accessible to the public a report of the most recently available data on provider prescribing patterns under the Medicaid program.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—

(1) REQUIRED CONTENT.—Each report required under subsection (a) for a calendar year shall include the following information with respect to each State (and, to the extent available, with respect to Puerto Rico,

the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa):

(A) A comparison of covered outpatient drug (as defined in section 1927(k)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(k)(2))) prescribing patterns under the State Medicaid plan or waiver of such plan (including drugs prescribed on a fee-for-service basis and drugs prescribed under managed care arrangements under such plan or waiver)—

(i) across all forms or models of reimbursement used under the plan or waiver;

(ii) within specialties and subspecialties, as defined by the Secretary;

(iii) by episodes of care for—

(I) each chronic disease category, as defined by the Secretary, that is represented in the 10 conditions that accounted for the greatest share of total spending under the plan or waiver during the year that is the subject of the report;

(II) procedural groupings; and

(III) rare disease diagnosis codes;

(iv) by patient demographic characteristics, including race (to the extent that the Secretary determines that there is sufficient data available with respect to such characteristic in a majority of States), gender, and age;

(v) by patient high-utilizer or risk status; and

(vi) by high and low resource settings by facility and place of service categories, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) In the case of medical assistance for covered outpatient drugs (as so defined) provided under a State Medicaid plan or waiver of such plan in a managed care setting, an analysis of the differences in managed care prescribing patterns when a covered outpatient drug is prescribed in a managed care setting as compared to when the drug is prescribed in a fee-for-service setting.

(2) ADDITIONAL CONTENT.—A report required under subsection (a) for a calendar year may include State-specific information about prescription utilization management tools under State Medicaid plans or waivers of such plans, including—

(A) a description of prescription utilization management tools under State programs to provide long-term services and supports under a State Medicaid plan or a waiver of such plan;

(B) a comparison of prescription utilization management tools applicable to populations covered under a State Medicaid plan waiver under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) and the models applicable to populations that are not covered under the waiver;

(C) a comparison of the prescription utilization management tools employed by different Medicaid managed care organizations, pharmacy benefit managers, and related entities within the State;

(D) a comparison of the prescription utilization management tools applicable to each enrollment category under a State Medicaid plan or waiver; and

(E) a comparison of the prescription utilization management tools applicable under the State Medicaid plan or waiver by patient high-utilizer or risk status.

(3) ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall include in each report published under subsection (a)—

(A) analyses of national, State, and local patterns of Medicaid population-based prescribing behaviors; and

(B) recommendations for administrative or legislative action to improve the effectiveness of, and reduce costs for, covered outpatient drugs under Medicaid while ensuring timely beneficiary access to medically necessary covered outpatient drugs.

(c) USE OF T-MSIS DATA.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be prepared using data and definitions from the Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System (T-MSIS) data set (or a successor data set) that is not more than 24 months old on the date that the report is published; and

(2) as appropriate, include a description with respect to each State of the quality and completeness of the data, as well as any necessary caveats describing the limitations of the data reported to the Secretary by the State that are sufficient to communicate the appropriate uses for the information.

(d) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be prepared by the Administrator for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 207. RISK-SHARING VALUE-BASED PAYMENT AGREEMENTS FOR COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS UNDER MEDICAID.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) STATE OPTION TO PAY FOR COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS THROUGH RISK-SHARING VALUE-BASED AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2022, a State shall have the option to pay (whether on a fee-for-service or managed care basis) for covered outpatient drugs that are potentially curative treatments intended for one-time use that are administered to individuals under this title by entering into a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement with the manufacturer of the drug in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

“(2) SECRETARIAL APPROVAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall submit a request to the Secretary to enter into a risk-sharing value based payment agreement, and the Secretary shall not approve a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement between a State and a manufacturer for payment for a covered outpatient drug of the manufacturer unless the following requirements are met:

“(i) MANUFACTURER IS PARTY TO REBATE AGREEMENT AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS.—The manufacturer has a rebate agreement in effect as required under subsection (a) and (b) of this section and is in compliance with all applicable requirements under this title.

“(ii) NO INCREASE TO PROJECTED NET FEDERAL SPENDING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Actuary certifies that the projected payments for each covered outpatient drug under such proposed agreement would not result in greater estimated Federal spending under this title than the net Federal spending that would result in the absence of the agreement.

“(II) NET FEDERAL SPENDING DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘net Federal spending’ means the amount of Federal payments the Chief Actuary estimates would be made under this title for administering a covered outpatient drug to an individual eligible for medical assistance under a State plan or a waiver of such plan, reduced by the amount of all rebates the Chief Actuary estimates would be paid with respect to the administering of such drug, including all rebates under this title and any supplemental or other additional rebates, in the absence of such an agreement.

“(III) INFORMATION.—The Chief Actuary shall make the certifications required under

this clause based on the most recently available and reliable drug pricing and product information. The State and manufacturer shall provide the Secretary and the Chief Actuary with all necessary information required to make the estimates needed for such certifications.

“(iii) LAUNCH AND LIST PRICE JUSTIFICATIONS.—The manufacturer submits all relevant information and supporting documentation necessary for pricing decisions as deemed appropriate by the Secretary, which shall be truthful and non-misleading, including manufacturer information and supporting documentation for launch price or list price increases, and any applicable justification required under section 1128L.

“(iv) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION; PENALTIES.—The provisions of subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (b)(3) shall apply to a manufacturer that fails to submit the information and documentation required under clauses (ii) and (iii) on a timely basis, or that knowingly provides false or misleading information, in the same manner as such provisions apply to a manufacturer with a rebate agreement under this section.

“(B) CONSIDERATION OF STATE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall treat a State request for approval of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement in the same manner that the Secretary treats a State plan amendment, and subpart B of part 430 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, including, subject to clause (ii), the timing requirements of section 430.16 of such title (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection), shall apply to a request for approval of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement in the same manner as such subpart applies to a State plan amendment.

“(ii) TIMING.—The Secretary shall consult with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs as required under subparagraph (C) and make a determination on whether to approve a request from a State for approval of a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement (or request additional information necessary to allow the Secretary to make a determination with respect to such request for approval) within the time period, to the extent practicable, specified in section 430.16 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection), but in no case shall the Secretary take more than 180 days after the receipt of such request for approval or response to such request for additional information to make such a determination (or request additional information).

“(C) CONSULTATION WITH THE COMMISSIONER OF FOOD AND DRUGS.—In considering whether to approve a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement, the Secretary, to the extent necessary, shall consult with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to determine whether the relevant clinical parameters specified in such agreement are appropriate.

“(3) INSTALLMENT-BASED PAYMENT STRUCTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A risk-sharing value-based payment agreement shall provide for a payment structure under which, for every installment year of the agreement (subject to subparagraph (B)), the State shall pay the total installment year amount in equal installments to be paid at regular intervals over a period of time that shall be specified in the agreement.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS.—

“(i) TIMING OF FIRST PAYMENT.—The State shall make the first of the installment payments described in subparagraph (A) for an installment year not later than 30 days after the end of such year.

“(ii) LENGTH OF INSTALLMENT PERIOD.—The period of time over which the State shall make the installment payments described in subparagraph (A) for an installment year shall not be longer than 5 years.

“(iii) NONPAYMENT OR REDUCED PAYMENT OF INSTALLMENTS FOLLOWING A FAILURE TO MEET CLINICAL PARAMETER.—If, prior to the payment date (as specified in the agreement) of any installment payment described in subparagraph (A) or any other alternative date or time frame (as otherwise specified in the agreement), the covered outpatient drug which is subject to the agreement fails to meet a relevant clinical parameter of the agreement, the agreement shall provide that—

“(I) the installment payment shall not be made; or

“(II) the installment payment shall be reduced by a percentage specified in the agreement that is based on the outcome achieved by the drug relative to the relevant clinical parameter.

“(4) NOTICE OF INTENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a manufacturer of a covered outpatient drug shall not be eligible to enter into a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this subsection with respect to such drug unless the manufacturer notifies the Secretary that the manufacturer is interested in entering into such an agreement with respect to such drug. The decision to submit and timing of a request to enter into a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement shall remain solely within the discretion of the State and shall only be effective upon Secretarial approval as required under this subsection.

“(B) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED DRUGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a manufacturer of a covered outpatient drug approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act after the date of enactment of this subsection, not more than 90 days after meeting with the Food and Drug Administration following phase II clinical trials for such drug (or, in the case of a drug described in clause (ii), not later than March 31, 2022), the manufacturer must notify the Secretary of the manufacturer's intent to enter into a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this subsection with respect to such drug. If no such meeting has occurred, the Secretary may use discretion as to whether a potentially curative treatment intended for one-time use may qualify for a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this section. A manufacturer notification of interest shall not have any influence on a decision for approval by the Food and Drug Administration.

“(ii) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED DRUGS.—A drug described in this clause is a covered outpatient drug of a manufacturer—

“(I) that is approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act after the date of enactment of this subsection; and

“(II) with respect to which, as of January 1, 2022, more than 90 days have passed after the manufacturer's meeting with the Food and Drug Administration following phase II clinical trials for such drug.

“(iii) PARALLEL APPROVAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall, to the extent practicable, approve a State's request to enter into a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement that otherwise meets the require-

ments of this subsection at the time that such a drug is approved by the Food and Drug Administration to help provide that no State that wishes to enter into such an agreement is required to pay for the drug in full at one time if the State is seeking to pay over a period of time as outlined in the proposed agreement.

“(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be applied or construed to modify or affect the timeframes or factors involved in the Secretary's determination of whether to approve or license a drug under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

“(5) SPECIAL PAYMENT RULES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, with respect to an individual who is administered a unit of a covered outpatient drug that is purchased under a State plan by a State Medicaid agency under a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement in an installment year, the State shall remain liable to the manufacturer of such drug for payment for such unit without regard to whether the individual remains enrolled in the State plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan) for each installment year for which the State is to make installment payments for covered outpatient drugs purchased under the agreement in such year.

“(B) DEATH.—In the case of an individual described in subparagraph (A) who dies during the period described in such subparagraph, the State plan shall not be liable for any remaining payment for the unit of the covered outpatient drug administered to the individual which is owed under the agreement described in such subparagraph.

“(C) WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—In the case of a covered outpatient drug that is the subject of a risk-sharing value-based agreement between a State and a manufacturer under this subsection, including a drug approved in accordance with section 506(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and such drug is the subject of an application that has been withdrawn by the Secretary, the State plan shall not be liable for any remaining payment that is owed under the agreement.

“(D) ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENT UNDER AGREEMENT.—Subject to approval by the Secretary, the terms of a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement submitted for approval by a State may provide that subparagraph (A) shall not apply.

“(E) GUIDANCE.—Not later than January 1, 2022, the Secretary shall issue guidance to States establishing a process for States to notify the Secretary when an individual who is administered a unit of a covered outpatient drug that is purchased by a State plan under a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement ceases to be enrolled under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan) or dies before the end of the installment period applicable to such unit under the agreement.

“(6) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS UNDER RISK-SHARING VALUE-BASED AGREEMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF AVERAGE MANUFACTURER PRICE; BEST PRICE.—The Secretary shall treat any payments made to the manufacturer of a covered outpatient drug under a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this subsection during a rebate period in the same manner that the Secretary treats payments made under a State supplemental rebate agreement under sections 447.504(c)(19) and 447.505(c)(7) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) for purposes of determining average manufacturer price and best price under this section with respect to the covered outpatient drug and a rebate period and for purposes of offsets required under subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(7) ASSESSMENTS AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) ASSESSMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each assessment period of any risk-sharing value-based payment agreement for a State approved under this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of such agreement which shall include an evaluation by the Chief Actuary to determine whether program spending under the risk-sharing value-based payment agreement aligned with the projections for the agreement made under paragraph (2)(A)(ii), including an assessment of whether actual Federal spending under this title under the agreement was less or more than net Federal spending would have been in the absence of the agreement.

“(ii) ASSESSMENT PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i)—

“(I) the first assessment period for a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement shall be the period of time over which payments are scheduled to be made under the agreement for the first 10 individuals who are administered covered outpatient drugs under the agreement except that such period shall not exceed the 5-year period after the date on which the Secretary approves the agreement; and

“(II) each subsequent assessment period for a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement shall be the 5-year period following the end of the previous assessment period.

“(B) RESULTS OF ASSESSMENTS.—

“(i) TERMINATION OPTION.—If the Secretary determines as a result of the assessment by the Chief Actuary under subparagraph (A) that the actual Federal spending under this title for any covered outpatient drug that was the subject of the State’s risk-sharing value-based payment agreement was greater than the net Federal spending that would have resulted in the absence of the agreement, the Secretary may terminate approval of such agreement and shall immediately conduct an assessment under this paragraph of any other ongoing risk-sharing value-based payment agreement to which the same manufacturer is a party.

“(ii) REPAYMENT REQUIRED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines as a result of the assessment by the Chief Actuary under subparagraph (A) that the Federal spending under the risk-sharing value-based agreement for a covered outpatient drug that was subject to such agreement was greater than the net Federal spending that would have resulted in the absence of the agreement, the manufacturer shall repay the difference to the State and Federal governments in a timely manner as determined by the Secretary.

“(II) TERMINATION FOR FAILURE TO PAY.—The failure of a manufacturer to make repayments required under subclause (I) in a timely manner shall result in immediate termination of all risk-sharing value-based agreements to which the manufacturer is a party.

“(III) ADDITIONAL PENALTIES.—In the case of a manufacturer that fails to make repayments required under subclause (I), the Secretary may treat such manufacturer in the same manner as a manufacturer that fails to pay required rebates under this section, and the Secretary may—

“(aa) suspend or terminate the manufacturer’s rebate agreement under this section; and

“(bb) pursue any other remedy that would be available if the manufacturer had failed to pay required rebates under this section.

“(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the first risk-sharing value-based payment agreement is approved under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit

to Congress and make available to the public a report that includes—

“(i) an assessment of the impact of risk-sharing value-based payment agreements on access for individuals who are eligible for benefits under a State plan or waiver under this title to medically necessary covered outpatient drugs and related treatments;

“(ii) an analysis of the impact of such agreements on overall State and Federal spending under this title;

“(iii) an assessment of the impact of such agreements on drug prices, including launch price and price increases; and

“(iv) such recommendations to Congress as the Secretary deems appropriate.

“(8) GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2022, the Secretary shall issue guidance to States seeking to enter into risk-sharing value-based payment agreements under this subsection that includes a model template for such agreements. The Secretary may issue any additional guidance or promulgate regulations as necessary to implement and enforce the provisions of this subsection.

“(B) MODEL AGREEMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a State expresses an interest in pursuing a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this subsection with a manufacturer for the purchase of a covered outpatient drug, the Secretary may share with such State any risk-sharing value-based agreement between a State and the manufacturer for the purchase of such drug that has been approved under this subsection. While such shared agreement may serve as a template for a State that wishes to propose, the use of a previously approved agreement shall not affect the submission and approval process for approval of a proposed risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under this subsection, including the requirements under paragraph (2)(A).

“(ii) CONFIDENTIALITY.—In the case of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement that is disclosed to a State by the Secretary under this subparagraph and that is only in effect with respect to a single State, the confidentiality of information provisions described in subsection (b)(3)(D) shall apply to such information.

“(C) OIG CONSULTATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services to determine whether there are potential program integrity concerns with agreement approvals or templates and address accordingly.

“(ii) OIG POLICY UPDATES AS NECESSARY.—The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall review and update, as necessary, any policies or guidelines of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Human Services (including policies related to the enforcement of section 1128B) to accommodate the use of risk-sharing value-based payment agreements in accordance with this section.

“(9) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) MODIFICATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection or any regulations promulgated under this subsection shall prohibit a State from requesting a modification from the Secretary to the terms of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement. A modification that is expected to result in any increase to projected net State or Federal spending under the agreement shall be subject to recertification by the Chief Actuary as described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) before the modification may be approved.

“(B) REBATE AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as requiring a State to enter into a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement or as limiting or superseding the ability of a State to enter

into a supplemental rebate agreement for a covered outpatient drug.

“(C) FFP FOR PAYMENTS UNDER RISK-SHARING VALUE-BASED PAYMENT AGREEMENTS.—Federal financial participation shall be available under this title for any payment made by a State to a manufacturer for a covered outpatient drug under a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement in accordance with this subsection, except that no Federal financial participation shall be available for any payment made by a State to a manufacturer under such an agreement on and after the effective date of a disapproval of such agreement by the Secretary.

“(D) CONTINUED APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as expressly provided in this subsection, nothing in this subsection or in any regulations promulgated under this subsection shall affect the application of any other provision of this Act.

“(10) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(11) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) CHIEF ACTUARY.—The term ‘Chief Actuary’ means the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

“(B) INSTALLMENT YEAR.—The term ‘installment year’ means, with respect to a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement, a 12-month period during which a covered outpatient drug is administered under the agreement.

“(C) POTENTIALLY CURATIVE TREATMENT INTENDED FOR ONE-TIME USE.—The term ‘potentially curative treatment intended for one-time use’ means a treatment that consists of the administration of a covered outpatient drug that—

“(i) is a form of gene therapy for a rare disease, as defined by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, designated under section 526 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, and approved under section 505 of such Act or licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act to treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition;

“(ii) if administered in accordance with the labeling of such drug, is expected to result in either—

“(I) the cure of such disease or condition; or

“(II) a reduction in the symptoms of such disease or condition to the extent that such disease or condition is not expected to lead to early mortality; and

“(iii) is expected to achieve a result described in clause (ii), which may be achieved over an extended period of time, after not more than 3 administrations.

“(D) RELEVANT CLINICAL PARAMETER.—The term ‘relevant clinical parameter’ means, with respect to a covered outpatient drug that is the subject of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement—

“(i) a clinical endpoint specified in the drug’s labeling or supported by one or more of the compendia described in section 1861(t)(2)(B)(ii)(I) that—

“(I) is able to be measured or evaluated on an annual basis for each year of the agreement on an independent basis by a provider or other entity; and

“(II) is required to be achieved (based on observed metrics in patient populations) under the terms of the agreement; or

“(ii) a surrogate endpoint (as defined in section 507(e)(9) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), including those developed by patient-focused drug development tools, that—

“(I) is able to be measured or evaluated on an annual basis for each year of the agreement on an independent basis by a provider or other entity; and

“(II) has been qualified by the Food and Drug Administration.

“(E) RISK-SHARING VALUE-BASED PAYMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ‘risk-sharing value-based payment agreement’ means an agreement between a State plan and a manufacturer—

“(i) for the purchase of a covered outpatient drug of the manufacturer that is a potentially curative treatment intended for one-time use;

“(ii) under which payment for such drug shall be made pursuant to an installment-based payment structure that meets the requirements of paragraph (3);

“(iii) which conditions payment on the achievement of at least 2 relevant clinical parameters (as defined in subparagraph (C));

“(iv) which provides that—

“(I) the State plan will directly reimburse the manufacturer for the drug; or

“(II) a third party will reimburse the manufacturer in a manner approved by the Secretary; and

“(v) is approved by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(F) TOTAL INSTALLMENT YEAR AMOUNT.—The term ‘total installment year amount’ means, with respect to a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement for the purchase of a covered outpatient drug and an installment year, an amount equal to the product of—

“(i) the unit price of the drug charged under the agreement; and

“(ii) the number of units of such drug administered under the agreement during such installment year.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1903(i)(10)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(i)(10)(A)) is amended by striking “or unless section 1927(a)(3) applies” and inserting “, section 1927(a)(3) applies with respect to such drugs, or such drugs are the subject of a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under section 1927(1)”.’

(2) Section 1927(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “(except for drugs for which payment is made by a State under a risk-sharing value-based payment agreement under subsection (1))” after “under the State plan for such period”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)(i), by inserting “or subsection (1)(2)(A)” after “subparagraph (A)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, under subsection (1)(2)(A),” after “under this paragraph”.

SEC. 208. APPLYING MEDICAID DRUG REBATE REQUIREMENT TO DRUGS PROVIDED AS PART OF OUTPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(k)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(k)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) LIMITING DEFINITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered outpatient drug’ does not include any drug, biological product, or insulin provided as part of, or as incident to and in the same setting as, any of the following (and for which payment may be made under this title as part of payment for the following and not as direct reimbursement for the drug):

“(i) Inpatient hospital services.

“(ii) Hospice services.

“(iii) Dental services, except that drugs for which the State plan authorizes direct reim-

bursement to the dispensing dentist are covered outpatient drugs.

“(iv) Physicians’ services.

“(v) Outpatient hospital services.

“(vi) Nursing facility services and services provided by an intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded.

“(vii) Other laboratory and x-ray services.

“(viii) Renal dialysis.

“(B) OTHER EXCLUSIONS.—Such term also does not include any such drug or product for which a National Drug Code number is not required by the Food and Drug Administration or a drug or biological used for a medical indication which is not a medically accepted indication.

“(C) STATE OPTION.—At the option of a State, such term may include any drug, biological product, or insulin for which the State is the primary payer under this title or a demonstration project concerning this title, and that is provided on an outpatient basis as part of, or as incident to and in the same setting as, described in clause (iv) or (v) of subparagraph (A) and for which payment is made as part of payment for such services.

“(D) NO EFFECT ON BEST PRICE.—Any drug, biological product, or insulin excluded from the definition of such term as a result of this paragraph shall be treated as a covered outpatient drug for purposes of determining the best price (as defined in subsection (c)(1)(C)) for such drug, biological product, or insulin.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION AND GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue guidance and relevant informational bulletins for States, manufacturers (as defined in section 1927(k)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(k)(5)), and other relevant stakeholders, including health care providers, regarding implementation of the amendment made by subsection (a).

TITLE III—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Subtitle A—CREATES Act

SEC. 301. ACTIONS FOR DELAYS OF GENERIC DRUGS AND BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “commercially reasonable, market-based terms” means—

(A) a nondiscriminatory price for the sale of the covered product at or below, but not greater than, the most recent wholesale acquisition cost for the drug, as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(6)(B));

(B) a schedule for delivery that results in the transfer of the covered product to the eligible product developer consistent with the timing under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv); and

(C) no additional conditions are imposed on the sale of the covered product;

(2) the term “covered product”—

(A) means—

(i) any drug approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262);

(ii) any combination of a drug or biological product described in clause (i); or

(iii) when reasonably necessary to support approval of an application under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355), or section 351 of the Public

Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262), as applicable, or otherwise meet the requirements for approval under either such section, any product, including any device, that is marketed or intended for use with such a drug or biological product; and

(B) does not include any drug or biological product that appears on the drug shortage list in effect under section 506E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 356e), unless—

(i) the drug or biological product has been on the drug shortage list in effect under such section 506E continuously for more than 6 months; or

(ii) the Secretary determines that inclusion of the drug or biological product as a covered product is likely to contribute to alleviating or preventing a shortage;

(3) the term “device” has the meaning given the term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321);

(4) the term “eligible product developer” means a person that seeks to develop a product for approval pursuant to an application for approval under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or for licensing pursuant to an application under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k));

(5) the term “license holder” means the holder of an application approved under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or the holder of a license under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) for a covered product;

(6) the term “REMS” means a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under section 505-1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1);

(7) the term “REMS with ETASU” means a REMS that contains elements to assure safe use under section 505-1(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1(f));

(8) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(9) the term “single, shared system of elements to assure safe use” means a single, shared system of elements to assure safe use under section 505-1(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1(f)); and

(10) the term “sufficient quantities” means an amount of a covered product that the eligible product developer determines allows it to—

(A) conduct testing to support an application under—

(i) subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355); or

(ii) section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)); and

(B) fulfill any regulatory requirements relating to approval of such an application.

(b) CIVIL ACTION FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT QUANTITIES OF A COVERED PRODUCT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible product developer may bring a civil action against the license holder for a covered product seeking relief under this subsection in an appropriate district court of the United States alleging that the license holder has declined to provide sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To prevail in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), an eligible product developer shall prove, by a preponderance of the evidence—

(i) that—

(I) the covered product is not subject to a REMS with ETASU; or

(II) if the covered product is subject to a REMS with ETASU—

(aa) the eligible product developer has obtained a covered product authorization from the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(bb) the eligible product developer has provided a copy of the covered product authorization to the license holder;

(i) that, as of the date on which the civil action is filed, the product developer has not obtained sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(ii) that the eligible product developer has submitted a written request to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product to the license holder and such request—

(I) was sent to a named corporate officer of the license holder;

(II) was made by certified or registered mail with return receipt requested;

(III) specified an individual as the point of contact for the license holder to direct communications related to the sale of the covered product to the eligible product developer and a means for electronic and written communications with that individual; and

(IV) specified an address to which the covered product was to be shipped upon reaching an agreement to transfer the covered product; and

(iv) that the license holder has not delivered to the eligible product developer sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms—

(I) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 31 days after the date on which the license holder received the request for the covered product; and

(II) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, by 31 days after the later of—

(aa) the date on which the license holder received the request for the covered product; or

(bb) the date on which the license holder received a copy of the covered product authorization issued by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) AUTHORIZATION FOR COVERED PRODUCT SUBJECT TO A REMS WITH ETASU.—

(i) REQUEST.—An eligible product developer may submit to the Secretary a written request for the eligible product developer to be authorized to obtain sufficient quantities of an individual covered product subject to a REMS with ETASU.

(ii) AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a request under clause (i) is received, the Secretary shall, by written notice, authorize the eligible product developer to obtain sufficient quantities of an individual covered product subject to a REMS with ETASU for purposes of—

(I) development and testing that does not involve human clinical trials, if the eligible product developer has agreed to comply with any conditions the Secretary determines necessary; or

(II) development and testing that involves human clinical trials, if the eligible product developer has—

(aa)(AA) submitted protocols, informed consent documents, and informational materials for testing that include protections that provide safety protections comparable to those provided by the REMS for the covered product; or

(BB) otherwise satisfied the Secretary that such protections will be provided; and

(bb) met any other requirements the Secretary may establish.

(iii) NOTICE.—A covered product authorization issued under this subparagraph shall state that the provision of the covered product by the license holder under the terms of the authorization will not be a violation of the REMS for the covered product.

(3) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), it shall be an affirmative defense, on which the defendant has the burden of persuasion by a preponderance of the evidence—

(A) that, on the date on which the eligible product developer requested to purchase sufficient quantities of the covered product from the license holder—

(i) neither the license holder nor any of its agents, wholesalers, or distributors was engaged in the manufacturing or commercial marketing of the covered product; and

(ii) neither the license holder nor any of its agents, wholesalers, or distributors otherwise had access to inventory of the covered product to supply to the eligible product developer on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(B) that—

(i) the license holder sells the covered product through agents, distributors, or wholesalers;

(ii) the license holder has placed no restrictions, explicit or implicit, on its agents, distributors, or wholesalers to sell covered products to eligible product developers; and

(iii) the covered product can be purchased by the eligible product developer in sufficient quantities on commercially reasonable, market-based terms from the agents, distributors, or wholesalers of the license holder; or

(C) that the license holder made an offer to the individual specified pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iii)(III), by a means of communication (electronic, written, or both) specified pursuant to such paragraph, to sell sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer at commercially reasonable market-based terms—

(i) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 14 days after the date on which the license holder received the request for the covered product, and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 7 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder; or

(ii) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, by the date that is 20 days after the date on which the license holder received the request for the covered product, and the eligible product developer did not accept such offer by the date that is 10 days after the date on which the eligible product developer received such offer from the license holder.

(4) REMEDIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible product developer prevails in a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the court shall—

(i) order the license holder to provide to the eligible product developer without delay sufficient quantities of the covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms;

(ii) award to the eligible product developer reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the civil action; and

(iii) award to the eligible product developer a monetary amount sufficient to deter the license holder from failing to provide eligible product developers with sufficient quantities of a covered product on commercially reasonable, market-based terms, if the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence—

(I) that the license holder delayed providing sufficient quantities of the covered product to the eligible product developer

without a legitimate business justification; or

(II) that the license holder failed to comply with an order issued under clause (i).

(B) MAXIMUM MONETARY AMOUNT.—A monetary amount awarded under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall not be greater than the revenue that the license holder earned on the covered product during the period—

(i) beginning on—

(I) for a covered product that is not subject to a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the date on which the license holder received the request; or

(II) for a covered product that is subject to a REMS with ETASU, the date that is 31 days after the later of—

(aa) the date on which the license holder received the request; or

(bb) the date on which the license holder received a copy of the covered product authorization issued by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2)(B); and

(i) ending on the date on which the eligible product developer received sufficient quantities of the covered product.

(C) AVOIDANCE OF DELAY.—The court may issue an order under subparagraph (A)(i) before conducting further proceedings that may be necessary to determine whether the eligible product developer is entitled to an award under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A), or the amount of any such award.

(C) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—A license holder for a covered product shall not be liable for any claim under Federal, State, or local law arising out of the failure of an eligible product developer to follow adequate safeguards to assure safe use of the covered product during development or testing activities described in this section, including transportation, handling, use, or disposal of the covered product by the eligible product developer.

(d) NO VIOLATION OF REMS.—Section 505-1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) PROVISION OF SAMPLES NOT A VIOLATION OF STRATEGY.—The provision of samples of a covered product to an eligible product developer (as those terms are defined in section 301(a) of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019) shall not be considered a violation of the requirements of any risk evaluation and mitigation strategy that may be in place under this section for such drug.”

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “antitrust laws” —

(A) has the meaning given the term in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12); and

(B) includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section applies to unfair methods of competition.

(2) ANTITRUST LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the operation of any provision of the antitrust laws.

SEC. 302. REMS APPROVAL PROCESS FOR SUBSEQUENT FILERS.

Section 505-1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1), as amended by section 301, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(4)(B)—

(A) in clause (i) by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) accommodate different, comparable aspects of the elements to assure safe use for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j), and the applicable listed drug.”;

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C)(i) Elements to assure safe use, if required under subsection (f) for the listed drug, which, subject to clause (ii), for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) may use—

“(I) a single, shared system with the listed drug under subsection (f); or

“(II) a different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use under subsection (f).

“(ii) The Secretary may require a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) and the listed drug to use a single, shared system under subsection (f), if the Secretary determines that no different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use could satisfy the requirements of subsection (f).”;

(3) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) SHARED REMS.—If the Secretary approves, in accordance with paragraph (1)(C)(i)(II), a different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use under subsection (f) for a drug that is the subject of an abbreviated new drug application under section 505(j), the Secretary may require that such different comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use can be used with respect to any other drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) or 505(b) that references the same listed drug.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) SEPARATE REMS.—When used in this section, the terms ‘different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use’ or ‘different, comparable approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategies’ means a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 505(j) that uses different methods or operational means than the strategy required under subsection (a) for the applicable listed drug, or other application under section 505(j) with the same such listed drug, but achieves the same level of safety as such strategy.”.

SEC. 303. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle, the amendments made by this subtitle, or in section 505-1 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355-1), shall be construed as—

(1) prohibiting a license holder from providing an eligible product developer access to a covered product in the absence of an authorization under this subtitle; or

(2) in any way negating the applicability of a REMS with ETASU, as otherwise required under such section 505-1, with respect to such covered product.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “covered product”, “eligible product developer”, “license holder”, and “REMS with ETASU” have the meanings given such terms in section 301(a).

Subtitle B—Pay-for-Delay

SEC. 311. UNLAWFUL AGREEMENTS.

(a) AGREEMENTS PROHIBITED.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), it shall be unlawful for an NDA or BLA holder and a subsequent filer (or for two subsequent filers) to enter into, or carry out, an agreement resolving or settling a covered patent infringement claim on a final or interim basis if under such agreement—

(1) a subsequent filer directly or indirectly receives from such holder (or in the case of such an agreement between two subsequent filers, the other subsequent filer) anything of value, including a license; and

(2) the subsequent filer agrees to limit or forego research on, or development, manufacturing, marketing, or sales, for any period of time, of the covered product that is the subject of the application described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (g)(8).

(b) EXCLUSION.—It shall not be unlawful under subsection (a) if a party to an agreement described in such subsection demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the value described in subsection (a)(1) is compensation solely for other goods or services that the subsequent filer has promised to provide.

(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit an agreement resolving or settling a covered patent infringement claim in which the consideration granted by the NDA or BLA holder to the subsequent filer (or from one subsequent filer to another) as part of the resolution or settlement includes only one or more of the following:

(1) The right to market the covered product that is the subject of the application described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (g)(8) in the United States before the expiration of—

(A) any patent that is the basis of the covered patent infringement claim; or

(B) any patent right or other statutory exclusivity that would prevent the marketing of such covered product.

(2) A payment for reasonable litigation expenses not to exceed \$7,500,000 in the aggregate.

(3) A covenant not to sue on any claim that such covered product infringes a patent.

(d) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) GENERAL APPLICATION.—The requirements of this section apply, according to their terms, to an NDA or BLA holder or subsequent filer that is—

(A) a person, partnership, or corporation over which the Commission has authority pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)); or

(B) a person, partnership, or corporation over which the Commission would have authority pursuant to such section but for the fact that such person, partnership, or corporation is not organized to carry on business for its own profit or that of its members.

(2) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A violation of this section shall be treated as an unfair or deceptive act or practice in violation of section 5(a)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(1)).

(B) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) and paragraphs (1)(B) and (3)—

(i) the Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this section; and

(ii) any NDA or BLA holder or subsequent filer that violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(C) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—In the case of a cease and desist order issued by the Commission under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) for violation of this section, a party to such order may obtain judicial review of such order as provided in such section 5, except that—

(i) such review may only be obtained in—

(I) the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit;

(II) the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the ultimate parent entity, as defined in section 801.1(a)(3) of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, of the NDA or BLA holder (if any such holder is a party to such order) is incorporated as of the date that the applica-

tion described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (g)(8) or an approved application that is deemed to be a license for a biological product under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 817) is submitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs; or

(III) the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the ultimate parent entity, as so defined, of any subsequent filer that is a party to such order is incorporated as of the date that the application described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (g)(8) is submitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs; and

(ii) the petition for review shall be filed in the court not later than 30 days after such order is served on the party seeking review.

(3) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

(A) CIVIL PENALTY.—The Commission may commence a civil action to recover a civil penalty in a district court of the United States against any NDA or BLA holder or subsequent filer that violates this section.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR RECOVERY OF PENALTY IF CEASE AND DESIST ORDER ISSUED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission has issued a cease and desist order in a proceeding under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) for violation of this section—

(I) the Commission may commence a civil action under subparagraph (A) to recover a civil penalty against any party to such order at any time before the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date on which such order becomes final under section 5(g) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 45(g)); and

(II) in such civil action, the findings of the Commission as to the material facts in such proceeding shall be conclusive, unless—

(aa) the terms of such order expressly provide that the Commission’s findings shall not be conclusive; or

(bb) such order became final by reason of section 5(g)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 45(g)(1)), in which case such findings shall be conclusive if supported by evidence.

(ii) RELATIONSHIP TO PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF AN ORDER.—The penalty provided in clause (i) for violation of this section is separate from and in addition to any penalty that may be incurred for violation of an order of the Commission under section 5(l) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(l)).

(C) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a civil penalty imposed in a civil action under subparagraph (A) on a party to an agreement described in subsection (a) shall be sufficient to deter violations of this section, but in no event greater than—

(I) if such party is the NDA or BLA holder (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who gave the value described in subsection (a)(1)), the greater of—

(aa) 3 times the value received by such NDA or BLA holder (or by such subsequent filer) that is reasonably attributable to the violation of this section; or

(bb) 3 times the value given to the subsequent filer (or to the other subsequent filer) reasonably attributable to the violation of this section; and

(II) if such party is the subsequent filer (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who received the value described in subsection (a)(1)), 3 times the value received by such subsequent filer that is reasonably attributable to the violation of this section.

(ii) **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In determining such amount, the court shall take into account—

(I) the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation;

(II) with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of violations, the ability to pay, any effect on the ability to continue doing business, profits earned by the NDA or BLA holder (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who gave the value described in subsection (a)(1)), compensation received by the subsequent filer (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, the subsequent filer who received the value described in subsection (a)(1)), and the amount of commerce affected; and

(III) other matters that justice requires.

(D) **INJUNCTIONS AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.**—In a civil action under subparagraph (A), the United States district courts are empowered to grant mandatory injunctions and such other and further equitable relief as they deem appropriate.

(4) **REMEDIES IN ADDITION.**—Remedies provided in this subsection are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other remedy provided by Federal law.

(5) **PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(e) **FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION RULEMAKING.**—The Commission may, in its discretion, by rule promulgated under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, exempt from this section certain agreements described in subsection (a) if the Commission finds such agreements to be in furtherance of market competition and for the benefit of consumers.

(f) **ANTITRUST LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, limit, or supersede the applicability of the antitrust laws as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), and of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition. Nothing in this section shall modify, impair, limit, or supersede the right of a subsequent filer to assert claims or counterclaims against any person, under the antitrust laws or other laws relating to unfair competition.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGREEMENT RESOLVING OR SETTLING A COVERED PATENT INFRINGEMENT CLAIM.**—The term “agreement resolving or settling a covered patent infringement claim” means any agreement that—

(A) resolves or settles a covered patent infringement claim; or

(B) is contingent upon, provides for a contingent condition for, or is otherwise related to the resolution or settlement of a covered patent infringement claim.

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

(3) **COVERED PATENT INFRINGEMENT CLAIM.**—The term “covered patent infringement claim” means an allegation made by the NDA or BLA holder to a subsequent filer (or, in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, by one subsequent filer to another), whether or not included in a complaint filed with a court of law, that—

(A) the submission of the application described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (9), or the manufacture, use, offering for sale, sale, or importation into the United States of a covered product that is the subject of such an application—

(i) in the case of an agreement between an NDA or BLA holder and a subsequent filer, infringes any patent owned by, or exclu-

sively licensed to, the NDA or BLA holder of the covered product; or

(ii) in the case of an agreement between two subsequent filers, infringes any patent owned by the subsequent filer; or

(B) in the case of an agreement between an NDA or BLA holder and a subsequent filer, the covered product to be manufactured under such application uses a covered product as claimed in a published patent application.

(4) **COVERED PRODUCT.**—The term “covered product” means a drug (as defined in section 201(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g))), including a biological product (as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i))).

(5) **NDA OR BLA HOLDER.**—The term “NDA or BLA holder” means—

(A) the holder of—

(i) an approved new drug application filed under section 505(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) for a covered product; or

(ii) a biologics license application filed under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)) with respect to a biological product;

(B) a person owning or controlling enforcement of the patent on—

(i) the list published under section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)) in connection with the application described in subparagraph (A)(i); or

(ii) any list published under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) comprised of patents associated with biologics license applications filed under section 351(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)); or

(C) the predecessors, subsidiaries, divisions, groups, and affiliates controlled by, controlling, or under common control with any entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) (such control to be presumed by direct or indirect share ownership of 50 percent or greater), as well as the licensees, licensors, successors, and assigns of each of the entities.

(6) **PATENT.**—The term “patent” means a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(7) **STATUTORY EXCLUSIVITY.**—The term “statutory exclusivity” means those prohibitions on the submission or approval of drug applications under clauses (ii) through (iv) of section 505(c)(3)(E) (5- and 3-year exclusivity), clauses (ii) through (iv) of section 505(j)(5)(F) (5-year and 3-year exclusivity), section 505(j)(5)(B)(iv) (180-day exclusivity), section 527 (orphan drug exclusivity), section 505A (pediatric exclusivity), or section 505E (qualified infectious disease product exclusivity) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(c)(3)(E), 355(j)(5)(B)(iv), 355(j)(5)(F), 360cc, 355a, 355f), or prohibitions on the submission or licensing of biologics license applications under section 351(k)(6) (interchangeable biological product exclusivity) or section 351(k)(7) (biological product reference product exclusivity) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)(6), (7)).

(8) **SUBSEQUENT FILER.**—The term “subsequent filer” means—

(A) in the case of a drug, a party that owns or controls an abbreviated new drug application submitted pursuant to section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)) or a new drug application submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(2)) and filed under section 505(b)(1) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)(1)) or has the exclusive rights to distribute the covered product that is the subject of such application; or

(B) in the case of a biological product, a party that owns or controls an application filed with the Food and Drug Administration under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) or has the exclusive rights to distribute the biological product that is the subject of such application.

(h) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section applies with respect to agreements described in subsection (a) entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 312. NOTICE AND CERTIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS.

(a) **NOTICE OF ALL AGREEMENTS.**—Section 1111(7) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (21 U.S.C. 355 note) is amended by inserting “or the owner of a patent for which a claim of infringement could reasonably be asserted against any person for making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States a biological product that is the subject of a biosimilar biological product application” before the period at the end.

(b) **CERTIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS.**—Section 1112 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Chief Executive Officer or the company official responsible for negotiating any agreement under subsection (a) or (b) that is required to be filed under subsection (c) shall, within 30 days of such filing, execute and file with the Assistant Attorney General and the Commission a certification as follows: ‘I declare that the following is true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge: The materials filed with the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice under section 1112 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, with respect to the agreement referenced in this certification—

“(1) represent the complete, final, and exclusive agreement between the parties;

“(2) include any ancillary agreements that are contingent upon, provide a contingent condition for, were entered into within 30 days of, or are otherwise related to, the referenced agreement; and

“(3) include written descriptions of any oral agreements, representations, commitments, or promises between the parties that are responsive to subsection (a) or (b) of such section 1112 and have not been reduced to writing.’”

SEC. 313. FORFEITURE OF 180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD.

Section 505(j)(5)(D)(i)(V) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(5)(D)(i)(V)) is amended by inserting “section 311 of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019 or” after “that the agreement has violated”.

SEC. 314. COMMISSION LITIGATION AUTHORITY.

Section 16(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 56(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) under section 311(d)(3)(A) of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019;”

SEC. 315. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Commission shall commence any administrative proceeding or civil action to enforce section 311 of this Act not later than 6 years after the date on which the parties to the agreement file the Notice of Agreement as provided by section 1112(c)(2) and (d) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (21 U.S.C. 355 note).

(b) CIVIL ACTION AFTER ISSUANCE OF CEASE AND DESIST ORDER.—If the Commission has issued a cease and desist order under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) for violation of section 311 of this Act and the proceeding for the issuance of such order was commenced within the period required by subsection (a) of this section, such subsection does not prohibit the commencement, after such period, of a civil action under section 311(d)(3)(A) against a party to such order or a civil action under subsection (l) of such section 5 for violation of such order.

Subtitle C—Blocking Act

SEC. 321. CHANGE CONDITIONS OF FIRST GENERIC EXCLUSIVITY TO SPUR ACCESS AND COMPETITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505(j)(5)(B)(iv) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(5)(B)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “180 days after” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “180 days after the earlier of—

“(aa) the date of the first commercial marketing of the drug (including the commercial marketing of the listed drug) by any first applicant; or

“(bb) the applicable date specified in subclause (III).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) APPLICABLE DATE.—The applicable date specified in this subclause, with respect to an application for a drug described in subclause (I), is the date on which each of the following conditions is first met:

“(aa) The approval of such an application could be made effective, but for the eligibility of a first applicant for 180-day exclusivity under this clause.

“(bb) At least 30 months have passed since the date of submission of an application for the drug by at least one first applicant.

“(cc) Approval of an application for the drug submitted by at least one first applicant is not precluded under clause (iii).

“(dd) No application for the drug submitted by any first applicant is approved at the time the conditions under items (aa), (bb), and (cc) are all met, regardless of whether such an application is subsequently approved.”.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish, as appropriate and available, information sufficient to allow applicants to assess whether the conditions described in section 505(j)(5)(B)(iv)(III) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by subsection (a)) are satisfied for all applications where the exclusivity period under clause (iv)(I) of section 505(j)(5)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as amended by such subsection) has not expired; and

(2) publish updates to such information to reflect the most recent information available to the Secretary.

Subtitle D—Purple Book

SEC. 331. PUBLIC LISTING.

Section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) PUBLIC LISTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) INITIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2019, the Secretary shall publish and make available to the public in a searchable, electronic format—

“(I) a list in alphabetical order of the non-proprietary or proper name of each biological product for which a biologics license

under subsection (a) or this subsection is in effect, or that has been deemed to be licensed under this section pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009, as of such date of enactment;

“(II) the date of approval of the marketing application and the application number; and

“(III) the marketing or licensure status of the biological product for which a biologics license under subsection (a) or this subsection is in effect or that has been deemed to be licensed under this section pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009.

“(ii) REVISIONS.—Every 30 days after the publication of the first list under clause (i), the Secretary shall revise the list to include each biological product which has been licensed under subsection (a) or this subsection during the 30-day period.

“(iii) PATENT INFORMATION.—Not later than 30 days after a list of patents under subsection (1)(3)(A), or a supplement to such list under subsection (1)(7), has been provided by the reference product sponsor to the subsection (k) applicant respecting a biological product included on the list published under this subparagraph, the reference product sponsor shall provide such list of patents (or supplement thereto) and their corresponding expiry dates to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall, in revisions made under clause (ii), include such information for such biological product. Within 30 days of providing any subsequent or supplemental list of patents to any subsequent subsection (k) applicant under subsection (1)(3)(A) or (1)(7), the reference product sponsor shall update the information provided to the Secretary under this clause with any additional patents from such subsequent or supplemental list and their corresponding expiry dates.

“(iv) LISTING OF EXCLUSIVITIES.—For each biological product included on the list published under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall specify each exclusivity period that is applicable and has not concluded under paragraph (6) or paragraph (7).

“(B) WITHDRAWAL OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSURE.—If the licensing of a biological product was withdrawn or suspended for safety, purity, or potency reasons, it may not be published in the list under subparagraph (A). If the withdrawal or suspension occurred after its publication in such list, the reference product sponsor shall notify the Secretary that—

“(i) the biological product shall be immediately removed from such list—

“(I) for the same period as the withdrawal or suspension; or

“(II) if the biological product has been withdrawn from sale, for the period of withdrawal from sale or, if earlier, the period ending on the date the Secretary determines that the withdrawal from sale is not for safety, purity, or potency reasons; and

“(ii) a notice of the removal shall be published in the Federal Register.”.

SEC. 332. REVIEW AND REPORT ON TYPES OF INFORMATION TO BE LISTED.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) solicit public comment regarding the type of information, if any, that should be added to or removed from the list required by paragraph (9) of section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)), as added by section 331; and

(2) transmit to Congress an evaluation of such comments, including any recommendations about the types of information that should be added to or removed from the list.

Subtitle E—Orange Book

SEC. 341. ORANGE BOOK.

(a) SUBMISSION OF PATENT INFORMATION FOR BRAND NAME DRUGS.—Paragraph (1) of section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any drug subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as part of the application—

“(A) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such drug is safe for use and whether such drug is effective in use;

“(B) a full list of the articles used as components of such drug;

“(C) a full statement of the composition of such drug;

“(D) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug;

“(E) such samples of such drug and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require;

“(F) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such drug;

“(G) any assessments required under section 505B; and

“(H) patent information, with respect to each patent for which a claim of patent infringement could reasonably be asserted if a person not licensed by the owner engaged in the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug, and consistent with the following requirements:

“(i) The applicant shall file with the application the patent number and the expiration date of—

“(I) any patent which claims the drug for which the applicant submitted the application and is a drug substance (including active ingredient) patent or a drug product (including formulation and composition) patent; and

“(II) any patent which claims the method of using such drug.

“(ii) If an application is filed under this subsection for a drug and a patent of the type described in clause (i) which claims such drug or a method of using such drug is issued after the filing date but before approval of the application, the applicant shall amend the application to include such patent information.

Upon approval of the application, the Secretary shall publish the information submitted under subparagraph (H). The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health and with representatives of the drug manufacturing industry, review and develop guidance, as appropriate, on the inclusion of women and minorities in clinical trials required by subparagraph (A).”.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES TO REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION OF PATENT INFORMATION.—Section 505(c)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “the patent number and the expiration date of any patent which” the following: “fulfills the criteria in subsection (b) and”;

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “Patent information that is not the type of patent information required by subsection (b) shall not be submitted.”; and

(3) by inserting after “could not file patent information under subsection (b) because no patent” the following: “of the type required to be submitted in subsection (b)”.

(c) LISTING OF EXCLUSIVITIES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C.

355(j)(7) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) For each drug included on the list, the Secretary shall specify each exclusivity period that is applicable and has not concluded under—

“(I) clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of subsection (c)(3)(E) of this section;

“(II) clause (iv) or (v) of paragraph (5)(B) of this subsection;

“(III) clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (5)(F) of this subsection;

“(IV) section 505A;

“(V) section 505E; or

“(VI) section 527(a).”.

(d) REMOVAL OF INVALID PATENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D)(i) The holder of an application approved under subsection (c) for a drug on the list shall notify within 14 days the Secretary in writing if either of the following occurs:

“(I) The Patent Trial and Appeals Board issues a decision from which no appeal has been or can be taken that a patent for such drug is invalid.

“(II) A court issues a decision from which no appeal has been or can be taken that a patent for such drug is invalid.

“(ii) The holder of an approved application shall include in any notification under clause (i) a copy of the decision described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i).

“(iii) The Secretary shall remove from the list any patent that is determined to be invalid in a decision described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i)—

“(I) promptly; but

“(II) not before the expiration of any 180-day exclusivity period under paragraph (5)(B)(iv) that relies on a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) that such patent was invalid.”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (D) of section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)), as added by paragraph (1), applies only with respect to a decision described in such subparagraph that is issued on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) REVIEW AND REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall—

(1) solicit public comment regarding the types of patent information that should be included on the list under section 507(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)); and

(2) transmit to the Congress an evaluation of such comments, including any recommendations about the types of patent information that should be included on or removed from such list.

SEC. 342. GAO REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this section as the “Comptroller General”) shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the patents included in the list published under section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)), including an analysis and evaluation of the types of patents included in such list and the claims such patents make about the products they claim.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report under subsection (a)—

(1) data on the number of—

(A) patents included in the list published under paragraph (7) of section 505(j) of the

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)), that claim the active ingredient or formulation of a drug in combination with a device that is used for delivery of the drug, together comprising the finished dosage form of the drug; and

(B) claims in each patent that claim a device that is used for the delivery of the drug, but do not claim such device in combination with an active ingredient or formulation of a drug;

(2) data on the date of inclusion in the list under paragraph (7) of such section 505(j) for all patents under such list, as compared to patents that claim a method of using the drug in combination with a device;

(3) an analysis regarding the impact of including on the list under paragraph (7) of such section 505(j) certain types of patent information for drug product applicants and approved application holders, including an analysis of whether—

(A) the listing of the patents described in paragraph (1)(A) delayed the market entry of one or more drugs approved under such section 505(j); and

(B) not listing the patents described in paragraph (1)(A) would delay the market entry of one or more such drugs; and

(4) recommendations about which kinds of patents relating to devices described in paragraph (1)(A) should be submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for inclusion on the list under paragraph (7) of such section 505(j) and which patents should not be required to be so submitted.

Subtitle F—Advancing Education on Biosimilars

SEC. 351. EDUCATION ON BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

(a) WEBSITE; CONTINUING EDUCATION.—Subpart 1 of part F of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: “SEC. 352A. EDUCATION ON BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

“(a) INTERNET WEBSITE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain and operate an internet website to provide educational materials for health care providers, patients, and caregivers, regarding the meaning of the terms, and the standards for review and licensing of, biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products.

“(2) CONTENT.—Educational materials provided under paragraph (1) may include—

“(A) explanations of key statutory and regulatory terms, including ‘biosimilar’ and ‘interchangeable’, and clarification regarding the use of interchangeable biosimilar biological products;

“(B) information related to development programs for biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products and relevant clinical considerations for prescribers, which may include, as appropriate and applicable, information related to the comparability of such biological products;

“(C) an explanation of the process for reporting adverse events for biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products; and

“(D) an explanation of the relationship between biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products licensed under section 351(k) and reference products (as defined in section 351(i)), including the standards for review and licensing of each such type of biological product.

“(3) FORMAT.—The educational materials provided under paragraph (1) may be—

“(A) in formats such as webinars, continuing medical education modules, videos,

fact sheets, infographics, stakeholder toolkits, or other formats as appropriate and applicable; and

“(B) tailored for the unique needs of health care providers, patients, caregivers, and other audiences, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(4) OTHER INFORMATION.—In addition to the information described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall continue to publish the following information:

“(A) The action package of each biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k).

“(B) The summary review of each biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k).

“(5) CONFIDENTIAL AND TRADE SECRET INFORMATION.—This subsection does not authorize the disclosure of any trade secret, confidential commercial or financial information, or other matter described in section 552(b) of title 5.

“(b) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall advance education and awareness among health care providers regarding biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products, as appropriate, including by developing or improving continuing education programs that advance the education of such providers on the prescribing of, and relevant clinical considerations with respect to, biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products.”.

(b) APPLICATION UNDER THE MEDICARE MERIT-BASED INCENTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM.—Section 1848(q)(5)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(q)(5)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) CLINICAL MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM ON BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.—Completion of a clinical medical education program developed or improved under section 352A(b) of the Public Health Service Act by a MIPS eligible professional during a performance period shall earn such eligible professional one-half of the highest potential score for the performance category described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii) for such performance period. A MIPS eligible professional may only count the completion of such a program for purposes of such category one time during the eligible professional’s lifetime.”.

Subtitle G—Streamlining Transition of Biological Products

SEC. 361. STREAMLINING THE TRANSITION OF BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

Section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-148) is amended—

(1) by striking “An approved application” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An approved application”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an application for a biological product submitted under subsection (b) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) that is filed not later than March 23, 2019, the Secretary shall continue to review such application under such section 505, even if such review continues after March 23, 2020.

“(ii) EFFECT ON LISTED DRUGS.—Only for purposes of carrying out clause (i), with respect to any applicable listed drug with respect to such application, the following shall apply:

“(I) Any drug that is a biological product that has been deemed licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) pursuant to subparagraph (A) and

that is referenced in an application described in clause (i), shall continue to be identified as a listed drug on the list published pursuant to section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the information for such drug on such list shall not be revised after March 20, 2020, until—

“(aa) such drug is removed from such list in accordance with subclause (III) or subparagraph (C) of such section 505(j)(7); or

“(bb) this subparagraph no longer has force or effect.

“(II) Any drug that is a biological product that has been deemed licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) pursuant to subparagraph (A) and that is referenced in an application described in clause (i) shall be subject only to requirements applicable to biological products licensed under such section.

“(III) Upon approval under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of an application described in clause (i), the Secretary shall remove from the list published pursuant to section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act any listed drug that is a biological product that has been deemed licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act pursuant to subparagraph (A) and that is referenced in such approved application, unless such listed drug is referenced in one or more additional applications described in clause (i).

“(iii) DEEMED LICENSURE.—Upon approval of an application described in clause (i), such approved application shall be deemed to be a license for the biological product under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, pursuant to subparagraph (A), and any period of exclusivity, as applicable, shall be determined in accordance with such section.

“(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(I) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—

“(aa) PATENT CERTIFICATION OR STATEMENT.—An application described in clause (i) shall contain a patent certification or statement described in, as applicable, section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or clauses (vii) and (viii) of section 505(j)(2)(A) of such Act and, with respect to any listed drug referenced in such application, comply with related requirements concerning any timely filed patent information listed pursuant to section 505(j)(7).

“(bb) DATE OF APPROVAL.—The earliest possible date on which any pending application described in clause (i) may be approved shall be determined based on—

“(AA) the last expiration date of any applicable period of exclusivity that would prevent such approval and that is described in section 505(c)(3)(E), 505(j)(5)(B)(iv), 505(j)(5)(F), 505A, 505E, or 527 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and

“(BB) if the application was submitted under section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and references any listed drug, the last applicable date determined under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 505(c)(3) of such Act, or, if the application was submitted under section 505(j) of such Act, the last applicable date determined under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 505(j)(5)(B).

“(II) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO EXCLUSIVITY.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to affect section 351(k)(7)(D) of the Public Health Service Act.

“(v) AUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary may continue to review an application after March 23, 2020, pursuant to clause (i), and continue to identify any applicable listed drug pursuant to clause (ii) on the list published pursuant to section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, even if such review or listing may reveal the existence of such application and the identity

of any listed drug for which the investigations described in section 505(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are relied upon by the applicant for approval of the pending application. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to disclose any other information that is a trade secret or confidential information described in section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

“(vi) SUNSET.—Beginning on October 1, 2022, this subparagraph shall have no force or effect and any applications described in clause (i) that have not been approved shall be deemed withdrawn.”

Subtitle H—Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform

SEC. 370. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN SUBTITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the “Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2019”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise specified, any reference to “this Act” contained in this subtitle shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this subtitle.

PART 1—OTC DRUG REVIEW

SEC. 371. REGULATION OF CERTAIN NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS THAT ARE MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED DRUG APPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting after section 505F of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355g) the following:

“SEC. 505G. REGULATION OF CERTAIN NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS THAT ARE MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED DRUG APPLICATION.

“(a) NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS MARKETED WITHOUT AN APPROVED APPLICATION.—Nonprescription drugs marketed without an approved drug application under section 505, as of the date of the enactment of this section, shall be treated in accordance with this subsection.

“(1) DRUGS SUBJECT TO A FINAL MONOGRAPH; CATEGORY I DRUGS SUBJECT TO A TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPH.—A drug is deemed to be generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), not a new drug under section 201(p), and not subject to section 503(b)(1), if—

“(A) the drug is—

“(i) in conformity with the requirements for nonprescription use of a final monograph issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (except as provided in paragraph (2)), the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and conditions or requirements under subsections (b), (c), and (k); and

“(ii) except as permitted by an order issued under subsection (b) or, in the case of a minor change in the drug, in conformity with an order issued under subsection (c), in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time under section 201(p)(2); or

“(B) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category I for safety and effectiveness under a tentative final monograph that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with the proposed requirements for nonprescription use of such tentative final monograph, any applicable subsequent determination by the Secretary, the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and conditions or requirements under subsections (b), (c), and (k); and

“(iii) except as permitted by an order issued under subsection (b) or, in the case of a minor change in the drug, in conformity

with an order issued under subsection (c), in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time under section 201(p)(2).

“(2) TREATMENT OF SUNSCREEN DRUGS.—With respect to sunscreen drugs subject to this section, the applicable requirements in terms of conformity with a final monograph, for purposes of paragraph (1)(A)(i), shall be the requirements specified in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as published on May 21, 1999, beginning on page 27687 of volume 64 of the Federal Register, except that the applicable requirements governing effectiveness and labeling shall be those specified in section 201.327 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(3) CATEGORY III DRUGS SUBJECT TO A TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPH; CATEGORY I DRUGS SUBJECT TO PROPOSED MONOGRAPH OR ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—A drug that is not described in paragraph (1), (2), or (4) is not required to be the subject of an application approved under section 505, and is not subject to section 503(b)(1), if—

“(A) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category III for safety or effectiveness in the preamble of a proposed rule establishing a tentative final monograph that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination for such drug issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with—

“(I) the conditions of use, including indication and dosage strength, if any, described for such category III drug in such preamble or in an applicable subsequent proposed rule;

“(II) the proposed requirements for drugs classified in such tentative final monograph in category I in the most recently proposed rule establishing requirements related to such tentative final monograph and in any final rule establishing requirements that are applicable to the drug; and

“(III) the general requirements for nonprescription drugs and conditions or requirements under subsection (b) or (k); and

“(iii) in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, had been used to a material extent and for a material time under section 201(p)(2); or

“(B) the drug is—

“(i) classified in category I for safety and effectiveness under a proposed monograph or advance notice of proposed rulemaking that is the most recently applicable proposal or determination for such drug issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) in conformity with the requirements for nonprescription use of such proposed monograph or advance notice of proposed rulemaking, any applicable subsequent determination by the Secretary, the general requirements for nonprescription drugs, and conditions or requirements under subsection (b) or (k); and

“(iii) in a dosage form that, immediately prior to the date of the enactment of this section, has been used to a material extent and for a material time under section 201(p)(2).

“(4) CATEGORY II DRUGS DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—A drug that is classified in category II for safety or effectiveness under a tentative final monograph or that is subject to a determination to be not generally recognized as safe and effective in a proposed rule that is the most recently applicable proposal issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be a new drug under section 201(p), misbranded under section 502(ee), and subject to the requirement for an approved new drug application under section 505 beginning on the day

that is 180 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this section, unless, before such day, the Secretary determines that it is in the interest of public health to extend the period during which the drug may be marketed without such an approved new drug application.

“(5) DRUGS NOT GRASE DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—A drug that the Secretary has determined not to be generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1) under a final determination issued under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be a new drug under section 201(p), misbranded under section 502(ee), and subject to the requirement for an approved new drug application under section 505.

“(6) OTHER DRUGS DEEMED NEW DRUGS.—Except as provided in subsection (m), a drug is deemed to be a new drug under section 201(p) and misbranded under section 502(ee) if the drug—

“(A) is not subject to section 503(b)(1); and
“(B) is not described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5), or subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary may, on the initiative of the Secretary or at the request of one or more requestors, issue an administrative order determining whether there are conditions under which a specific drug, a class of drugs, or a combination of drugs, is determined to be—

“(i) not subject to section 503(b)(1); and

“(ii) generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1).

“(B) EFFECT.—A drug or combination of drugs shall be deemed to not require approval under section 505 if such drug or combination of drugs—

“(i) is determined by the Secretary to meet the conditions specified in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A);

“(ii) is marketed in conformity with an administrative order under this subsection;

“(iii) meets the general requirements for nonprescription drugs; and

“(iv) meets the requirements under subsections (c) and (k).

“(C) STANDARD.—The Secretary shall find that a drug is not generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1) if—

“(i) the evidence shows that the drug is not generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1); or

“(ii) the evidence is inadequate to show that the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1).

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS INITIATED BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) upon the Secretary's initiative, the Secretary shall—

“(i) make reasonable efforts to notify informally, not later than 2 business days before the issuance of the proposed order, the sponsors of drugs who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for the drugs or combination of drugs that will be subject to the administrative order;

“(ii) after any such reasonable efforts of notification—

“(I) issue a proposed administrative order by publishing it on the website of the Food and Drug Administration and include in such order the reasons for the issuance of such order; and

“(II) publish a notice of availability of such proposed order in the Federal Register;

“(iii) except as provided in subparagraph (B), provide for a public comment period with respect to such proposed order of not less than 45 calendar days; and

“(iv) if, after completion of the proceedings specified in clauses (i) through (iii), the Secretary determines that it is appropriate to issue a final administrative order—

“(I) issue the final administrative order, together with a detailed statement of reasons, which order shall not take effect until the time for requesting judicial review under paragraph (3)(D)(ii) has expired;

“(II) publish a notice of such final administrative order in the Federal Register;

“(III) afford requestors of drugs that will be subject to such order the opportunity for formal dispute resolution up to the level of the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, which initially must be requested within 45 calendar days of the issuance of the order, and, for subsequent levels of appeal, within 30 calendar days of the prior decision; and

“(IV) except with respect to drugs described in paragraph (3)(B), upon completion of the formal dispute resolution procedure, inform the persons which sought such dispute resolution of their right to request a hearing.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—When issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) on the Secretary's initiative proposing to determine that a drug described in subsection (a)(3) is not generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), the Secretary shall follow the procedures in subparagraph (A), except that—

“(i) the proposed order shall include notice of—

“(I) the general categories of data the Secretary has determined necessary to establish that the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1); and

“(II) the format for submissions by interested persons;

“(ii) the Secretary shall provide for a public comment period of no less than 180 calendar days with respect to such proposed order, except when the Secretary determines, for good cause, that a shorter period is in the interest of public health; and

“(iii) any person who submits data in such comment period shall include a certification that the person has submitted all evidence created, obtained, or received by that person that is both within the categories of data identified in the proposed order and relevant to a determination as to whether the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1).

“(3) HEARINGS; JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Only a person who participated in each stage of formal dispute resolution under subclause (III) of paragraph (2)(A)(iv) of an administrative order with respect to a drug may request a hearing concerning a final administrative order issued under such paragraph with respect to such drug. If a hearing is sought, such person must submit a request for a hearing, which shall be based solely on information in the administrative record, to the Secretary not later than 30 calendar days after receiving notice of the final decision of the formal dispute resolution procedure.

“(B) NO HEARING REQUIRED WITH RESPECT TO ORDERS RELATING TO CERTAIN DRUGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not be required to provide notice and an opportunity for a hearing pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iv) if the final administrative order involved relates to a drug—

“(I) that is described in subsection (a)(3)(A); and

“(II) with respect to which no human or non-human data studies relevant to the safety or effectiveness of such drug have been submitted to the administrative record since the issuance of the most recent tentative final monograph relating to such drug.

“(ii) HUMAN DATA STUDIES AND NON-HUMAN DATA DEFINED.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) The term ‘human data studies’ means clinical trials of safety or effectiveness (in-

cluding actual use studies), pharmacokinetics studies, or bioavailability studies.

“(II) The term ‘non-human data’ means data from testing other than with human subjects which provides information concerning safety or effectiveness.

“(C) HEARING PROCEDURES.—

“(i) DENIAL OF REQUEST FOR HEARING.—If the Secretary determines that information submitted in a request for a hearing under subparagraph (A) with respect to a final administrative order issued under paragraph (2)(A)(iv) does not identify the existence of a genuine and substantial question of material fact, the Secretary may deny such request. In making such a determination, the Secretary may consider only information and data that are based on relevant and reliable scientific principles and methodologies.

“(ii) SINGLE HEARING FOR MULTIPLE RELATED REQUESTS.—If more than one request for a hearing is submitted with respect to the same administrative order under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may direct that a single hearing be conducted in which all persons whose hearing requests were granted may participate.

“(iii) PRESIDING OFFICER.—The presiding officer of a hearing requested under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(I) be designated by the Secretary;

“(II) not be an employee of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research; and

“(III) not have been previously involved in the development of the administrative order involved or proceedings relating to that administrative order.

“(iv) RIGHTS OF PARTIES TO HEARING.—The parties to a hearing requested under subparagraph (A) shall have the right to present testimony, including testimony of expert witnesses, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by other parties. Where appropriate, the presiding officer may require that cross-examination by parties representing substantially the same interests be consolidated to promote efficiency and avoid duplication.

“(v) FINAL DECISION.—

“(I) At the conclusion of a hearing requested under subparagraph (A), the presiding officer of the hearing shall issue a decision containing findings of fact and conclusions of law. The decision of the presiding officer shall be final.

“(II) The final decision may not take effect until the period under subparagraph (D)(ii) for submitting a request for judicial review of such decision expires.

“(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The procedures described in section 505(h) shall apply with respect to judicial review of final administrative orders issued under this subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applies to an order described in such section except that the judicial review shall be taken by filing in an appropriate district court of the United States in lieu of the appellate courts specified in such section.

“(ii) PERIOD TO SUBMIT A REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person eligible to request a hearing under this paragraph and seeking judicial review of a final administrative order issued under this subsection shall file such request for judicial review not later than 60 calendar days after the latest of—

“(I) the date on which notice of such order is published;

“(II) the date on which a hearing with respect to such order is denied under subparagraph (B) or (C)(i);

“(III) the date on which a final decision is made following a hearing under subparagraph (C)(v); or

“(IV) if no hearing is requested, the date on which the time for requesting a hearing expires.

“(4) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS INITIATED BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) IMMINENT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a determination by the Secretary that a drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs subject to this section poses an imminent hazard to the public health, the Secretary, after first making reasonable efforts to notify, not later than 48 hours before issuance of such order under this subparagraph, sponsors who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for such drug or combination of drugs—

“(I) may issue an interim final administrative order for such drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs under paragraph (1), together with a detailed statement of the reasons for such order;

“(II) shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of availability of any such order; and

“(III) shall provide for a public comment period of at least 45 calendar days with respect to such interim final order.

“(ii) NONDELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the authority to issue an interim final administrative order under this subparagraph.

“(B) SAFETY LABELING CHANGES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a determination by the Secretary that a change in the labeling of a drug, class of drugs, or combination of drugs subject to this section is reasonably expected to mitigate a significant or unreasonable risk of a serious adverse event associated with use of the drug, the Secretary may—

“(I) make reasonable efforts to notify informally, not later than 48 hours before the issuance of the interim final order, the sponsors of drugs who have a listing in effect under section 510(j) for such drug or combination of drugs;

“(II) after reasonable efforts of notification, issue an interim final administrative order in accordance with paragraph (1) to require such change, together with a detailed statement of the reasons for such order;

“(III) publish in the Federal Register a notice of availability of such order; and

“(IV) provide for a public comment period of at least 45 calendar days with respect to such interim final order.

“(ii) CONTENT OF ORDER.—An interim final order issued under this subparagraph with respect to the labeling of a drug may provide for new warnings and other information required for safe use of the drug.

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—An order under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall take effect on a date specified by the Secretary.

“(D) FINAL ORDER.—After the completion of the proceedings in subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue a final order in accordance with paragraph (1);

“(ii) publish a notice of availability of such final administrative order in the Federal Register; and

“(iii) afford sponsors of such drugs that will be subject to such an order the opportunity for formal dispute resolution up to the level of the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, which must initially be within 45 calendar days of the issuance of the order, and for subsequent levels of appeal, within 30 calendar days of the prior decision.

“(E) HEARINGS.—A sponsor of a drug subject to a final order issued under subparagraph (D) and that participated in each stage of formal dispute resolution under clause (iii) of such subparagraph may request a

hearing on such order. The provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (3), other than paragraph (3)(C)(v)(II), shall apply with respect to a hearing on such order in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply with respect to a hearing on an administrative order issued under paragraph (2)(A)(iv).

“(F) TIMING.—

“(i) FINAL ORDER AND HEARING.—The Secretary shall—

“(I) not later than 6 months after the date on which the comment period closes under subparagraph (A) or (B), issue a final order in accordance with paragraph (1); and

“(II) not later than 12 months after the date on which such final order is issued, complete any hearing under subparagraph (E).

“(ii) DISPUTE RESOLUTION REQUEST.—The Secretary shall specify in an interim final order issued under subparagraph (A) or (B) such shorter periods for requesting dispute resolution under subparagraph (D)(iii) as are necessary to meet the requirements of this subparagraph.

“(G) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A final order issued pursuant to subparagraph (F) shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with paragraph (3)(D).

“(5) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER INITIATED AT THE REQUEST OF A REQUESTOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In issuing an administrative order under paragraph (1) at the request of a requestor with respect to certain drugs, classes of drugs, or combinations of drugs—

“(i) the Secretary shall, after receiving a request under this subparagraph, determine whether the request is sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review;

“(ii) if the Secretary determines that the request is sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review, the Secretary shall—

“(I) file the request; and

“(II) initiate proceedings with respect to issuing an administrative order in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3); and

“(iii) except as provided in paragraph (6), if the Secretary determines that a request does not meet the requirements for filing or is not sufficiently complete and formatted to permit a substantive review, the requestor may demand that the request be filed over protest, and the Secretary shall initiate proceedings to review the request in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) REQUEST TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A requestor seeking an administrative order under paragraph (1) with respect to certain drugs, classes of drugs, or combinations of drugs, shall submit to the Secretary a request to initiate proceedings for such order in the form and manner as specified by the Secretary. Such requestor may submit a request under this subparagraph for the issuance of an administrative order—

“(I) determining whether a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), exempt from section 503(b)(1), and not required to be the subject of an approved application under section 505; or

“(II) determining whether a change to a condition of use of a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), exempt from section 503(b)(1), and not required to be the subject of an approved application under section 505, if, absent such a changed condition of use, such drug is—

“(aa) generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1) in accordance with subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or an order under this subsection; or

“(bb) subject to subsection (a)(3), but only if such requestor initiates such request in conjunction with a request for the Secretary to determine whether such drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), which is filed by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to complete review of a request for a change described in clause (i)(II) if the Secretary determines that there is an inadequate basis to find the drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1) under paragraph (1) and issues a final order announcing that determination.

“(iii) WITHDRAWAL.—The requestor may withdraw a request under this paragraph, according to the procedures set forth pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(B). Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if such request is withdrawn, the Secretary may cease proceedings under this subparagraph.

“(C) EXCLUSIVITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A final administrative order issued in response to a request under this section shall have the effect of authorizing solely the order requestor (or the licensee, assignees, or successors in interest of such requestor with respect to the subject of such order), for a period of 18 months following the effective date of such final order and beginning on the date the requestor may lawfully market such drugs pursuant to the order, to market drugs—

“(I) incorporating changes described in clause (ii); and

“(II) subject to the limitations under clause (iv).

“(ii) CHANGES DESCRIBED.—A change described in this clause is a change subject to an order specified in clause (i), which—

“(I) provides for a drug to contain an active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient) not previously incorporated in a drug described in clause (iii); or

“(II) provides for a change in the conditions of use of a drug, for which new human data studies conducted or sponsored by the requestor (or for which the requestor has an exclusive right of reference) were essential to the issuance of such order.

“(iii) DRUGS DESCRIBED.—The drugs described in this clause are drugs—

“(I) specified in subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3);

“(II) subject to a final order issued under this section;

“(III) subject to a final sunscreen order (as defined in section 586(2)(A)); or

“(IV) described in subsection (m)(1), other than drugs subject to an active enforcement action under chapter III of this Act.

“(iv) LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVITY.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Only one 18-month period under this subparagraph shall be granted, under each order described in clause (i), with respect to changes (to the drug subject to such order) which are either—

“(aa) changes described in clause (ii)(I), relating to active ingredients; or

“(bb) changes described in clause (ii)(II), relating to conditions of use.

“(II) NO EXCLUSIVITY ALLOWED.—No exclusivity shall apply to changes to a drug which are—

“(aa) the subject of a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request (as defined in section 744L);

“(bb) safety-related changes, as defined by the Secretary, or any other changes the Secretary considers necessary to assure safe use; or

“(cc) changes related to methods of testing safety or efficacy.

“(v) NEW HUMAN DATA STUDIES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘new human data studies’ means clinical trials of safety

or effectiveness (including actual use studies), pharmacokinetics studies, or bioavailability studies, the results of which—

“(I) have not been relied on by the Secretary to support—

“(aa) a proposed or final determination that a drug described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of clause (iii) is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1); or

“(bb) approval of a drug that was approved under section 505; and

“(II) do not duplicate the results of another study that was relied on by the Secretary to support—

“(aa) a proposed or final determination that a drug described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of clause (iii) is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1); or

“(bb) approval of a drug that was approved under section 505.

“(6) INFORMATION REGARDING SAFE NON-PRESCRIPTION MARKETING AND USE AS CONDITION FOR FILING A GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE AND EFFECTIVE REQUEST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In response to a request under this section that a drug described in subparagraph (B) be generally recognized as safe and effective, the Secretary—

“(i) may file such request, if the request includes information specified under subparagraph (C) with respect to safe non-prescription marketing and use of such drug; or

“(ii) if the request fails to include information specified under subparagraph (C), shall refuse to file such request and require that nonprescription marketing of the drug be pursuant to a new drug application as described in subparagraph (D).

“(B) DRUG DESCRIBED.—A drug described in this subparagraph is a nonprescription drug which contains an active ingredient not previously incorporated in a drug—

“(i) specified in subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3);

“(ii) subject to a final order under this section; or

“(iii) subject to a final sunscreen order (as defined in section 586(2)(A)).

“(C) INFORMATION DEMONSTRATING PRIMA FACIE SAFE NONPRESCRIPTION MARKETING AND USE.—Information specified in this subparagraph, with respect to a request described in subparagraph (A)(i), is—

“(i) information sufficient for a prima facie demonstration that the drug subject to such request has a verifiable history of being marketed and safely used by consumers in the United States as a nonprescription drug under comparable conditions of use;

“(ii) if the drug has not been previously marketed in the United States as a nonprescription drug, information sufficient for a prima facie demonstration that the drug was marketed and safely used under comparable conditions of marketing and use in a country listed in section 802(b)(1)(A) or designated by the Secretary in accordance with section 802(b)(1)(B)—

“(I) for such period as needed to provide reasonable assurances concerning the safe nonprescription use of the drug; and

“(II) during such time was subject to sufficient monitoring by a regulatory body considered acceptable by the Secretary for such monitoring purposes, including for adverse events associated with nonprescription use of the drug; or

“(iii) if the Secretary determines that information described in clause (i) or (ii) is not needed to provide a prima facie demonstration that the drug can be safely marketed and used as a nonprescription drug, such other information the Secretary determines is sufficient for such purposes.

“(D) MARKETING PURSUANT TO NEW DRUG APPLICATION.—In the case of a request described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the drug sub-

ject to such request may be resubmitted for filing only if—

“(i) the drug is marketed as a nonprescription drug, under conditions of use comparable to the conditions specified in the request, for such period as the Secretary determines appropriate (not to exceed 5 consecutive years) pursuant to an application approved under section 505; and

“(ii) during such period, 1,000,000 retail packages of the drug, or an equivalent quantity as determined by the Secretary, were distributed for retail sale, as determined in such manner as the Secretary finds appropriate.

“(E) RULE OF APPLICATION.—Except in the case of a request involving a drug described in section 586(9), as in effect on January 1, 2017, if the Secretary refuses to file a request under this paragraph, the requestor may not file such request over protest under paragraph (5)(A)(iii).

“(7) PACKAGING.—An administrative order issued under paragraph (2), (4)(A), or (5) may include requirements for the packaging of a drug to encourage use in accordance with labeling. Such requirements may include unit dose packaging, requirements for products intended for use by pediatric populations, requirements to reduce risk of harm from unsupervised ingestion, and other appropriate requirements. This paragraph does not authorize the Food and Drug Administration to require standards or testing procedures as described in part 1700 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(8) FINAL AND TENTATIVE FINAL MONOGRAPHS FOR CATEGORY I DRUGS DEEMED FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A final monograph or tentative final monograph described in subparagraph (B) shall be deemed to be a final administrative order under this subsection and may be amended, revoked, or otherwise modified in accordance with the procedures of this subsection.

“(B) MONOGRAPHS DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a final monograph or tentative final monograph is described in this subparagraph if it—

“(i) establishes conditions of use for a drug described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a); and

“(ii) represents the most recently promulgated version of such conditions, including as modified, in whole or in part, by any proposed or final rule.

“(C) DEEMED ORDERS INCLUDE HARMONIZING TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The deemed establishment of a final administrative order under subparagraph (A) shall be construed to include any technical amendments to such order as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that such order is appropriately harmonized, in terms of terminology or cross-references, with the applicable provisions of this Act (and regulations thereunder) and any other orders issued under this section.

“(c) PROCEDURE FOR MINOR CHANGES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Minor changes in the dosage form of a drug that is described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) or the subject of an order issued under subsection (b) may be made by a requestor without the issuance of an order under subsection (b) if—

“(A) the requestor maintains such information as is necessary to demonstrate that the change—

“(i) will not affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug; and

“(ii) will not materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient in comparison to a suitable reference product; and

“(B) the change is in conformity with the requirements of an applicable administrative

order issued by the Secretary under paragraph (3).

“(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

“(A) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—A sponsor shall submit records requested by the Secretary relating to such a minor change under section 704(a)(4), within 15 business days of receiving such a request, or such longer period as the Secretary may provide.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the Secretary determines that the information contained in such records is not sufficient to demonstrate that the change does not affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug or materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient, the Secretary—

“(i) may so inform the sponsor of the drug in writing; and

“(ii) if the Secretary so informs the sponsor, shall provide the sponsor of the drug with a reasonable opportunity to provide additional information.

“(C) FAILURE TO SUBMIT SUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the sponsor fails to provide such additional information within a time prescribed by the Secretary, or if the Secretary determines that such additional information does not demonstrate that the change does not—

“(i) affect the safety or effectiveness of the drug; or

“(ii) materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to the active ingredient in comparison to a suitable reference product,

the drug as modified is a new drug under section 201(p) and shall be deemed to be misbranded under section 502(ee).

“(3) DETERMINING WHETHER A CHANGE WILL AFFECT SAFETY OR EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue one or more administrative orders specifying requirements for determining whether a minor change made by a sponsor pursuant to this subsection will affect the safety or effectiveness of a drug or materially affect the extent of absorption or other exposure to an active ingredient in the drug in comparison to a suitable reference product, together with guidance for applying those orders to specific dosage forms.

“(B) STANDARD PRACTICES.—The orders and guidance issued by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall take into account relevant public standards and standard practices for evaluating the quality of drugs, and may take into account the special needs of populations, including children.

“(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), any information, including reports of testing conducted on the drug or drugs involved, that is submitted by a requestor in connection with proceedings on an order under this section (including any minor change under subsection (c)) and is a trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, or section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, shall not be disclosed to the public unless the requestor consents to that disclosure.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make any information submitted by a requestor in support of a request under subsection (b)(5)(A) available to the public not later than the date on which the proposed order is issued; and

“(ii) make any information submitted by any other person with respect to an order requested (or initiated by the Secretary) under subsection (b), available to the public upon such submission.

“(B) LIMITATIONS ON PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Information described in subparagraph (A) shall not be made public if—

“(i) the information pertains to pharmaceutical quality information, unless such information is necessary to establish standards under which a drug is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1);

“(ii) the information is submitted in a requestor-initiated request, but the requestor withdraws such request, in accordance with withdrawal procedures established by the Secretary, before the Secretary issues the proposed order;

“(iii) the Secretary requests and obtains the information under subsection (c) and such information is not submitted in relation to an order under subsection (b); or

“(iv) the information is of the type contained in raw datasets.

“(e) UPDATES TO DRUG LISTING INFORMATION.—A sponsor who makes a change to a drug subject to this section shall submit updated drug listing information for the drug in accordance with section 510(j) within 30 calendar days of the date when the drug is first commercially marketed, except that a sponsor who was the order requestor with respect to an order subject to subsection (b)(5)(C) (or a licensee, assignee, or successor in interest of such requestor) shall submit updated drug listing information on or before the date when the drug is first commercially marketed.

“(f) APPROVALS UNDER SECTION 505.—The provisions of this section shall not be construed to preclude a person from seeking or maintaining the approval of an application for a drug under sections 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), and 505(j). A determination under this section that a drug is not subject to section 503(b)(1), is generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), and is not a new drug under section 201(p) shall constitute a finding that the drug is safe and effective that may be relied upon for purposes of an application under section 505(b)(2), so that the applicant shall be required to submit for purposes of such application only information needed to support any modification of the drug that is not covered by such determination under this section.

“(g) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS.—The Secretary shall establish, maintain, update (as determined necessary by the Secretary but no less frequently than annually), and make publicly available, with respect to orders issued under this section—

“(1) a repository of each final order and interim final order in effect, including the complete text of the order; and

“(2) a listing of all orders proposed and under development under subsection (b)(2), including—

“(A) a brief description of each such order; and

“(B) the Secretary’s expectations, if resources permit, for issuance of proposed orders over a 3-year period.

“(h) DEVELOPMENT ADVICE TO SPONSORS OR REQUESTORS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures under which sponsors or requestors may meet with appropriate officials of the Food and Drug Administration to obtain advice on the studies and other information necessary to support submissions under this section and other matters relevant to the regulation of nonprescription drugs and the development of new nonprescription drugs under this section.

“(i) PARTICIPATION OF MULTIPLE SPONSORS OR REQUESTORS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to facilitate efficient participation by multiple sponsors or requestors in proceedings under this section, including provision for joint meetings with multiple sponsors or requestors or with organizations nominated by sponsors or requestors to represent their interests in a proceeding.

“(j) ELECTRONIC FORMAT.—All submissions under this section shall be in electronic format.

“(k) EFFECT ON EXISTING REGULATIONS GOVERNING NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—

“(1) REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY TO NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Except as provided in this subsection, nothing in this section supersedes regulations establishing general requirements for nonprescription drugs, including regulations of general applicability contained in parts 201, 250, and 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulations. The Secretary shall establish or modify such regulations by means of rulemaking in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) REGULATIONS ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIFIC NONPRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—

“(A) The provisions of section 310.545 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section, shall be deemed to be a final order under subsection (b).

“(B) Regulations in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section, establishing requirements for specific nonprescription drugs marketed pursuant to this section (including such requirements in parts 201 and 250 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations), shall be deemed to be final orders under subsection (b), only as they apply to drugs—

“(i) subject to paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a); or

“(ii) otherwise subject to an order under this section.

“(3) WITHDRAWAL OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall withdraw regulations establishing final monographs and the procedures governing the over-the-counter drug review under part 330 and other relevant parts of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section), or make technical changes to such regulations to ensure conformity with appropriate terminology and cross references. Notwithstanding subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, any such withdrawal or technical changes shall be made without public notice and comment and shall be effective upon publication through notice in the Federal Register (or upon such date as specified in such notice).

“(1) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance that specifies—

“(1) the procedures and principles for formal meetings between the Secretary and sponsors or requestors for drugs subject to this section;

“(2) the format and content of data submissions to the Secretary under this section;

“(3) the format of electronic submissions to the Secretary under this section;

“(4) consolidated proceedings for appeal and the procedures for such proceedings where appropriate; and

“(5) for minor changes in drugs, recommendations on how to comply with the requirements in orders issued under subsection (c)(3).

“(m) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not affect the treatment or status of a nonprescription drug—

“(A) that is marketed without an application approved under section 505 as of the date of the enactment of this section;

“(B) that is not subject to an order issued under this section; and

“(C) to which paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (a) do not apply.

“(2) TREATMENT OF PRODUCTS PREVIOUSLY FOUND TO BE SUBJECT TO TIME AND EXTENT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a drug described in subparagraph (B) may only be lawfully marketed, without an application approved under section 505, pursuant to an order issued under this section.

“(B) A drug described in this subparagraph is a drug which, prior to the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary determined in a proposed or final rule to be ineligible for review under the OTC drug review (as such phrase ‘OTC drug review’ was used in section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section).

“(3) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—

“(A) Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to preclude or limit the applicability of any provision of this Act other than this section.

“(B) Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from issuing an order under this section finding a drug to be not generally recognized as safe and effective under section 201(p)(1), as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(n) INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS.—A drug is not subject to this section if an exemption for investigational use under section 505(i) is in effect for such drug.

“(o) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to collections of information made under this section.

“(p) INAPPLICABILITY OF NOTICE AND COMMENT RULEMAKING AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to orders issued under this section instead of the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(q) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘nonprescription drug’ refers to a drug not subject to the requirements of section 503(b)(1).

“(2) The term ‘sponsor’ refers to any person marketing, manufacturing, or processing a drug that—

“(A) is listed pursuant to section 510(j); and

“(B) is or will be subject to an administrative order under this section of the Food and Drug Administration.

“(3) The term ‘requestor’ refers to any person or group of persons marketing, manufacturing, processing, or developing a drug.”

(b) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a study to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate addressing the effectiveness and overall impact of exclusivity under section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a), and section 586C of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3), including the impact of such exclusivity on consumer access. Such study shall include—

(1) an analysis of the impact of exclusivity under such section 505G for nonprescription drug products, including—

(A) the number of nonprescription drug products that were granted exclusivity and the indication for which the nonprescription drug products were determined to be generally recognized as safe and effective;

(B) whether the exclusivity for such drug products was granted for—

(i) a new active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient); or

(ii) changes in the conditions of use of a drug, for which new human data studies conducted or sponsored by the requestor were essential;

(C) whether, and to what extent, the exclusivity impacted the requestor’s or sponsor’s decision to develop the drug product;

(D) an analysis of the implementation of the exclusivity provision in such section 505G, including—

(i) the resources used by the Food and Drug Administration;

(ii) the impact of such provision on innovation, as well as research and development in the nonprescription drug market;

(iii) the impact of such provision on competition in the nonprescription drug market;

(iv) the impact of such provision on consumer access to nonprescription drug products;

(v) the impact of such provision on the prices of nonprescription drug products; and

(vi) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under such section 505G have been sufficient to encourage the development of nonprescription drug products that would likely not be otherwise developed, or developed in as timely a manner; and

(E) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under such section 505G have been sufficient incentive to encourage innovation in the nonprescription drug market; and

(2) an analysis of the impact of exclusivity under such section 586C for sunscreen ingredients, including—

(A) the number of sunscreen ingredients that were granted exclusivity and the specific ingredient that was determined to be generally recognized as safe and effective;

(B) whether, and to what extent, the exclusivity impacted the requestor's or sponsor's decision to develop the sunscreen ingredient;

(C) whether, and to what extent, the sunscreen ingredient granted exclusivity had previously been available outside of the United States;

(D) an analysis of the implementation of the exclusivity provision in such section 586C, including—

(i) the resources used by the Food and Drug Administration;

(ii) the impact of such provision on innovation, as well as research and development in the sunscreen market;

(iii) the impact of such provision on competition in the sunscreen market;

(iv) the impact of such provision on consumer access to sunscreen products;

(v) the impact of such provision on the prices of sunscreen products; and

(vi) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under such section 505G have been utilized by sunscreen ingredient sponsors and whether such process has been sufficient to encourage the development of sunscreen ingredients that would likely not be otherwise developed, or developed in as timely a manner; and

(E) whether the administrative orders initiated by requestors under such section 586C have been sufficient incentive to encourage innovation in the sunscreen market.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 751(d)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379r(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “final regulation promulgated” and inserting “final order under section 505G”; and

(B) by striking “and not misbranded”; and (2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “regulation in effect” and inserting “regulation or order in effect”.

SEC. 372. MISBRANDING.

Section 502 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(ee) If it is a nonprescription drug that is subject to section 505G, is not the subject of an application approved under section 505, and does not comply with the requirements under section 505G.

“(ff) If it is a drug and it was manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed in a facility for which fees have not been paid as required by section 744M.”.

SEC. 373. DRUGS EXCLUDED FROM THE OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUG REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act (or the amendments made by this Act) shall apply to any nonprescription drug (as defined in section 505G(q) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act) which was excluded by the Food and Drug Administration from the Over-the-Counter Drug Review in accordance with the paragraph numbered 25 on page 9466 of volume 37 of the Federal Register, published on May 11, 1972.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude or limit the applicability of any other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

SEC. 374. TREATMENT OF SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT.

(a) **REVIEW OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 505G FOR PENDING SUBMISSIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A sponsor of a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a proposed sunscreen order under section 586C of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3) may elect, by means of giving written notification to the Secretary of Health and Human Services within 180 calendar days of the enactment of this Act, to transition into the review of such ingredient or combination of ingredients pursuant to the process set out in section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act.

(B) **ELECTION EXERCISED.**—Upon receipt by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of a timely notification under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the proposed sunscreen order involved is deemed to be a request for an order under subsection (b) of section 505G of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act; and

(ii) such order is deemed to have been accepted for filing under subsection (b)(6)(A)(i) of such section 505G.

(C) **ELECTION NOT EXERCISED.**—If a notification under subparagraph (A) is not received by the Secretary of Health and Human Services within 180 calendar days of the date of enactment of this Act, the review of the proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) shall continue under section 586C of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3); and

(ii) shall not be eligible for review under section 505G, added by section 1001 of this Act.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the terms “sponsor”, “nonprescription”, “sunscreen active ingredient”, and “proposed sunscreen order” have the meanings given to those terms in section 586 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff).

(b) **AMENDMENTS TO SUNSCREEN PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDERS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 586C(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **RELATIONSHIP TO ORDERS UNDER SECTION 505G.**—A final sunscreen order shall be deemed to be a final order under section 505G.”.

(2) **MEETINGS.**—Paragraph (7) of section 586C(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “A sponsor may request” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A sponsor may request”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CONFIDENTIAL MEETINGS.**—A sponsor may request one or more confidential meetings with respect to a proposed sunscreen order, including a letter deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), to discuss matters relating to data requirements to support a general recognition of safety and effectiveness involving confidential information and public information related to such proposed sunscreen order, as appropriate. The Secretary shall convene a confidential meeting with such sponsor in a reasonable time period. If a sponsor requests more than one confidential meeting for the same proposed sunscreen order, the Secretary may refuse to grant an additional confidential meeting request if the Secretary determines that such additional confidential meeting is not reasonably necessary for the sponsor to advance its proposed sunscreen order, or if the request for a confidential meeting fails to include sufficient information upon which to base a substantive discussion. The Secretary shall publish a post-meeting summary of each confidential meeting under this subparagraph that does not disclose confidential commercial information or trade secrets. This subparagraph does not authorize the disclosure of confidential commercial information or trade secrets subject to 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, or section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.”.

(3) **EXCLUSIVITY.**—Section 586C of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff-3) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **EXCLUSIVITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A final sunscreen order shall have the effect of authorizing solely the order requestor (or the licensees, assignees, or successors in interest of such requestor with respect to the subject of such request and listed under paragraph (5)) for a period of 18 months, to market a sunscreen ingredient under this section incorporating changes described in paragraph (2) subject to the limitations under paragraph (4), beginning on the date the requestor (or any licensees, assignees, or successors in interest of such requestor with respect to the subject of such request and listed under paragraph (5)) may lawfully market such sunscreen ingredient pursuant to the order.

“(2) **CHANGES DESCRIBED.**—A change described in this paragraph is a change subject to an order specified in paragraph (1) that permits a sunscreen to contain an active sunscreen ingredient not previously incorporated in a marketed sunscreen listed in paragraph (3).

“(3) **MARKETED SUNSCREEN.**—The marketed sunscreen ingredients described in this paragraph are sunscreen ingredients—

“(A) marketed in accordance with a final monograph for sunscreen drug products set forth at part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as published at 64 Fed. Reg. 27687); or

“(B) marketed in accordance with a final order issued under this section.

“(4) **LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVITY.**—Only one 18-month period may be granted per ingredient under paragraph (1).

“(5) **LISTING OF LICENSEES, ASSIGNEES, OR SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.**—Requestors shall submit to the Secretary at the time when a drug subject to such request is introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate

commerce, a list of licensees, assignees, or successors in interest under paragraph (1).”

(4) **SUNSET PROVISION.**—Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ff et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: **“SEC. 586H. SUNSET.**

“This subchapter shall cease to be effective at the end of fiscal year 2022.”

(5) **TREATMENT OF FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.**—The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by striking section 586E of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360ff-5).

(c) **TREATMENT OF AUTHORITY REGARDING FINALIZATION OF SUNSCREEN MONOGRAPH.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **REVISION OF FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.**—Not later than November 26, 2019, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”) shall amend and revise the final administrative order concerning nonprescription sunscreen (referred to in this subsection as the “sunscreen order”) for which the content, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was represented by the final monograph for sunscreen drug products set forth in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on May 21, 1999).

(B) **ISSUANCE OF REVISED SUNSCREEN ORDER; EFFECTIVE DATE.**—A revised sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) issued in accordance with the procedures described in section 505G(c)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

(ii) issued in proposed form not later than May 28, 2019;

(iii) effective not later than November 26, 2020; and

(iv) issued by the Secretary at least 1 year prior to the effective date of the revised order.

(2) **REPORTS.**—If a revised sunscreen order issued under paragraph (1) does not include provisions related to the effectiveness of various sun protection factor levels, and does not address all dosage forms known to the Secretary to be used in sunscreens marketed in the United States without a new drug application approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate on the rationale for omission of such provisions from such order, and a plan and timeline to compile any information necessary to address such provisions through such order.

(d) **TREATMENT OF NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any application described in section 586F of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ff-6) that was submitted to the Secretary pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, as such provisions were in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment date of this Act, shall be extinguished as of such date of enactment, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) **ORDER REQUEST.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) precludes the submission of an order request under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act, with respect to a drug that was the subject of an application extinguished under paragraph (1).

SEC. 375. ANNUAL UPDATE TO CONGRESS ON APPROPRIATE PEDIATRIC INDICATION FOR CERTAIN OTC COUGH AND COLD DRUGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, annually submit to the Committee on Energy and

Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a letter describing the progress of the Food and Drug Administration—

(1) in evaluating the cough and cold monograph described in subsection (b) with respect to children under age 6; and

(2) as appropriate, revising such cough and cold monograph to address such children through the order process under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act.

(b) **COUGH AND COLD MONOGRAPH DESCRIBED.**—The cough and cold monograph described in this subsection consists of the conditions under which nonprescription drugs containing antitussive, expectorant, nasal decongestant, or antihistamine active ingredients (or combinations thereof) are generally recognized as safe and effective, as specified in part 341 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act), and included in an order deemed to be established under section 505G(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 1001 of this Act.

(c) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The requirement under subsection (a) shall terminate as of the date of a letter submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to such subsection in which the Secretary indicates that the Food and Drug Administration has completed its evaluation and revised, in a final order, as applicable, the cough and cold monograph as described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 376. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.**—Section 801(e)(4)(E)(iii) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 381(e)(4)(E)(iii)) is amended by striking “subparagraph” each place such term appears and inserting “paragraph”.

(b) **FDA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 905(b)(4) of the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-52) is amended by striking “Section 744H(e)(2)(B)” and inserting “Section 744H(f)(2)(B)”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as of the enactment of the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-52).

PART 2—USER FEES

SEC. 381. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This part may be cited as the “Over-the-Counter Monograph User Fee Act of 2019”.

(b) **FINDING.**—The Congress finds that the fees authorized by the amendments made in this part will be dedicated to OTC monograph drug activities, as set forth in the goals identified for purposes of part 10 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 382. FEES RELATING TO OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS.

Subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379 et seq.) is amended by inserting after part 9 the following:

“PART 10—FEES RELATING TO OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS

“SEC. 744L. DEFINITIONS.

“In this part:

“(1) The term ‘affiliate’ means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity if, directly or indirectly—

“(A) one business entity controls, or has the power to control, the other business entity; or

“(B) a third party controls, or has power to control, both of the business entities.

“(2) The term ‘contract manufacturing organization facility’ means an OTC monograph drug facility where neither the owner of such manufacturing facility nor any affiliate of such owner or facility sells the OTC monograph drug produced at such facility directly to wholesalers, retailers, or consumers in the United States.

“(3) The term ‘costs of resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities’ means the expenses in connection with OTC monograph drug activities for—

“(A) officers and employees of the Food and Drug Administration, contractors of the Food and Drug Administration, advisory committees, and costs related to such officers, employees, and committees and costs related to contracts with such contractors;

“(B) management of information, and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of computer resources;

“(C) leasing, maintenance, renovation, and repair of facilities and acquisition, maintenance, and repair of fixtures, furniture, scientific equipment, and other necessary materials and supplies; and

“(D) collecting fees under section 744M and accounting for resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities.

“(4) The term ‘FDA establishment identifier’ is the unique number automatically generated by Food and Drug Administration’s Field Accomplishments and Compliance Tracking System (FACTS) (or any successor system).

“(5) The term ‘OTC monograph drug’ means a nonprescription drug without an approved new drug application which is governed by the provisions of section 505G.

“(6) The term ‘OTC monograph drug activities’ means activities of the Secretary associated with OTC monograph drugs and inspection of facilities associated with such products, including the following activities:

“(A) The activities necessary for review and evaluation of OTC monographs and OTC monograph order requests, including—

“(i) orders proposing or finalizing applicable conditions of use for OTC monograph drugs;

“(ii) orders affecting status regarding general recognition of safety and effectiveness of an OTC monograph ingredient or combination of ingredients under specified conditions of use;

“(iii) all OTC monograph drug development and review activities, including intragovernmental collaboration;

“(iv) regulation and policy development activities related to OTC monograph drugs;

“(v) development of product standards for products subject to review and evaluation;

“(vi) meetings referred to in section 505G(i);

“(vii) review of labeling prior to issuance of orders related to OTC monograph drugs or conditions of use; and

“(viii) regulatory science activities related to OTC monograph drugs.

“(B) Inspections related to OTC monograph drugs.

“(C) Monitoring of clinical and other research conducted in connection with OTC monograph drugs.

“(D) Safety activities with respect to OTC monograph drugs, including—

“(i) collecting, developing, and reviewing safety information on OTC monograph drugs, including adverse event reports;

“(ii) developing and using improved adverse event data-collection systems, including information technology systems; and

“(iii) developing and using improved analytical tools to assess potential safety risks, including access to external databases.

“(E) Other activities necessary for implementation of section 505G.

“(7) The term ‘OTC monograph order request’ means a request for an order submitted under section 505G(b)(5).

“(8) The term ‘Tier 1 OTC monograph order request’ means any OTC monograph order request not determined to be a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request.

“(9)(A) The term ‘Tier 2 OTC monograph order request’ means, subject to subparagraph (B), an OTC monograph order request for—

“(i) the reordering of existing information in the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug;

“(ii) the addition of information to the other information section of the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug, as limited by section 201.66(c)(7) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(iii) modification to the directions for use section of the drug facts label of an OTC monograph drug, if such changes conform to changes made pursuant to section 505G(c)(3)(A);

“(iv) the standardization of the concentration or dose of a specific finalized ingredient within a particular finalized monograph;

“(v) a change to ingredient nomenclature to align with nomenclature of a standards-setting organization; or

“(vi) addition of an interchangeable term in accordance with section 330.1 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(B) The Secretary may, based on program implementation experience or other factors found appropriate by the Secretary, characterize any OTC monograph order request as a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request (including recharacterizing a request from Tier 1 to Tier 2) and publish such determination in a proposed order issued pursuant to section 505G.

“(10)(A) The term ‘OTC monograph drug facility’ means a foreign or domestic business or other entity that—

“(i) is—

“(I) under one management, either direct or indirect; and

“(II) at one geographic location or address engaged in manufacturing or processing the finished dosage form of an OTC monograph drug;

“(ii) includes a finished dosage form manufacturer facility in a contractual relationship with the sponsor of one or more OTC monograph drugs to manufacture or process such drugs; and

“(iii) does not include a business or other entity whose only manufacturing or processing activities are one or more of the following: production of clinical research supplies, testing, or placement of outer packaging on packages containing multiple products, for such purposes as creating multipacks, when each monograph drug product contained within the overpackaging is already in a final packaged form prior to placement in the outer overpackaging.

“(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(II), separate buildings or locations within close proximity are considered to be at one geographic location or address if the activities conducted in such buildings or locations are—

“(i) closely related to the same business enterprise;

“(ii) under the supervision of the same local management; and

“(iii) under a single FDA establishment identifier and capable of being inspected by

the Food and Drug Administration during a single inspection.

“(C) If a business or other entity would meet criteria specified in subparagraph (A), but for being under multiple management, the business or other entity is deemed to constitute multiple facilities, one per management entity, for purposes of this paragraph.

“(11) The term ‘OTC monograph drug meeting’ means any meeting regarding the content of a proposed OTC monograph order request.

“(12) The term ‘person’ includes an affiliate of a person.

“(13) The terms ‘requestor’ and ‘sponsor’ have the meanings given such terms in section 505G.

“SEC. 744M. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE OTC MONOGRAPH FEES.

“(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall assess and collect fees in accordance with this section as follows:

“(1) FACILITY FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that owns a facility identified as an OTC monograph drug facility on December 31 of the fiscal year or at any time during the preceding 12-month period shall be assessed an annual fee for each such facility as determined under subsection (c).

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) A fee shall not be assessed under subparagraph (A) if the identified OTC monograph drug facility—

“(I) has ceased all activities related to OTC monograph drugs prior to January 31, 2019, for the first program year, and December 31 of the fiscal year for subsequent fiscal years; and

“(II) has updated its registration to reflect such change under the requirements for drug establishment registration set forth in section 510.

“(ii) The amount of the fee for a contract manufacturing organization facility shall be equal to two-thirds of the amount of the fee for an OTC monograph drug facility that is not a contract manufacturing organization facility.

“(C) AMOUNT.—The amount of fees established under subparagraph (A) shall be established under subsection (c).

“(D) DUE DATE.—

“(i) FOR FIRST PROGRAM YEAR.—For fiscal year 2019, the facility fees required under subparagraph (A) shall be due 45 calendar days after publication of the Federal Register notice provided for under subsection (c)(4)(A).

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For each fiscal year after fiscal year 2019, the facility fees required under subparagraph (A) shall be due on the later of—

“(I) the first business day of June of such year; or

“(II) the first business day after the enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees under this section for such year.

“(2) OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that submits an OTC monograph order request shall be subject to a fee for an OTC monograph order request. The amount of such fee shall be—

“(i) for a Tier 1 OTC monograph order request, \$500,000, adjusted for inflation for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1)(B)); and

“(ii) for a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request, \$100,000 adjusted for inflation for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1)(B)).

“(B) DUE DATE.—The OTC monograph order request fees required under subparagraph (A)

shall be due on the date of submission of the OTC monograph order request.

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN SAFETY CHANGES.—A person who is named as the requestor in an OTC monograph order shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary finds that the OTC monograph order request seeks to change the drug facts labeling of an OTC monograph drug in a way that would add to or strengthen—

“(i) a contraindication, warning, or precaution;

“(ii) a statement about risk associated with misuse or abuse; or

“(iii) an instruction about dosage and administration that is intended to increase the safe use of the OTC monograph drug.

“(D) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST IS RECATEGORIZED AS A TIER 2 OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST.—If the Secretary determines that an OTC monograph request initially characterized as Tier 1 shall be re-characterized as a Tier 2 OTC monograph order request, and the requestor has paid a Tier 1 fee in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall refund the requestor the difference between the Tier 1 and Tier 2 fees determined under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (A)(ii), respectively.

“(E) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST REFUSED FOR FILING OR WITHDRAWN BEFORE FILING.—The Secretary shall refund 75 percent of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) for any order request which is refused for filing or was withdrawn before being accepted or refused for filing.

“(F) FEES FOR ORDER REQUESTS PREVIOUSLY REFUSED FOR FILING OR WITHDRAWN BEFORE FILING.—An OTC monograph order request that was submitted but was refused for filing, or was withdrawn before being accepted or refused for filing, shall be subject to the full fee under subparagraph (A) upon being resubmitted or filed over protest.

“(G) REFUND OF FEE IF ORDER REQUEST WITHDRAWN.—If an order request is withdrawn after the order request was filed, the Secretary may refund the fee or a portion of the fee if no substantial work was performed on the order request after the application was filed. The Secretary shall have the sole discretion to refund a fee or a portion of the fee under this subparagraph. A determination by the Secretary concerning a refund under this subparagraph shall not be reviewable.

“(3) REFUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Other than refunds provided pursuant to any of subparagraphs (D) through (G) of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall not refund any fee paid under paragraph (1) except as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) DISPUTES CONCERNING FEES.—To qualify for the return of a fee claimed to have been paid in error under paragraph (1) or (2), a person shall submit to the Secretary a written request justifying such return within 180 calendar days after such fee was paid.

“(4) NOTICE.—Within the timeframe specified in subsection (c), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the amount of the fees under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year.

“(b) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—

“(1) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—For fiscal year 2019, fees under subsection (a)(1) shall be established to generate a total facility fee revenue amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the annual base revenue for fiscal year 2019 (as determined under paragraph (3));

“(B) the dollar amount equal to the operating reserve adjustment for the fiscal year, if applicable (as determined under subsection (c)(2)); and

“(C) additional direct cost adjustments (as determined under subsection (c)(3)).

“(2) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2023, fees under subsection (a)(1) shall be established to generate a total facility fee revenue amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the annual base revenue for the fiscal year (as determined under paragraph (3));

“(B) the dollar amount equal to the inflation adjustment for the fiscal year (as determined under subsection (c)(1));

“(C) the dollar amount equal to the operating reserve adjustment for the fiscal year, if applicable (as determined under subsection (c)(2));

“(D) additional direct cost adjustments (as determined under subsection (c)(3)); and

“(E) additional dollar amounts for each fiscal year as follows:

“(i) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.

“(ii) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.

“(iii) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.

“(iv) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

“(3) ANNUAL BASE REVENUE.—For purposes of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A), the dollar amount of the annual base revenue for a fiscal year shall be—

“(A) for fiscal year 2019, \$8,000,000; and

“(B) for fiscal years 2020 through 2023, the dollar amount of the total revenue amount established under this subsection for the previous fiscal year, not including any adjustments made under subsection (c)(2) or (c)(3).

“(c) ADJUSTMENTS; ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—

“(1) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), the dollar amount of the inflation adjustment to the annual base revenue for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to the product of—

“(i) such annual base revenue for the fiscal year under subsection (b)(2); and

“(ii) the inflation adjustment percentage under subparagraph (C).

“(B) OTC MONOGRAPH ORDER REQUEST FEES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the dollar amount of the inflation adjustment to the fee for OTC monograph order requests for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be equal to the product of—

“(i) the applicable fee under subsection (a)(2) for the preceding fiscal year; and

“(ii) the inflation adjustment percentage under subparagraph (C).

“(C) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT PERCENTAGE.—The inflation adjustment percentage under this subparagraph for a fiscal year is equal to—

“(i) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; Not Seasonally Adjusted; All items; Annual Index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years of available data; and

“(ii) for each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the sum of—

“(I) the average annual percent change in the cost, per full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration, of all personnel compensation and benefits paid with respect to such positions for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years, multiplied by the proportion of personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of OTC monograph drug activities for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years; and

“(II) the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; Not Seasonally Adjusted; All items; Annual Index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years of available data multiplied by the proportion of all costs other than personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of OTC monograph drug activities for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years.

“(2) OPERATING RESERVE ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2019 and subsequent fiscal years, for purposes of subsections (b)(1)(B) and (b)(2)(C), the Secretary may, in addition to adjustments under paragraph (1), further increase the fee revenue and fees if such an adjustment is necessary to provide operating reserves of carryover user fees for OTC monograph drug activities for not more than the number of weeks specified in subparagraph (B).

“(B) NUMBER OF WEEKS.—The number of weeks specified in this subparagraph is—

“(i) 3 weeks for fiscal year 2019;

“(ii) 7 weeks for fiscal year 2020;

“(iii) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2021;

“(iv) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2022; and

“(v) 10 weeks for fiscal year 2023.

“(C) DECREASE.—If the Secretary has carryover balances for such process in excess of 10 weeks of the operating reserves referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall decrease the fee revenue and fees referred to in such subparagraph to provide for not more than 10 weeks of such operating reserves.

“(D) RATIONALE FOR ADJUSTMENT.—If an adjustment under this paragraph is made, the rationale for the amount of the increase or decrease (as applicable) in fee revenue and fees shall be contained in the annual Federal Register notice under paragraph (4) establishing fee revenue and fees for the fiscal year involved.

“(3) ADDITIONAL DIRECT COST ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall, in addition to adjustments under paragraphs (1) and (2), further increase the fee revenue and fees for purposes of subsection (b)(2)(D) by an amount equal to—

“(A) \$14,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(B) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(C) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(D) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(E) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

“(4) ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—The Secretary shall, not later than the second Monday in March of 2019—

“(i) establish OTC monograph drug facility fees for fiscal year 2019 under subsection (a), based on the revenue amount for such year under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection; and

“(ii) publish fee revenue, facility fees, and OTC monograph order requests in the Federal Register.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—The Secretary shall, not later than the second Monday in March of each fiscal year that begins after September 30, 2019—

“(i) establish for each such fiscal year, based on the revenue amounts under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection—

“(I) OTC monograph drug facility fees under subsection (a)(1); and

“(II) OTC monograph order request fees under subsection (a)(2); and

“(ii) publish such fee revenue amounts, facility fees, and OTC monograph order request fees in the Federal Register.

“(d) IDENTIFICATION OF FACILITIES.—Each person that owns an OTC monograph drug facility shall submit to the Secretary the information required under this subsection each year. Such information shall, for each fiscal year—

“(1) be submitted as part of the requirements for drug establishment registration set forth in section 510; and

“(2) include for each such facility, at a minimum, identification of the facility's business operation as that of an OTC monograph drug facility.

“(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—

“(1) OTC MONOGRAPH DRUG FACILITY FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Failure to pay the fee under subsection (a)(1) within 20 calendar

days of the due date as specified in subparagraph (D) of such subsection shall result in the following:

“(i) The Secretary shall place the facility on a publicly available arrears list.

“(ii) All OTC monograph drugs manufactured in such a facility or containing an ingredient manufactured in such a facility shall be deemed misbranded under section 502(ff).

“(B) APPLICATION OF PENALTIES.—The penalties under this paragraph shall apply until the fee established by subsection (a)(1) is paid.

“(2) ORDER REQUESTS.—An OTC monograph order request submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for filing by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person under this section have been paid.

“(3) MEETINGS.—A person subject to fees under this section shall be considered ineligible for OTC monograph drug meetings until all such fees owed by such person have been paid.

“(f) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Fees authorized under subsection (a) shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to remain available until expended.

“(2) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the fees authorized by this section shall be collected and available in each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the amount specified in appropriation Acts, or otherwise made available for obligation, for such fiscal year.

“(B) USE OF FEES AND LIMITATION.—The fees authorized by this section shall be available to defray increases in the costs of the resources allocated for OTC monograph drug activities (including increases in such costs for an additional number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services to be engaged in such activities), only if the Secretary allocates for such purpose an amount for such fiscal year (excluding amounts from fees collected under this section) no less than \$12,000,000, multiplied by the adjustment factor applicable to the fiscal year involved under subsection (c)(1).

“(C) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall be considered to have met the requirements of subparagraph (B) in any fiscal year if the costs funded by appropriations and allocated for OTC monograph drug activities are not more than 15 percent below the level specified in such subparagraph.

“(D) PROVISION FOR EARLY PAYMENTS IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Payment of fees authorized under this section for a fiscal year (after fiscal year 2019), prior to the due date for such fees, may be accepted by the Secretary in accordance with authority provided in advance in a prior year appropriations Act.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023, there is authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section an amount equal to the total amount of fees assessed for such fiscal year under this section.

“(g) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 calendar days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

“(h) CONSTRUCTION.—This section may not be construed to require that the number of

full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services, for officers, employers, and advisory committees not engaged in OTC monograph drug activities, be reduced to offset the number of officers, employees, and advisory committees so engaged.

“SEC. 744N. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) **PERFORMANCE REPORT.**—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, and not later than 120 calendar days after the end of each fiscal year thereafter for which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report concerning the progress of the Food and Drug Administration in achieving the goals identified in the letters described in section 2001(b) of the Over-the-Counter Monograph Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act of 2019 during such fiscal year and the future plans of the Food and Drug Administration for meeting such goals.

“(b) **FISCAL REPORT.**—Not later than 120 calendar days after the end of fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year for which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the implementation of the authority for such fees during such fiscal year and the use, by the Food and Drug Administration, of the fees collected for such fiscal year.

“(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the reports required under subsections (a) and (b) available to the public on the internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.

“(d) REAUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing recommendations to present to the Congress with respect to the goals described in subsection (a), and plans for meeting the goals, for OTC monograph drug activities for the first 5 fiscal years after fiscal year 2023, and for the reauthorization of this part for such fiscal years, the Secretary shall consult with—

“(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

“(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

“(C) scientific and academic experts;

“(D) health care professionals;

“(E) representatives of patient and consumer advocacy groups; and

“(F) the regulated industry.

“(2) **PUBLIC REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—After negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall—

“(A) present the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) to the congressional committees specified in such paragraph;

“(B) publish such recommendations in the Federal Register;

“(C) provide for a period of 30 calendar days for the public to provide written comments on such recommendations;

“(D) hold a meeting at which the public may present its views on such recommendations; and

“(E) after consideration of such public views and comments, revise such recommendations as necessary.

“(3) **TRANSMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than January 15, 2023, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress the revised recommendations under paragraph (2), a summary of the views and comments received under such paragraph, and any changes made to the recommendations in response to such views and comments.”.

Subtitle I—Other Provisions

SEC. 391. PROTECTING ACCESS TO BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

Section 351(k)(7) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) DEEMED LICENSES.—

“(i) **NO ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIVITY THROUGH DEMING.**—An approved application that is deemed to be a license for a biological product under this section pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 shall not be treated as having been first licensed under subsection (a) for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(ii) **APPLICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVITY.**—Subparagraph (C) shall apply with respect to a reference product referred to in such subparagraph that was the subject of an approved application that was deemed to be a license pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009.

“(iii) **APPLICABILITY.**—The exclusivity periods described in section 527, section 505A(b)(1)(A)(ii), and section 505A(c)(1)(A)(ii) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act shall continue to apply to a biological product after an approved application for the biological product is deemed to be a license for the biological product under subsection (a) pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009.”.

SEC. 392. ORPHAN DRUG CLARIFICATION.

Section 527(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360cc(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies to any drug designated under section 526 for which an application was approved under section 505 of this Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act after the date of enactment of the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017, regardless of the date on which such drug was designated under section 526.”.

SEC. 393. CONDITIONS OF USE FOR BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

Section 351(k)(2)(A)(iii) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)(2)(A)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) may include information to show that the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling proposed for the biological product have been previously approved for the reference product.”.

SEC. 394. CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF NEW CHEMICAL ENTITY.

Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended—

(1) in section 505 (21 U.S.C. 355)—

(A) in subsection (c)(3)(E)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(B) in subsection (j)(5)(F)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section

314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”;

(C) in subsection (1)(2)(A)(i), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”;

(D) in subsection (s), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(E) in subsection (u)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(ii) by striking “same active ingredient” and inserting “same active moiety”;

(2) in section 512(c)(2)(F) (21 U.S.C. 360b(c)(2)(F))—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(C) in clause (v), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(3) in section 524(a)(4)(C) (21 U.S.C. 360n(a)(4)(C)), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(4) in section 529(a)(4)(A)(ii) (21 U.S.C. 360ff(a)(4)(A)(ii)), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”; and

(5) in section 565(a)(4)(D) (21 U.S.C. 360bbb-4a(a)(4)(D)), by striking “active ingredient (including any ester or salt of the active ingredient)” and inserting “active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations))”.

TITLE IV—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF REDUCTION IN MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION FLOOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “10 percent” and inserting “7.5 percent”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 213 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f).

(2) Section 56(b)(1) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), and (F), as subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E), respectively.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2018.

SEC. 402. SAFE HARBOR FOR HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS WITHOUT DEDUCTIBLE FOR INSULIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(c)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “or for insulin or any device for the delivery of insulin” before the period at the end.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 403. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN OVER-THE-COUNTER MEDICAL PRODUCTS AS QUALIFIED MEDICAL EXPENSES.

(a) HSAs.—Section 223(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking the last sentence of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following: “For purposes of this subparagraph, amounts paid for menstrual care products shall be treated as paid for medical care.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) MENSTRUAL CARE PRODUCT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘menstrual care product’ means a tampon, pad, liner, cup, sponge, or similar product used by individuals with respect to menstruation or other genital-tract secretions.”.

(b) ARCHER MSAs.—Section 220(d)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “For purposes of this subparagraph, amounts paid for menstrual care products (as defined in section 223(d)(2)(D)) shall be treated as paid for medical care.”.

(c) HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS AND HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(f) REIMBURSEMENTS FOR MENSTRUAL CARE PRODUCTS.—For purposes of this section and section 105, expenses incurred for menstrual care products (as defined in section 223(d)(2)(D)) shall be treated as incurred for medical care.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—The amendment made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to amounts paid after December 31, 2019.

(2) REIMBURSEMENTS.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to expenses incurred after December 31, 2019.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. PAYMENT FOR BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS DURING INITIAL PERIOD.

Section 1847A(c)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and moving such subclauses 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii) and moving such clauses 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “UNAVAILABLE.—In the case” and inserting “UNAVAILABLE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT AMOUNT FOR BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS DURING INITIAL PERIOD.—In the case of a biosimilar biological product furnished on or after July 1, 2020, in lieu of applying subparagraph (A) during the initial period described in such subparagraph with respect to the biosimilar biological product, the amount payable under this section for the biosimilar biological product is the lesser of the following:

“(i) The amount determined under clause (ii) of such subparagraph for the biosimilar biological product.

“(ii) The amount determined under subsection (b)(1)(B) for the reference biological product.”.

SEC. 502. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON AVERAGE SALES PRICE.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study on spending for applicable drugs under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(2) APPLICABLE DRUGS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “applicable drugs” means drugs and biologicals—

(A) for which reimbursement under such part B is based on the average sales price of the drug or biological; and

(B) that account for the largest percentage of total spending on drugs and biologicals under such part B (as determined by the Comptroller General, but in no case less than 25 drugs or biologicals).

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of the following:

(A) The extent to which each applicable drug is paid for—

(i) under such part B for Medicare beneficiaries; or

(ii) by private payers in the commercial market.

(B) Any change in Medicare spending or Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing that would occur if the average sales price of an applicable drug was based solely on payments by private payers in the commercial market.

(C) The extent to which drug manufacturers provide rebates, discounts, or other price concessions to private payers in the commercial market for applicable drugs, which the manufacturer includes in its average sales price calculation, for—

(i) formulary placement;

(ii) utilization management considerations; or

(iii) other purposes.

(D) Barriers to drug manufacturers providing such price concessions for applicable drugs.

(E) Other areas determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 503. REQUIRING PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS AND MA-PD PLANS TO REPORT POTENTIAL FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE TO THE SECRETARY OF HHS.

Section 1860D–4 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p) REPORTING POTENTIAL FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE.—Beginning January 1, 2021, the PDP sponsor of a prescription drug plan shall report to the Secretary, as specified by the Secretary—

“(1) any substantiated or suspicious activities (as defined by the Secretary) with respect to the program under this part as it relates to fraud, waste, and abuse; and

“(2) any steps made by the PDP sponsor after identifying such activities to take corrective actions.”.

SEC. 504. ESTABLISHMENT OF PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

Section 1860D–4(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–104(c)) is amended by

adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) APPLICATION OF PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A PDP sponsor that implements incentive payments to a pharmacy or price concessions paid by a pharmacy based on quality measures shall use measures established or approved by the Secretary under subparagraph (B) with respect to payment for covered part D drugs dispensed by such pharmacy.

“(B) STANDARD PHARMACY QUALITY MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish or approve standard quality measures from a consensus and evidence-based organization for payments described in subparagraph (A). Such measures shall focus on patient health outcomes and be based on proven criteria measuring pharmacy performance.

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement under subparagraph (A) shall take effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, or such earlier date specified by the Secretary if the Secretary determines there are sufficient measures established or approved under subparagraph (B) to meet the requirement under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 505. IMPROVING COORDINATION BETWEEN THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND THE CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PUBLIC MEETING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall convene a public meeting for the purposes of discussing and providing input on improvements to coordination between the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services in preparing for the availability of novel medical products described in subsection (c) on the market in the United States.

(B) ATTENDEES.—The public meeting shall include—

(i) representatives of relevant Federal agencies, including representatives from each of the medical product centers within the Food and Drug Administration and representatives from the coding, coverage, and payment offices within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

(ii) stakeholders with expertise in the research and development of novel medical products, including manufacturers of such products;

(iii) representatives of commercial health insurance payers;

(iv) stakeholders with expertise in the administration and use of novel medical products, including physicians; and

(v) stakeholders representing patients and with expertise in the utilization of patient experience data in medical product development.

(C) TOPICS.—The public meeting shall include a discussion of—

(i) the status of the drug and medical device development pipeline related to the availability of novel medical products;

(ii) the anticipated expertise necessary to review the safety and effectiveness of such products at the Food and Drug Administration and current gaps in such expertise, if any;

(iii) the expertise necessary to make coding, coverage, and payment decisions with respect to such products within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and current gaps in such expertise, if any;

(iv) trends in the differences in the data necessary to determine the safety and effectiveness of a novel medical product and the data necessary to determine whether a novel

medical product meets the reasonable and necessary requirements for coverage and payment under title XVIII of the Social Security Act pursuant to section 1862(a)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)(1)(A));

(v) the availability of information for sponsors of such novel medical products to meet each of those requirements; and

(vi) the coordination of information related to significant clinical improvement over existing therapies for patients between the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services with respect to novel medical products.

(D) **TRADE SECRETS AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.**—No information discussed as a part of the public meeting under this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to disclose any information that is a trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY OF CRITERIA FOR MEDICARE COVERAGE.**—

(A) **DRAFT GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 18 months after the public meeting under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall update the final guidance titled “National Coverage Determinations with Data Collection as a Condition of Coverage: Coverage with Evidence Development” to address any opportunities to improve the availability and coordination of information as described in clauses (iv) through (vi) of paragraph (1)(C).

(B) **FINAL GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 12 months after issuing draft guidance under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall finalize the updated guidance to address any such opportunities.

(b) **REPORT ON CODING, COVERAGE, AND PAYMENT PROCESSES UNDER MEDICARE FOR NOVEL MEDICAL PRODUCTS.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a report on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding processes under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) with respect to the coding, coverage, and payment of novel medical products described in subsection (c). Such report shall include the following:

(1) A description of challenges in the coding, coverage, and payment processes under the Medicare program for novel medical products.

(2) Recommendations to—

(A) incorporate patient experience data (such as the impact of a disease or condition on the lives of patients and patient treatment preferences) into the coverage and payment processes within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

(B) decrease the length of time to make national and local coverage determinations under the Medicare program (as those terms are defined in subparagraph (A) and (B), respectively, of section 1862(l)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(l)(6));

(C) streamline the coverage process under the Medicare program and incorporate input from relevant stakeholders into such coverage determinations; and

(D) identify potential mechanisms to incorporate novel payment designs similar to those in development in commercial insurance plans and State plans under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) into the Medicare program.

(c) **NOVEL MEDICAL PRODUCTS DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of this section, a novel medical product described in this subsection is a medical product, including a drug, biological (including gene and cell therapy), or medical device, that has been designated as a breakthrough therapy under section 506(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 356(a)), a breakthrough device under

section 515B of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360e–3), or a regenerative advanced therapy under section 506(g) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 356(g)).

SEC. 506. PATIENT CONSULTATION IN MEDICARE NATIONAL AND LOCAL COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS IN ORDER TO MITIGATE BARRIERS TO INCLUSION OF SUCH PERSPECTIVES.

Section 1862(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) **PATIENT CONSULTATION IN NATIONAL AND LOCAL COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS.**—The Secretary may consult with patients and organizations representing patients in making national and local coverage determinations.”

SEC. 507. MEDPAC REPORT ON SHIFTING COVERAGE OF CERTAIN MEDICARE PART B DRUGS TO MEDICARE PART D.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”) shall conduct a study on shifting coverage of certain drugs and biologicals for which payment is currently made under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.) to part D of such title (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21 et seq.). Such study shall include an analysis of—

(1) differences in program structures and payment methods for drugs and biologicals covered under such parts B and D, including effects of such a shift on program spending, beneficiary cost-sharing liability, and utilization management techniques for such drugs and biologicals; and

(2) the feasibility and policy implications of shifting coverage of drugs and biologicals for which payment is currently made under such part B to such part D.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 30, 2021, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include information, and recommendations as the Commission deems appropriate, regarding—

(A) formulary design under such part D;

(B) the ability of the benefit structure under such part D to control total spending on drugs and biologicals for which payment is currently made under such part B;

(C) changes to the bid process under such part D, if any, that may be necessary to integrate coverage of such drugs and biologicals into such part D; and

(D) any other changes to the program that Congress should consider in determining whether to shift coverage of such drugs and biologicals from such part B to such part D.

(E) the feasibility and policy implications of creating a methodology to preserve the healthcare provider’s ability to take title of the drug, including a methodology under which—

(i) prescription drug plans negotiate reimbursement rates and other arrangements with drug manufacturers on behalf of a wholesaler;

(ii) wholesalers purchase the drugs from the manufacturers at the negotiated rate and ship them through distributors to physicians to administer to patients;

(iii) physicians and hospitals purchase the drug from the wholesaler via the distributor;

(iv) after administering the drug, the physician submits a claim to the MAC for their drug administration fee;

(v) to be reimbursed for the purchase of the drug from the distributor, the physician furnishes the claim for the drug itself to the wholesaler and the wholesaler would refund the cost of the drug to the physician; and

(vi) the wholesaler passes this claim to the PDP to receive reimbursement.

SEC. 508. REQUIREMENT THAT DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS INCLUDE TRUTHFUL AND NON-MISLEADING PRICING INFORMATION.

Part A of title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 1150C. REQUIREMENT THAT DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS INCLUDE TRUTHFUL AND NON-MISLEADING PRICING INFORMATION.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall require that each direct-to-consumer advertisement for a prescription drug or biological product for which payment is available under title XVIII or XIX includes an appropriate disclosure of truthful and non-misleading pricing information with respect to the drug or product.

“(b) **DETERMINATION BY CMS.**—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall determine the components of the requirement under subsection (a), such as the forms of advertising, the manner of disclosure, the price point listing, and the price information for disclosure.”

SEC. 509. CHIEF PHARMACEUTICAL NEGOTIATOR AT THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “and one Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator” and inserting “one Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, and one Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator”;

(B) by striking “or the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator” and inserting “the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, or the Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator”;

(C) by striking “and the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator” and inserting “the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, and the Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) The principal function of the Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to United States pharmaceutical products and services. The Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States pharmaceutical interests. The Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.”

(b) **COMPENSATION.**—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.” and inserting the following: “Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

“Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.”

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than the date that is one year after the appointment of the first Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report describing in detail—

(1) enforcement actions taken by the United States Trade Representative during the one-year period preceding the submission

of the report to ensure the protection of United States pharmaceutical products and services; and

(2) other actions taken by the United States Trade Representative to advance United States pharmaceutical products and services.

SEC. 510. WAIVING MEDICARE COINSURANCE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING TESTS.

Section 1833(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)) is amended—

(1) by moving the flush text following paragraph (9) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end of such flush text the following new sentence: “For items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2021, paragraph (1)(Y) shall apply with respect to a colorectal cancer screening test regardless of the code that is billed for the establishment of a diagnosis as a result of the test, or for the removal of tissue or other matter or other procedure that is furnished in connection with, as a result of, and in the same clinical encounter as the screening test.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in support of the substitute amendment, H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

There is a better way, ladies and gentlemen. We can reduce the high costs of drugs. We can improve health and lower long-term costs without stifling innovation and restricting patients' access to new, lifesaving medications.

H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, is the bipartisan solution that can be signed into law this year and immediately begin to provide relief to patients and seniors from high prescription costs.

This bill lowers out-of-pocket spending. It protects access to new medicines and cures. It strengthens transparency and accountability and champions competition.

Every single proposal in this substitute is bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans coming together.

First, H.R. 19 encourages innovation of groundbreaking new cures and promotes the introduction of more low-cost generic and biosimilar competition to the marketplace faster, through inclusion of the CREATES Act, which streamlines the regulation of over-the-counter products, stopping the pay-for-delay agreements and patent system gamesmanship.

These policies unanimously passed the Energy and Commerce Committee earlier this year. They would have unanimously passed on this House floor, had a poison pill not been put in up in the Rules Committee.

H.R. 19 also has a critical provision to make insulin more affordable by requiring insurance companies to cap the costs of insulin for seniors at \$50 a month.

H.R. 19 increases transparency and removes uncertainty at the pharmacy counter by requiring insurance compa-

nies to make information about drug costs available in the doctor's office before a prescription is written.

It reduces the cost of drug administration, including for cancer treatment. We can cut that in half. We will pay for quality, not sites.

H.R. 19, for the first time, places a cap on seniors' out-of-pocket costs for the year.

Critically, it stops the U.S. from subsidizing other freeloader foreign countries by having a strong trade rep to negotiate better deals for Americans.

This will lower costs, and it will bring about cures.

Mr. Chairman, I urge bipartisan support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PHILLIPS). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I made a promise to my constituents when I was elected that I would lower drug prices, and that requires a strong, robust plan for negotiating fair prices for Americans.

Our constituents are demanding lower drug prices, and this amendment fails to deliver. It does nothing to address the root causes of high drug prices and would let pharma companies continue to raise prices unreasonably for the same drug year after year.

I have a bill to stop that, which is included in H.R. 3. The Freedom from Price Gouging Act recovers taxpayer dollars from pharmaceutical companies when they try to hike their prices not just once per year but multiple times every year in order to boost their profits.

This legislation has bipartisan support. It is included in Republican Senator GRASSLEY's drug pricing package in the Senate.

Without a way to hold drug price increases to at most the rate of inflation, drug companies can just counter your amendment's required discounts by jacking up drug prices and setting sky-high launch prices. They can continue to raise those prices year after year, and the American people will have no choice but to pay those prices because without a way to truly hold drug companies accountable, nothing will change.

I believe we need real, substantive reforms, and for a while, so did our President. Though he has recently walked back this commitment, he once promised the American people that he would authorize the HHS Secretary to negotiate a fair deal on drugs. Do you know why he did that? Because drug price negotiation only upsets Big Pharma's CEOs. Everybody else—in fact, 90 percent of Americans—support giving the Secretary the power to negotiate prices for drugs, Democrats, Republicans, independents alike.

H.R. 3 does just that. It pairs real reforms on drug pricing with a Medicare

part D redesign that caps out-of-pocket expenses for seniors and more equitably shares the responsibility to determine prices among the Federal Government part D plans and drug manufacturers.

The Walden amendment fails to achieve that goal. This amendment doesn't help the 150 million Americans with employer insurance, and many of those Americans even with good insurance still can't afford their medications. This amendment will gut protections in H.R. 3 and leave us with legislation that doesn't do nearly enough to rein in the costs of prescription drugs.

It is time for all of us to take real action to lower drug prices for our constituents.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the leading Republican on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his strong leadership on this. It has been invaluable.

Like impeachment, Speaker PELOSI's fewer cures bill was written in secret, highly partisan, and is dead when it goes to the Senate. The President won't sign it. The Senate won't take it up. It is losing support every day.

Here is an idea. Let's pass a bill. Let's come together. The only bill that has bipartisan provisions, bicameral provisions, a bill that lowers prices, deserves to become law, a bill you can be proud of, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, our Republican bill.

It doesn't kill cures; it accelerates them. It makes it easier for patients to use their personal healthcare plans to lower costs for medicines, holds pharma accountable by insisting they pay more of the drug costs for seniors. It pulls back the curtain on drug pricing. It forces these companies to justify their prices. It can help seniors lower their medicine costs by \$300 a year.

Every Member of Congress who pledged to deliver lower costs for families and seniors and who truly wants more cures for diseases will fulfill that promise with H.R. 19. I urge support.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my Republican colleagues that we do need bipartisan action on drug pricing. Negotiating drug prices is not partisan to the American people; it is common sense.

But let's be clear. The amendment to this bill is not bipartisan. Only Republicans have cosponsored this amendment.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. That is true on the bipartisan, but every provision in the bill has Democratic support as individual bills in other sectors. We brought only bipartisan bills into this alternative.

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct that there are many provisions in the amendment that do have strong bipartisan support, including, for example, making permanent the medical expense tax deduction.

The problem with the amendment is it doesn't tackle the fundamental problem, which is reducing drug prices. This amendment fails to solve the main problem of actually lowering drug prices.

This is why Senator GRASSLEY has been a sponsor on the Republican side in the Senate of the kinds of things I have worked on that are included in this bill that would address price gouging, the ability of pharmaceutical companies to raise prices multiple times in a single year. This bill, H.R. 3, would let us capture the taxpayer savings from that.

The GAO found that fewer than one in five new drugs are truly innovative. It is true that we need new cures, new cures for Alzheimer's, new cures for ALS, but H.R. 3 makes sure not just that we have new cures by increasing science research, but makes sure that those new cures are going to be affordable and can actually get into the hands of Americans.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say in response, the CBO also said 38 new cures as a result of H.R. 3 will never come about. The Council of Economic Advisers says 100 new cures will never come about.

H.R. 3, the underlying bill the majority wants to put into law, actually denies people who are desperately hoping for cures, that innovation.

To answer further your question, there are 138 different Democratic sponsors of the bill that we have put together here.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Democrats are putting politics over progress by advancing a socialist drug pricing scheme that will hurt the development of money-saving treatments and, more importantly, people's lives.

Sadly, workers and families are being let down by Democrats. That is why I am proud to sponsor and support H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act. This legislation includes 40 provisions backed by Democrats and Republicans, and it can go to the President's desk today.

□ 1100

Unlike H.R. 3, which the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office predicts will result in 38 fewer cures, H.R. 19 protects access to new medicines and cures. It also lowers out-of-pocket spending, strengthens transparency and accountability, and champions competition.

Mr. Chair, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act is policy that acts in the interests of hardworking Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, commonsense amendment.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, claims that H.R. 3 will devastate research and stop cures are fearmongering.

H.R. 3 makes substantial investment in public research to help create new cures and, most importantly, will make sure those cures actually can help people in their lives.

It is only fair that the government, elected by the taxpayers, and the administration, appointed by elected officials, should get to negotiate drug prices, and it will not come at the expense of innovation.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to come up with ways to support drug innovation and support the kind of innovation that is happening in Orange County, the area that I represent.

But we have to tackle the fundamental problem here, which is that pharmaceutical companies are gouging Americans; they are overcharging them; and they are leaving lifesaving drugs out of the hands of the American people each and every day. This amendment does not tackle that fundamental problem. Today, 9 out of 10 big pharmaceutical companies spend more on marketing, sales, and overhead than they do on research.

I am proud to support the package of H.R. 3 because it will tackle the fundamental problem of permitting price negotiation and making drugs more affordable for Americans.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

Ours is the only bipartisan bill. Thirty-six different provisions passed out of either the Ways and Means or Energy and Commerce Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support, all these provisions cosponsored by Democrats. Seventeen different bills passed out of the House of Representatives with bipartisan support in here. This is the bipartisan package.

I have always worked across the line to get things done, whether it was in opioids or 21st Century Cures or modernizing the FDA. I pledge to continue to do that.

The partisan bill on the floor today is H.R. 3. The facts of the matter show that it will deny new innovation in America and new cures for patients whose lives are on the line.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 3 and a "yes" on the substitute.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title VIII the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 812. ADDITION OF NEW MEASURES BASED ON ACCESS TO BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS TO THE 5-STAR RATING SYSTEM UNDER MEDICARE ADVANTAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(o)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) ADDITION OF NEW MEASURES BASED ON ACCESS TO BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For 2021 and subsequent years, the Secretary shall add a new set of measures to the 5-star rating system based on access to biosimilar biological products covered under part B and, in the case of MA-PD plans, such products that are covered part D drugs. Such measures shall assess the impact a plan's benefit structure may have on enrollees' utilization of or ability to access biosimilar biological products, including in comparison to the reference biological product, and shall include measures, as applicable, with respect to the following:

“(I) COVERAGE.—Assessing whether a biosimilar biological product is on the plan formulary in lieu of or in addition to the reference biological product.

“(II) PREFERENCING.—Assessing tier placement or cost-sharing for a biosimilar biological product relative to the reference biological product.

“(III) UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT TOOLS.—Assessing whether and how utilization management tools are used with respect to a biosimilar biological product relative to the reference biological product.

“(IV) UTILIZATION.—Assessing the percentage of enrollees prescribed the biosimilar biological product when the reference biological product is also available.

“(ii) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph, the terms ‘biosimilar biological product’ and ‘reference biological product’ have the meaning given those terms in section 1847A(c)(6).

“(iii) PROTECTING PATIENT INTERESTS.—In developing such measures, the Secretary shall ensure that each measure developed to address coverage, preferencing, or utilization management is constructed such that patients retain equal access to appropriate therapeutic options without undue administrative burden.”.

(b) CLARIFICATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS.—To the extent the Secretary of Health and Human Services applies the 5-star rating system under section 1853(o)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)(4)), or a similar system, to prescription drug plans under part D of title XVIII of such Act, the provisions of subparagraph (E) of such section, as

added by subsection (a) of this section, shall apply under the system with respect to such plans in the same manner as such provisions apply to the 5-star rating system under such section 1853(o)(4).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Despite the passage in 2010 of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act through the Affordable Care Act, which created the modern pathway for bringing biosimilar drugs to market, consumers in the United States are still not reaping the cost-saving benefits that a full, mature biosimilars market would provide. As of May, only 19 biosimilars had been approved by the FDA, and many of those that have been approved are not on the market for a number of reasons.

Economics 101 teaches us that, when more competition is introduced into the market, prices come down. We have seen this with the overwhelming success of the generic pharmaceuticals market here at home, and we are seeing it with biosimilars in other parts of the globe.

In Europe, for example, the introduction of biosimilar competition for Humira led to the brand manufacturer dropping the price by more than 80 percent in some countries.

Unfortunately, here in the United States, biosimilars still face very low market share and utilization, despite the fact they could generate much-needed savings for patients and for taxpayers.

If we want to continue to meaningfully lower drug costs for American patients, Congress can, and should, do more to create a policy environment that is ripe for greater biosimilar adoption.

That is the underlying rationale behind my amendment, which is based on legislation I introduced with Congressman BOB GIBBS, known as the Star Ratings for Biosimilars Act.

This amendment would require the Department of Health and Human Services to incorporate into the existing Star Ratings system for Medicare Advantage and part D plans a measure that evaluates how plans promote access to biosimilar drugs.

In creating such a measure, HHS would look at things such as coverage on a plan's formulary, tier placement, cost sharing, and other utilization management techniques.

By evaluating plans on biosimilar access, this amendment would motivate health plans to improve performance and implement changes to improve access to biosimilars, creating a policy environment ripe for further biosimilar development. A similar measure has already been adopted by the Senate Finance Committee as they worked

through their prescription drug legislation.

I have heard from some criticism that the Star Ratings system has traditionally not been used for this type of measure. To that, I would contend that star ratings have already been used in several ways to influence plan behavior and improve plan quality, such as evaluating plans on how well they provide cancer screenings, care coordination, and Medicaid management, for example.

All of these metrics are designed to incent plans into behavior that will improve plan transparency and beneficiary health.

Likewise, access to affordable medications has significant implications for beneficiary health, as patients will abstain from needed medications if costs are simply too high. The CBO score for the underlying legislation makes this connection crystal clear.

By evaluating plans on biosimilar access, we are ensuring that patients have the information they need that will allow them to live healthier lives.

In closing, Mr. Chair, I would simply urge my colleagues to support this important amendment that will help lay the groundwork for greater biosimilar adoption and continue to lower drug costs for patients, obviously a common cause for each and every person in this Chamber.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I commend my friend, and he is my friend, Mr. TONKO. He is a very thoughtful legislator, and we have worked together on a lot of different bills.

He offered and withdrew this amendment at full committee markup of H.R. 3, and I continue to extend the offer to sit down and try to work out the differences in the language.

Unfortunately, as it is currently constructed, though, this could have unintended consequences, we believe, including actually increasing drug prices, which none of us wants, which I know is not the gentleman's goal either.

Star ratings to measure the quality of an insurance plan or a specific benefit are a good tool for consumers and the government, but to apply an automatic star rating change to a plan's coverage of biosimilars could give a manufacturer too much negotiating leverage, and we don't want to do that.

This would be a major shift in the type of quality measure the plans would be rated on and would actually affect the way they would negotiate with manufacturers and, unfortunately, we believe, not necessarily be in a way that lowers costs for consumers in Medicare Advantage.

Star ratings are an important factor consumers consider when they are

choosing their plan. If a plan knows they will be rated and reimbursed based on coverage of one biosimilar, they do not have much ground to stand on if they want to negotiate the cost of that drug down to benefit the patient.

That means the manufacturer of the biosimilar has all the leverage and they can keep the price high, knowing they will likely still be placed on the plan's formulary because the plan is being rated on it.

But the gentleman is right. We should do more to incentivize biosimilar development and coverage in this country. This is an important issue. And, again, I would be happy to work with him and others on the other side of the aisle on this and many other provisions.

Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the intent that the gentleman has here with this bill.

The costs of prescription drugs have continued to rise, putting Montanans with critical health issues in jeopardy.

I recently heard from a senior in Libby, Montana, with colon cancer. He was diagnosed in 2010, and his disease has bankrupted his family.

He confided that the cancer drug he takes costs \$17,000 per month. It is the only drug that works for his cancer, and Medicare only covers \$11,000. He is forced to either give up his fight against cancer or pay an extra \$6,000 a month for a lifesaving drug. That is an extra \$72,000 a year.

As he put it: "I find it rather disconcerting that one must sell his home and all his possessions just to survive cancer."

I agree. This has to stop. No one should have to end up like my constituent in Libby.

The fact is that we could lower prescription costs while capping seniors' out-of-pocket costs by the end of 2019. It is also disheartening that Republicans have been working in good faith all year on a bipartisan basis to do just that.

Unfortunately, House Democrats, led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI, are putting partisan politics in front of patients. Her plan would have devastating consequences for Montanans. It will lead to rationing of lifesaving medication, Big Government price fixing, and government bureaucrats between you and your medication.

The truth is her partisan bill will never move past the House floor.

We have heard from Majority Leader MCCONNELL that the Pelosi plan is dead on arrival in the Senate, and it doesn't have a chance of being signed into law by President Trump.

Unfortunately, as we wait on Democrats to act in a bipartisan way, costs

continue to rise and hardworking Montanans continue to choose between their needed medication and paying their bills.

On the other hand, Republicans have introduced the Lower Costs, More Cures Act. This is a bipartisan bill that could be signed into law by the end of 2019. This bill increases transparency, encourages innovation for new drugs and cures, and places a cap on seniors' out-of-pocket costs.

I have also been working to lower costs and shed light on the true cost of prescription drugs. Last week, I introduced bipartisan legislation to bring much-needed transparency into the practice of middlemen in the pharmaceutical supply chain, called pharmacy benefit managers. My bill increases competition between PBMs and lowers costs for patients. It is truly a win-win.

Waiting any longer to pass bills that lower costs for patients to score political points is unacceptable. Enough is enough. Let's stop the political theater and get back to work.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, we have no further speakers on this side, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, I respect the opinions of Mr. WALDEN. We have worked in a bipartisan fashion on several issues before in Energy and Commerce, but I believe the claim that this would increase costs is simply false. Like the Senate Finance Committee that is moving forward with this proposition on biosimilars, we believe it is a way to lower costs.

To date, the nine biosimilars accessible to patients are at an average discount of 28 percent. It is simply a false claim that a biosimilar would not launch at a lower price.

Certainly, we must do better. We are reminded constantly that we can do better and we must do better. As the namesake of this legislation had constantly implored, Representative Elijah Cummings always knew that we must score for the public. That is why we must pass this amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand my friend's comments. None of us wants to accidentally create a situation where prices go up rather than down, and I know that is not his intent. We have that concern on this side.

Perhaps we can work this out along the way and get to the same place here, because I think we share a similar goal.

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

□ 1115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 195, line 9, strike "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000".

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 703. INNOVATION NETWORK.

Part A of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 281 et seq.), as amended by section 702, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 404P. INNOVATION NETWORK.

"(a) FUNDS.—The Director of NIH shall award grants or contracts to eligible entities to develop, expand, and enhance the commercialization of biomedical products.

"(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity receiving funding under—

"(1) the Small Business Innovation Research program of the National Institutes of Health; or

"(2) the Small Business Technology Transfer program of the National Institutes of Health.

"(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity shall use the funds received through such grant or contract to support—

"(1) the Commercialization Readiness Pilot program of the National Institutes of Health;

"(2) the Innovation Corps program of the National Institutes of Health;

"(3) the Commercialization Accelerator program of the National Institutes of Health;

"(4) the Commercialization Assistance program of the National Institutes of Health; and

"(5) such other programs and activities as the Director of NIH determines to be appropriate, to support the commercialization stage of research, later stage research and development, technology transfer, and commercialization technical assistance.

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, to be available until expended."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3 is not perfect. No bill is. But I will support it today because it is our best chance to get moving on the very pressing issue of high prescription drug prices. I hope the Senate will work with us in a good-faith manner to come up with a final bill that both lowers prices and preserves incentives for innovation.

The concerns and some outstanding questions about the effect of this bill on innovation in the private sector are legitimate. My colleagues have referenced the CBO studies. Also, the California Life Sciences Association released a report in October that predicted that H.R. 3 would make drug development particularly challenging for small and emerging companies in California.

The amendment I offer today will go a long way toward preserving and supporting biopharmaceutical innovation, and that is not an abstraction. It can be measured in jobs, breakthrough cures, and even state-of-the-art research facilities.

Innovation, research, and development are the economic lifeblood of California and, particularly, San Diego. Over the past decade, California firms have received more than 30 percent of total biotech investment in the country, and in San Diego County there are over 48,000 jobs in the life sciences sector supported by \$1.5 billion in venture capital.

In San Diego alone, we have five institutions that rank among the top recipients of National Institutes of Health funding in the country, and they are doing amazing things.

One La Jolla-based research and development facility in my district recently launched a one-time gene replacement therapy that essentially halts the progression of a rare and deadly genetic childhood disorder: spinal muscular atrophy. This company is also currently investing in research to cure a genetic form of ALS.

If we aren't careful, we might put those kinds of breakthrough therapies at risk of never treating a single patient.

From the NIH and academic research institutions to philanthropy and biopharmaceutical industry, there is a network of capital today in the public and private sectors that supports innovation.

At the risk of oversimplifying, the NIH focuses on basic biomedical science, investigating the underlying mechanisms of disease, while smaller biotech companies supported by institutional investors take the basic science to the preclinical and early-phase stages of drug development.

Drug companies conduct later-stage research, fund clinical trials, and invest in startups. These financial backers, like drug companies and venture capitalists, are important because they can help close the funding gap that exists between preclinical research and the early-and later-stage clinical trials.

If H.R. 3 changes investor behavior as some predict, that could widen the gap for smaller biotech companies, the so-called "valley of death." I think we can all agree that these are consequences we want to avoid.

Securing funding for the high cost of clinical trials is often cited as the key hurdle facing smaller biotech companies at the precipice of the so-called valley of death.

While the biopharmaceutical industry and the Federal Government both fund clinical trials, NIH's ability to bring drugs to market is constrained by its limited budget and a mandate to carry out its core mission of advancing biomedical research, which is not necessarily the same as bringing drugs to market.

Over time, these limitations have resulted in the declining number of NIH-

sponsored clinical trials. The biopharma industry is really good at bringing drugs to market because it can afford expensive failures. The Federal Government is really good at research and development because it can ignore constraining signals of the commercial market.

We do patients no favors by pitting biopharma against government. And I want to thank Chairman PALLONE and his staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee for working with me to include two priorities of mine in his bill.

I establish a pilot program that will award multiyear contracts to public and private entities like research institutions, medical centers, and biotech companies to support phase 2 and phase 3 clinical trials. That pilot program will receive \$500 million every year for 5 years.

The bill also includes this amendment No. 3 before you today, which is based on my bill, the Innovation and Capital Network Act of 2019.

My amendment creates an innovation startup fund at NIH that will support the commercialization stage of research, later-stage research and development, as well as technology, transfer, and technical assistance. Specifically, it directs \$500 million over 5 years to incentivize incubators, accelerators, and other financial backers to support biotech companies through early- to mid-stage clinical studies.

These two things are mutually reinforcing. NIH is free to do more drug development, and more small to midsize biotech companies can freely follow the science. In other words, these small biotechs can pursue unforeseen opportunities that could lead to a cure for cancer.

Whether you vote for H.R. 3 or not, we must continue to support and strengthen the network of capital that sustains innovation.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will support this amendment and the freedom to follow science, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I am opposed to the amendment and seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's amendment on this. I understand it. And I think it is important because it does strike at the heart of the issue and the concerns many of us on this side of the aisle have.

The California Life Sciences Association told us that, if enacted, H.R. 3's Medicare part D foreign reference pricing proposal would reduce by 88 percent the number of drugs brought to market by small and emerging companies in California alone due to changed investor behavior.

So they think up to 88 percent of the great innovations and cures they are working on will never come to market. They also think it would eliminate

80,000 biotech R&D jobs nationwide and reduce revenues by \$71 billion a year.

So, these are the people, predominantly out in California, that do this every day, that are living in this world of trying to create innovation and new lifesaving drugs. And they are saying up to 88 percent of the new drugs they are working on would never come to market. These are the small startups.

We have heard a lot from others on the floor in the last 24 hours about Big Pharma. Well, we are not talking about Big Pharma here. We are talking about small, little startups, American entrepreneurs. If you think about Silicon Valley in the high-tech world, this is the equivalent in the biotech world.

These are individuals who have an idea and a big brain, and they are coming together to come up with a cure to these diseases like SMA, Alzheimer's, sickle cell anemia, and things like that that we all struggle with in our communities.

Our fear on this side of the aisle, as Republicans, is we know, based on the facts and the independent analysis of our Congressional Budget Office, based on the Council of Economic Advisers, based on the input of the very people who are in the trenches every day in these laboratories across America, where two-thirds of the world's innovation comes from in this space, that H.R. 3 will significantly reduce new cures coming to market.

Now, we are all for lowering drug prices. I think we would have a unanimous vote on the provisions in our alternative here if we had a fair opportunity to take these one at a time. We are glad we have the opportunity to have the vote.

I think, because there are 138 Democrats on the measures that are in what I would call our bipartisan proposal here, that we could get bipartisan support for it. And we could lower drug costs. We can stop the gaming in the system. And we can continue to have more cures in America, not less.

And, let's face it—I do not believe it is an overstatement to say people will die if we have fewer cures. We know that to be a fact. It is not just a talking point. It is a fact. It is a truth. And in a time when we should rely on more facts, this is one we should think about seriously before we vote on H.R. 3.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, we came up with this combination of really thoughtful proposals, some of which have passed out of committees in the House or in the Senate—bipartisan support for them.

Now, on the Peters amendment itself: It is a laudable amendment. It will not be able to substitute for the destruction, however, of the American biomedical industry under H.R. 3.

The Congressional Budget Office says the effects on the new drug introductions from increased Federal spending under the bill on biomedical research would be modest. That is CBO.

I will let our Members vote as they want. Certainly, we all want to do

more to invest in our National Institutes of Health.

I have no real objection to the gentleman's amendment, but the underlying bill eviscerates what he is trying to accomplish here in terms of medical research and breakthrough cures.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 1192 of the Social Security Act, as proposed to be added by section 101(a)—

(1) in subsection (a), strike "the Secretary shall" and insert "subject to subsection (h), the Secretary shall"; and

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

"(h) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services determines the Secretary has a conflict, with respect to a matter described in paragraph (2), the individual described in paragraph (3) shall carry out the duties of the Secretary under this part, with respect to a negotiation-eligible drug, that would otherwise be such a conflict.

"(2) MATTER DESCRIBED.—A matter described in this paragraph is—

"(A) a financial interest (as described in section 2635.402 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (except for an interest described in subsection (b)(2)(iv) of such section)) on the date of the selected drug publication date, with respect to the price applicability year (as applicable);

"(B) a personal or business relationship (as described in section 2635.502 of such title) on the date of the selected drug publication date, with respect to the price applicability year;

"(C) employment by a manufacturer of a negotiation-eligible drug during the preceding 10-year period beginning on the date of the selected drug publication date, with respect to each price applicability year; and

"(D) any other matter the General Counsel determines appropriate.

"(3) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this paragraph is—

"(A) the highest-ranking officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services (as determined by the organizational chart of the Department) that does not have a conflict under this subsection; and

"(B) is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate with respect to the position;"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman PALLONE, Chairman NEAL,

and Chairman SCOTT for their extraordinary leadership on this legislation and for helping bring this historic reform of our prescription drug system to the floor today.

In the last few years, President Trump has demonstrated how quickly the revolving door between industry lobbyists and high-ranking government officials and offices can spin.

It is a practice that may not have started when he entered office, but it is certainly one that he has perfected. Even after promising to drain the swamp, President Trump has appointed more former industry lobbyists to his cabinet in under 3 years than both President Obama and President Bush did in their entire time in office.

With those appointments, conflicts of interest run rampant, and corruption has not been hard to find. That is what this amendment attempts to address. It is about good, clean, ethical governance.

If we are giving the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate drug prices, which we absolutely should, we must ensure that those negotiations cannot be tainted by past business relationships or potential personal financial gain, because it is not fair for a secretary to be put into a position where his or her motives may be questioned. And it is certainly not fair to the public to be forced to question the intentions of that secretary.

Put simply, a secretary who was previously responsible for price increases on insulin and numerous other drugs while working for a Big Pharma company may be inclined to choose profits of that former employer over the patients he now serves. That same secretary may choose to increase those prices higher or negotiate in something other than good faith based on inside knowledge, past relationships, or a potential future return to that same job after his government service has ended.

That would give patients rightful doubt that their interests will guide the negotiations taking place on their behalf.

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, at first glance, Mr. KENNEDY's amendment sounds like a good idea. Of course Republicans don't want administration officials to have a conflict of interest in carrying out their official duties on behalf of the American people.

But, in reality, this amendment is narrowly tailored to be a petty jab at the current Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Look, people want more cures and lower drug costs. They don't want more cheap political shots. Luckily, the underlying bill, H.R. 3, stands no chance of becoming law, so this amendment means nothing.

We do, as Republicans, oppose H.R. 3's government price-setting regime because it will kill lifesaving cures for Americans struggling with the ravages of Alzheimer's and dementia, ALS, Parkinson's, the many cancers we face, leukemia, pulmonary hypertension—all those costly and stubborn diseases.

□ 1130

We know, and the Congressional Budget Office has already confirmed, at least 38 fewer medicines and cures the next two decades. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates it will be close to 100 lost cures. Even in the Speaker's home State of California, the California Life Sciences Association, those small firms that do three-fourths of our clinical trials to bring new drugs to America, they modeled the gentlewoman's bill and said nearly 9 out of 10 of the drugs that they would be working on would never come to market if this Democratic drug bill becomes laws.

We think, rather than kill cures, you should accelerate it. Because when you look at the ravages to these families and our loved ones, really the costliest drug is the one that never gets developed. That is what we strongly oppose.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Representative KENNEDY, for adding an amendment to this bill that will tighten it even further. I also thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman PALLONE, Chairman NEAL, and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership and efforts on this historic legislation, which brings desperately needed relief to America's patients and seniors from the high drug prices that are scaring too many of them.

There is a reason that we pay nearly four times more for prescription drugs than other industrialized nations. They use negotiation to lower drug prices. We don't.

Negotiating lower drug prices is a promise that the President, Democrats, and Republicans have made, and the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act makes good to this commitment.

Representative KENNEDY's amendment further strengthens this provision to ensure that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who is responsible for these negotiations, is free from conflicts of interest. A public office is a public trust, and America's seniors and patients deserve to have confidence that the Secretary's interests are aligned with theirs.

That is why this amendment is so important. It puts American people

first when negotiating drug prices so that they receive the best deal possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will ensure that the American people, not special interests, are represented in drug price negotiations.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by stating a couple of things.

First, to my friend, the chairman from Texas, the intent of this amendment is not directed at any one individual. It is directed at an intent, which I think we do share, to ensure the integrity of a position and an office that is focused on the well-being of every American.

Second, nobody here wants to do anything that is somehow going to hinder anyone's cure or the potential for a new cure to come to market.

We do, however, have to wrestle with the fact that 26 percent of the patients across this country in need of insulin ration it. We have to reconcile the fact that 55 percent of the counties in this country do not have a single practicing psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker. We have to wrestle with the fact that one-third of the donations on GoFundMe are for healthcare costs.

The existing system that we have is failing American families day in and day out. They are asking for this for a reason, and we are delivering it. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the underlying bill here.

I was on the Ways and Means Committee when we worked with President Bush to create the first affordable drug plan for seniors. Then-leader PELOSI and Democrats tried their best to kill it. They all voted against it.

The gentlewoman famously predicted that creating the part D drug program for our seniors would end "Medicare as we know it." Can you imagine how many seniors' lives would have been lost if Democrats had succeeded in stopping the affordable Medicare drug program that 43 million seniors have come to depend upon?

NANCY PELOSI and Democrats were dangerously wrong then. Can Americans afford the pain and lost lives of our loved ones when they are dangerously wrong again?

We oppose this amendment, and we oppose the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title VIII the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 812. GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENTS IN RURAL AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 399V-7. GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENTS IN RURAL AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

“(a) RURAL AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITY GME GRANT PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ‘Secretary’), acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall establish a rural and underserved community graduate medical education grant program under which the Secretary shall award grants to specified hospitals (as defined in subsection (b)) that have not established an approved medical residency training program (as defined for purposes of section 1886(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(h))) in order to encourage such hospitals to establish such a program, or to establish an affiliation with a hospital that has established such a program in order to host residents under such program.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used by a specified hospital for any initial costs associated with establishing such a program or such an affiliation, including costs associated with faculty development, administration, infrastructure, supplies, and legal and consultant services.

“(c) SPECIFIED HOSPITAL DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘specified hospital’ means a hospital or critical access hospital (as such terms are defined in section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x)) that—

“(1) is—

“(A) located in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(2)(D))); or

“(B) treated as being located in a rural area pursuant to section 1886(d)(8)(E) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(8)(E)); and

“(2) is located in a medically underserved area (as defined in section 330I(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-14(a))).

“(d) CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITAL GRANT PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall establish a grant program under which the Secretary awards grants to critical access hospitals (as defined in section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x)) that do not have in effect an affiliation with a hospital with an approved medical residency training program to host residents of such program in order to assist such critical access hospitals in setting up such affiliations in order to host such residents.

“(e) LIMITATION ON GRANT AMOUNTS.—No hospital may receive an aggregate amount of grants under this section in excess of \$250,000.

“(f) REPORTS.—

“(1) HHS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report

on graduate medical residency training programs of hospitals that received a grant under subsection (a) or (d). Such report shall include the following:

“(A) The number of hospitals that applied for a grant under this section.

“(B) The number of hospitals that were awarded such a grant.

“(C) The number of residency positions created by hospitals receiving such a grant.

“(D) An estimate of the number of such positions such hospitals will create after the date of the submission of such report.

“(E) A description of any challenges faced by hospitals in applying for such a grant or using funds awarded under such a grant.

“(2) GAO.—Not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing an analysis of—

“(A) the number of residents who trained at a hospital or critical access hospital that received a grant under subsection (a) or (d); and

“(B) whether such residents continued to practice medicine in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(2)(D))) or in a medically underserved area (as defined in section 330I(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-14(a))) after completing such training.

“(g) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for purposes of making grants under this section for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from Arizona (O’HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

I would first like to thank Chairman PALLONE and Chairman NEAL for committing to work with me on this amendment and the committee staff for their efforts as well.

I am proud to represent Arizona’s First Congressional District. Our district is larger than the State of Illinois and is one of the most rural in the country.

This year, I have held 26 townhalls across the vast district. At each and every one, I heard from rural residents struggling to access quality healthcare close to home. That is why I introduced my amendment.

My amendment would reward grants to hospitals in rural and medically underserved areas so these hospitals are able to establish a graduate medical education program or partner with an approved hospital to host residents.

According to the Congressional Research Service, more than half of family medicine physicians reside within 100 miles of where they trained as residents. My amendment will incentivize doctors to stay in practice in our rural communities by providing opportunities to bring medical students to rural areas for residency training. Hospitals are not reimbursed for hosting graduate medical education programs until they are fully established.

The grants awarded under my amendment would cover associated startup costs for hospitals, including necessary infrastructure, equipment, and fees.

My amendment also requires the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office to issue a report on the success of the changes that this education will implement, including analysis of whether residents stayed in the rural communities where they trained.

According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, our country will suffer a shortage of over 120,000 physicians by the year 2032. We are already losing physicians across rural America, and rural areas will be hit especially hard.

I am offering my amendment today to mitigate the effects that those seeking care in rural areas will experience. As we move forward with H.R. 3, we must not leave our rural communities on the back burner. Our rural communities will not be able to access their medications in the first place if they cannot access providers.

My amendment takes an all-of-the-above approach to improving rural healthcare by expanding access and re-vamping the ways we recruit qualified medical professionals in the area where we need them most. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, this amendment requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to hospitals, including critical access hospitals, located in rural or medically underserved areas to establish and improve medical residency training programs. The goals in this amendment are laudable.

But like so much around here, bipartisan work in this area has been stopped because of impeachment. The rush to impeachment has created a toxic atmosphere and prevented parties from working on the people’s business, creating a constitutional crisis for purely political reasons.

It is a nice change to hear this discussion because earlier this year, we offered in the Ways and Means Committee an amendment to reallocate these GME slots exactly to these rural and medically underserved areas. Unfortunately, those amendments were rejected on a largely partisan basis. I wish the gentleman from Arizona would have been with us that day because almost all Democrats voted no.

That said, I do have real concerns. This amendment provides more Medicare-funded payments to hospitals for these GME slots but without making any immediate reforms that everyone knows need to happen. An Institute of Medicine report called for innovative approaches to finance these slots in order to improve the match between the physician workforce that we need and national healthcare needs.

Just last week, the Journal of American Medical Association Internal Medicine published a study and found Medicare is overpaying for GME and that this wasted money could actually be used to address the physician shortages in underserved areas.

According to the study's lead author, Medicare GME may be overpaying some hospitals up to \$1.28 billion annually. So instead of creating another grant program on a bill that is deader than a doornail, let's make a serious attempt at GME reform.

After impeachment is over, if it wastes all of next year as well as this, maybe we can build upon MedPAC recommendations, establish a permanent performance-based incentive program that actually reaches what I think we as Democrats and Republicans want and create the standards needed for these rural underserved areas.

These overpayments identified in the report could actually go toward expanding the teaching health center program, which would be terrific because that focuses on training in community-based primary care settings. That is where healthcare providers are needed the most. That is where they tend to stay to serve the community. That is a win-win for everyone.

While I look forward to working with the gentleman from Arizona on ways to reform graduate medical education, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL), my colleague.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding and for his tireless work fighting for improved healthcare in rural communities.

Congressman O'HALLERAN's amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor, is vital in rural areas like those in New Mexico's Second Congressional District. Hospitals often run on small margins and do not have the necessary resources to establish new residency training programs.

This is especially problematic given the shortage of up to more than 100,000 physicians by 2030 in the United States. Rural communities, in particular, already struggle to attract and keep medical professionals. Therefore, it is only fitting that the Federal Government invests a portion of the savings earned by H.R. 3 into rural areas to improve healthcare accessibility, and this amendment would do just that.

As we continue debating healthcare legislation, I urge my colleagues to support initiatives that provide rural residents greater access to basic healthcare. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close after the gentleman from Arizona finishes his remarks. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative TORRES SMALL, and I thank all of my colleagues for standing with me today in support of this important amendment that has received an endorsement from the National Association of Rural Health Clinics. I look forward to joining my colleagues to vote for the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act later today.

This sweeping legislation will lower high-cost prescription drugs, enable Medicare to negotiate prices, and save real dollars that can be reinvested for drug research and development. This bill has the potential to better the lives of countless American seniors, veterans, and families. No family should have to choose between the medication they need and putting food on the table.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of my amendment and H.R. 3 later today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, impeachment has really ruined most of these bipartisan efforts in healthcare, including the underlying bill. Democrats and Republicans were working well together. Speaker PELOSI shut it all down for this partisan, secretly written bill. Impeachment has stopped most of this.

When and if impeachment is ever done, finished—and I know that Congressman GREEN, my colleague, has said that they can impeach again multiple times—when all of that foolish wasted time finishes, maybe we can work together. I think it would be tremendous.

I have rural areas, underserved areas. They need these GME slots, and the whole thing needs to be reformed in a positive way.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1145

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ms. JACKSON LEE, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following new section (and update the table of sections accordingly):

SEC. ____. **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE IMPACT OF THE HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ON COMMUNITIES OF COLOR AND PERSONS LIVING IN RURAL OR SPARSELY POPULATED AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES.**

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States has the highest drug prices in the world and for millions of Americans the cost of prescription drugs is increasing as a barrier to proper disease treatment, especially for communities of color and for persons living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the nation;

(2) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) substantially reduced the number of uninsured Americans, but over 28 million Americans remain without insurance and approximately 55 percent of uninsured Americans under the age of 65 are persons of color;

(3) without health insurance, paying retail prices for medications is invariably burdensome or financially impossible;

(4) the median net worth of Caucasian households in 2016 was 9.7 times higher than African-American households and 8.3 times higher than Hispanic households, which contributes to disparities in negative health consequences, including for example the underuse of insulin among insured adults with diabetes; and

(5) due to the high cost of prescription drugs to communities of color and for persons living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the nation, this Act should positively impact such communities and persons (and the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Treasury should monitor such impact).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the designee of my esteemed colleague SHEILA JACKSON LEE from Houston to offer this amendment. She was unavoidably detained at the Judiciary Committee to consider Articles of Impeachment against our President.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss the Jackson Lee amendment to the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Prices Now Act.

Let me also express my gratitude to the chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction for their hard work in crafting this important legislation: Chairman PALLONE of Energy and Commerce, Chairman NEAL of Ways and Means, and Chairman SCOTT of Education and Labor.

The Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Prices Now Act levels the playing field for American patients and taxpayers by:

One, giving Medicare the power to negotiate directly with the drug companies and creating powerful new tools to force drug companies to the table to

agree to real price reductions, while ensuring seniors never lose access to the prescriptions they need;

Two, making the lower drug prices negotiated by Medicare available to Americans with private insurance, not just Medicare beneficiaries;

Three, stopping drug companies from ripping off Americans while charging other countries less for the same drugs and limiting the maximum price for any negotiated drug to be in line with the average price in countries like ours;

Four, creating a new, \$2,000 out-of-pocket limit on prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries;

Five, reinvesting in the most transformational improvement to Medicare since its creation—delivering vision, dental, and hearing benefits—and turbocharging the search for new cures.

High drug prices are harmful. Medical costs and out-of-pocket expenses result in high rates of bankruptcies, and 10 to 25 percent of patients either delay, abandon, or compromise treatments because of financial constraints.

Survival is also compromised. For example, in chronic myeloid leukemia, the 8- to 10-year survival rate is 80 percent in Europe where treatment is universally affordable, but the 5-year survival rate is only 60 percent in the United States.

The high out-of-pocket expenses discourages patients from seeking care or purchasing drugs. In a recent survey, one-third of insured persons in Ms. JACKSON LEE's home State of Texas delayed or did not pursue care because of high out-of-pocket expenses.

The Jackson Lee amendment is simple and straightforward. The Jackson Lee amendment improves the bill by expressing the sense of Congress regarding the harmful impact of the high cost of prescription drugs on communities of color and persons living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the United States.

According to the Center for American Progress, the negotiation authority provided in H.R. 3 could save some diabetics more than \$700 on an annual supply of certain types of insulin. Moreover, negotiations could bring down the net price for other types of drugs that are particularly needed in minority and poor communities—including expensive treatments for cancer and multiple sclerosis—by thousands every month.

Reform is desperately needed, and nearly one in four Americans currently taking prescription drugs find them difficult to afford. Some people struggling to afford medication for chronic illnesses even turn to drug rationing in desperation, which can be lethal. In fact, a recent study found that one in four patients with diabetes rations their insulin in response to rising prices.

The American public overwhelmingly agrees that it is time to allow the government to negotiate with pharma-

ceutical companies: 85 percent of Americans support this tactic to reduce prices for Medicare and private insurance.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee amendment. I urge our colleagues to agree to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the serious impact prescription drug prices have on all Americans. We all have constituents facing the same problem: drug prices are too high. We all want to come together to find a way to lower drug prices.

Where we separate is our proposal would lower drug prices, put a cap on what seniors pay, and, for the first time, in Medicare part D, reduce their insulin costs but not end the kind of incredible innovation in America we see today. It would not cost 88,000 American innovators their jobs, and it would not reduce this innovation that is producing two-thirds of the world's cures.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3 would do that. H.R. 3—the underlying bill that is a very disappointingly partisan bill—would cost patients cures to their diseases. We know that.

It is not my conclusion. These are the people who innovate in this space. These are Congressional Budget Office analysts and the Council of Economic Advisers. There has not been a single piece of evidence presented on this floor that says that H.R. 3 will do anything but reduce investment and outcome of overall new cures.

In fact, a colleague of mine and I were talking during the last amendment debate. In effect, we are trading \$1 trillion in private-sector investment in new innovation in America for medical cures for \$100 million—in this case, the Peters amendment—in taxpayer money.

So you are trading \$100 million for \$1 trillion, and \$1 trillion is private-sector investment coming in, because we know a lot of these new paths that our innovators pick to go down to find a cure just simply end up being a dry hole and all that money is lost. So it takes a lot to find a cure, but we stand on the cusp of something big and bold, and that is cures for diseases where there is none today. We do have a problem in America trying to figure out how to pay for that.

I am going to be retiring at the end of this Congress, and I know my colleague is going off to the Senate at the end of this Congress if voters in Massachusetts have their way, but together, we still, as a country, have to come together and figure out with precision medicine that may produce a cure for you and you only: How are we going to pay for that?

We don't have a lot of answers. I don't think giving the government the

biggest club in history to take 95 percent of revenues if you don't agree with what the government wants to pay for something is the right approach. That is what H.R. 3 does. We know it takes \$1 trillion out of the pipeline of investment in innovation in America and costs 80-some thousand jobs in innovation.

But in terms of the Jackson Lee amendment which was so ably brought and described by Mr. KENNEDY, I share the concern about what the costs of medicines are putting as a burden on people, especially in rural areas. My district would stretch from the Atlantic to Ohio—we could put a lot of Massachusetts in my district—and our people are suffering.

So I look forward to a day when, after our substitute becomes law, we can continue to work together on these other issues.

I hope my friend will support our substitute because I think it is all bipartisan; 138 Democrats have supported provisions in our substitute amendment. There isn't a single partisan poison pill in our substitute amendment. I think that is why it is attracting support on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I know we have a lot of business to do. I appreciate Mr. KENNEDY bringing this to the floor on behalf of Ms. JACKSON LEE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Jackson Lee Amendment to the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Prices Now Act.

Let me also express my thanks to the chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction for their hard work in crafting this critically important legislation: Chairman PALLONE of Energy and Commerce; Chairman NEAL of Ways and Means; and Chairman SCOTT of Education and Labor.

The Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Prices Now Act levels the playing field for American patients and taxpayers by:

1. Giving Medicare the power to negotiate directly with the drug companies and creating powerful new tools to force drug companies to the table to agree to real price reductions, while ensuring seniors never lose access to the prescriptions they need.

2. Making the lower drug prices negotiated by Medicare available to Americans with private insurance, not just Medicare beneficiaries.

3. Stopping drug companies from ripping off Americans while charging other countries less for the same drugs and limiting the maximum price for any negotiated drug to be in line with the average price in countries like ours;

4. Creating a new, \$2,000 out-of-pocket limit on prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries; and

5. Reinvesting in most transformational improvement to Medicare since its creation—delivering vision, dental and hearing benefits—and turbocharging the search for new cures.

High drug prices are harmful. Medical costs and out-of-pocket expenses result in high

rates of bankruptcies, and 10 to 25 percent of patients either delay, abandon or compromise treatments because of financial constraints.

Survival is also compromised.

For example, in chronic myeloid leukemia, the 8 to 10 year survival rate is 80 percent in Europe (where treatment is universally affordable), but the 5-year survival rate is only 60 percent in the United States.

The high out-of-pocket expenses discourages patients from seeking care or purchasing drugs.

And in a recent survey, one-third of insured persons in my home state of Texas delayed or did not pursue care because of high out-of-pocket expenses.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is simple and straightforward.

The Jackson Lee Amendment improves the bill by expressing the Sense of Congress regarding the harmful impact of the high cost of prescription drugs on communities of color and persons living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the United States.

According to the Center for American Progress, the negotiation authority provided in H.R. 3 could save some diabetics more than \$700 on an annual supply of certain types of insulin.

Moreover, negotiation could bring down the net price for other types of drugs that are particularly needed in minority and poor communities—including expensive treatments for cancer and multiple sclerosis—by thousands per month.

Reform is desperately needed and nearly 1 in 4 Americans currently taking prescription drugs find them difficult to afford.

Some people struggling to afford medication for chronic illnesses even turn to drug rationing in desperation, which can be lethal.

In fact, a recent study found that 1 in 4 patients with diabetes ration their insulin in response to rising prices.

The American public overwhelmingly agrees that it is time to allow the government to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies: 85 percent of Americans support this tactic to reduce prices for Medicare and private insurance.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 712. STUDY ON HIGH-RISK, HIGH-REWARD DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study to identify—

(1) diseases or conditions that lack a treatment approved by the Food and Drug Administration and instances in which development of a treatment for such diseases or conditions could fill an unmet medical need for the treatment of a serious or life-threatening disease or condition or a rare disease or condition; and

(2) appropriate incentives that would lead to the development, approval, and marketing of such treatments.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS; RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that includes—

(1) findings from the study under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations regarding legislation necessary to create appropriate incentives identified pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019.

My amendment will ensure continued innovation and research to further the development of lifesaving medicines for rare diseases, including cancer, Alzheimer's, ALS, and rare disorders.

The challenge now is that, at best, only 1 out of every 20 clinical trials result in a cure. This, of course, means that manufacturers invest billions before they can find a medicine that can go to market to help save lives. They don't just bet on the winners; they have to also bet and take a lot of risks that don't turn out to succeed and get to market.

America has the best medical innovators in the world. When our health is on the line, we can't stop taking those risks to make sure that we find those cures. We can't risk falling behind.

My amendment provides investment in qualified clinical testing for drug applications that address unmet medical needs to treat rare and life-threatening diseases, diseases that may go unaddressed without extra incentives. My amendment requires HHS to conduct a study to identify diseases without an FDA-approved treatment and where the development of a treatment would fill an unmet medical need for these rare diseases.

My amendment also requires HHS to identify appropriate incentives that would ensure the continued investment in the development of these treatments, treatments that will save lives of the children, adults, and seniors of our families.

The Congressional Budget Office and other studies have shown potential reductions in the number of drug approvals each year as a potential risk of H.R. 3. This amendment helps address that concern.

Targeted therapies and medicines serving smaller populations stand to lose the most from this blow to R&D. These are areas where the science is the most difficult but also the most important, such as cancers and other

rare diseases. Cures for these horrific diseases could always be just around the corner, but not if we are forced to abandon what might be the next cure.

While I appreciate the intention of H.R. 3 to reinvest savings in medical research, including at NIH and FDA, without this amendment, there would still be no clear answer to explain what might happen to the incredible research and development work that occurs every day in the private sector. This amendment addresses that.

I know how critical NIH funding is and have consistently advocated for increasing the investment in research there. However, NIH does not manufacture medication, and neither does the FDA. The private sector, including all the research being done every day in my home State of New Jersey, manufactures the lifesaving medications that Americans rely on every single day.

It is also why my Republican colleague from Michigan, FRED UPTON, and I introduced bipartisan legislation this week, the Protecting America's Life Saving Medicines Act, to ensure that life sciences companies continue to invest in these innovative drugs with a tax credit for qualified clinical research, again, to ensure that this research keeps getting done and that they keep making the bets on moon-shot drugs that, without those investments, might not save lives like they do today, again, in the greatest country in the world where we innovate like no one else.

It is critical that we never give up hope that the next cure is within our reach. My amendment today will help us to reach the goal of curing our most life-threatening diseases.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering his amendment today, and I really do. We work a lot of with Mr. GOTTHEIMER on a number of issues before the Congress, and I appreciate his commitment to this cause.

Republicans fully support the goal of the amendment: to identify those diseases and conditions in which there is an unmet medical need and exploring ways to further incentivize getting treatments to market.

In fact, a study in unmet medical needs is especially timely with the consideration of this underlying bill, H.R. 3, because we believe it will crush development and hope for new treatments.

We are not alone. We have come to this conclusion based on others' factual evaluation of the bill. There is no shortage of sources warning us that H.R. 3 will lead to fewer cures. In fact, independently, the Council of Economic Advisers estimates as many as

100 new treatments will be lost over the next decade under the partisan H.R. 3.

I think the most disturbing, Mr. Chairman, is that the California Life Sciences Association, the great innovators in America who come up with these new cures that we all are counting on, predicts an 88 percent reduction in the number of drugs brought to market by small and emerging companies. And that is only in California, apparently.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, another source here, our third independent source, estimates that, under H.R. 3, we will have nearly 40 fewer drugs over, roughly, the next two decades; and then, after that, you would see an annual—every year—reduction of 10 percent in the number of drugs entering the market in the later years.

□ 1200

That is what has led so many of us Republicans to oppose H.R. 3. We support the goal of getting drug prices down. We think there are other ways to do that, and we are open to working on those issues.

No President has ever leaned further forward on this matter and taken the pharma companies' CEOs head on than President Trump. But even he, after reading through the bill, said it goes too far. And you can't sacrifice innovation and lifesaving cures for what else is in the bill.

H.R. 3 will undoubtedly lead to an increase in patients with unmet medical needs, fewer drugs. Republicans believe the value of fostering innovation is essential, that is why we led on 21st Century Cures, and passed it into law, led by my friend from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and my friend from Colorado, DIANA DEGETTE, a bipartisan effort.

But we know there are diseases out there that still long for a cure. This is why our bipartisan solution to lower drug prices, the substitute amendment, H.R. 19, will lower costs, but also promote innovation, and promote it from the private sector side. We want that private venture capital money to continue to flow into this pipeline.

H.R. 3, we are told, the independent analysis tells us, a trillion dollars in private sector money will leave this sector because the punishment is so harsh.

Can you imagine, you are working your whole life, you have gone to college, you have got this great degree, this big brain, you are coming up with a solution to ALS or something, you finally get it done. It goes through all the trials. It is perfected. It works. You get a patent.

And then the government says, We are going to set the price, and if you don't agree to that price, we are going to take 95 percent of the revenues for wherever else you sell this.

By the way, Congressional Research Services warned Congress, and we have had other constitutional experts tell us

for sure, H.R. 3 is so punitive and so unfair, it would violate the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution.

So the underlying bill, as we have been told, is unconstitutional. We all stand down here and take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution. We are being told by our own Congressional Research Service it likely upends, is in violation of, the Constitution. We have other experts say for sure it is.

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. I do. We know there are unmet needs that need to be dealt with. I think it makes a lot of sense.

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for his thoughtful comments and his thoughts about what I think is clearly an unmet need and one we need to continue to invest in, so I thank him for his leadership, too, sir.

Before I finish, let me just say that I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, because we need to keep making those investments to keep our leadership as a country when it comes to R&D innovation. It is one of the reasons why our country is so great and why so many lives have been saved and so many families and children helped.

We need to make sure that we get drug prices down overall, which is why this legislation is so important, to make sure we have competition, more development of generics in the marketplace and, of course, overall the best quality healthcare in the world. It is critical for our country.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTWRIGHT). The gentleman from Oregon has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's hard work on this issue. I know we share a common goal of getting drug prices down and meeting unmet needs of cures. But, tragically, the Democrat bill, H.R. 3, is a very partisan bill.

We are told by the California Life Sciences Association that, if enacted, you could see an 88 percent reduction in the number of drugs brought to market by small and emerging companies in California alone. That is their estimate. These are the people who do this work. They also estimate we would lose 80,000—that is a lot—80,000 biotech R&D jobs nationwide. That is what H.R. 3 does.

So, if you are for cutting jobs in America in biotechnical research, and if you are for 88 percent fewer drugs coming to market from small and emerging innovators in California, then I guess you are going to vote for H.R. 3. I am not going to. I think we can do better.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Reducing Administrative Costs and Burdens in Health Care

SEC. 731. REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND BURDENS IN HEALTH CARE.

Title II of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART E—REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND BURDENS IN HEALTH CARE

“SEC. 281. ELIMINATING UNNECESSARY ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.

“(a) REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with providers of health services, health care suppliers of services, health care payers, health professional societies, health vendors and developers, health care standard development organizations and operating rule entities, health care quality organizations, health care accreditation organizations, public health entities, States, patients, and other appropriate entities, shall, in accordance with subsection (b)—

“(1) establish a goal of reducing unnecessary costs and administrative burdens across the health care system, including the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act, and the private health insurance market, by at least half over a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this section;

“(2) develop strategies and benchmarks for meeting the goal established under paragraph (1);

“(3) develop recommendations for meeting the goal established under paragraph (1); and

“(4) take action to reduce unnecessary costs and administrative burdens based on recommendations identified in this subsection.

“(b) STRATEGIES, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To achieve the goal established under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary, in consultation with the entities described in such subsection, shall not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, develop strategies and recommendations and take actions to meet such goal in accordance with this subsection. No strategies, recommendation, or action shall undermine the quality of patient care or patient health outcomes.

“(2) STRATEGIES.—The strategies developed under paragraph (1) shall address unnecessary costs and administrative burdens. Such

strategies shall include broad public comment and shall prioritize—

“(A) recommendations identified as a result of efforts undertaken to implement section 3001;

“(B) recommendations and best practices identified as a result of efforts undertaken under this part;

“(C) a review of regulations, rules, and requirements of the Department of Health and Human Services that could be modified or eliminated to reduce unnecessary costs and administrative burden imposed on patients, providers, payers, and other stakeholders across the health care system; and

“(D) feedback from stakeholders in rural or frontier areas on how to reduce unnecessary costs and administrative burdens on the health care system in those areas.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The recommendations developed under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) actions that improve the standardization and automation of administrative transactions;

“(B) actions that integrate clinical and administrative functions;

“(C) actions that improve patient care and reduce unnecessary costs and administrative burdens borne by patients, their families, and other caretakers;

“(D) actions that advance the development and adoption of open application programming interfaces and other emerging technologies to increase transparency and interoperability, empower patients, and facilitate better integration of clinical and administrative functions;

“(E) actions to be taken by the Secretary and actions that need to be taken by other entities; and

“(F) other areas, as the Secretary determines appropriate, to reduce unnecessary costs and administrative burdens required of health care providers.

“(4) CONSISTENCY.—Any improvements in electronic processes proposed by the Secretary under this section should leverage existing information technology definitions under Federal Law. Specifically, any electronic processes should not be construed to include a facsimile, a proprietary payer portal that does not meet standards specified by the Secretary, or an electronic form image.

“(5) ACTIONS.—The Secretary shall take action to achieve the goal established under subsection (a)(1), and, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and biennially thereafter, submit to Congress and make publically available, a report describing the actions taken by the Secretary pursuant to goals, strategies, and recommendations described in this subsection.

“(6) FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the development of the goal, strategies, recommendations, or actions described in this section.

“(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize, or be used by, the Federal Government to inhibit or otherwise restrain efforts made to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse across the health care system.

“SEC. 282. GRANTS TO STATES TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACCELERATE STATE INNOVATION TO REDUCE HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

“(a) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall award grants to at least 15 States, and one coordinating entity designated as provided for under subsection (e), to enable such States to establish and administer private-public multi-stakeholder commissions for the purpose of reducing

health care administrative costs and burden within and across States. Not less than 3 of such grants shall be awarded to States that are primarily rural, frontier, or a combination thereof, in nature.

“(2) ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘State’ means a State, a State designated entity, or a multi-State collaborative (as defined by the Secretary).

“(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications submitted by States that propose to carry out a pilot program or support the adoption of electronic health care transactions and operating rules.

“(b) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) a State shall submit to the Secretary an application in such a manner and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, including the information described in paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—In addition to any additional information required by the Secretary under this subsection, an application shall include a description of—

“(A) the size and composition of the commission to be established under the grant, including the stakeholders represented and the degree to which the commission reflects important geographic and population characteristics of the State;

“(B) the relationship of the commission to the State official responsible for coordinating and implementing the recommendations resulting from the commission, and the role and responsibilities of the State with respect to the commission, including any participation, review, oversight, implementation or other related functions;

“(C) the history and experience of the State in addressing health care administrative costs, and any experience similar to the purpose of the commission to improve health care administrative processes and the exchange of health care administrative data;

“(D) the resources and expertise that will be made available to the commission by commission members or other possible sources, and how Federal funds will be used to leverage and complement these resources;

“(E) the governance structure and procedures that the commission will follow to make, implement, and pilot recommendations;

“(F) the proposed objectives relating to the simplification of administrative transactions and operating rules, increased standardization, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the transmission of health information;

“(G) potential cost savings and other improvements in meeting the objectives described in subparagraph (F); and

“(H) the method or methods by which the recommendations described in subsection (c) will be reviewed, tested, adopted, implemented, and updated as needed.

“(c) MULTI-STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a grant is awarded to a State under this section, the State official described in subsection (b)(2)(B), the State insurance commissioner, or other appropriate State official shall convene a multi-stakeholder commission, in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The commission convened under paragraph (1) shall include representatives from health plans, health care providers, health vendors, relevant State agencies, health care standard development organizations, and operating rule entities, relevant professional and trade associations, patients, and other entities determined appropriate by the State.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date on which a grant is

awarded to a State under this section, the commission shall make recommendations and plans, consistent with the application submitted by the State under subsection (b), and intended to meet the objectives defined in the application. Such recommendations shall comply with, and build upon, all relevant Federal requirements and regulations, and may include—

“(A) common, uniform specifications, best practices, and conventions, for the efficient, effective exchange of administrative transactions adopted pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191);

“(B) the development of streamlined business processes for the exchange and use of health care administrative data; and

“(C) specifications, incentives, requirements, tools, mechanisms, and resources to improve—

“(i) the access, exchange, and use of health care administrative information through electronic means;

“(ii) the implementation of utilization management protocols; and

“(iii) compliance with Federal and State laws.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—A State may use amounts received under a grant under this section for one or more of the following:

“(1) The development, implementation, and best use of shared data infrastructure that supports the electronic transmission of administrative data.

“(2) The development and provision of training and educational materials, forums, and activities as well as technical assistance to effectively implement, use, and benefit from electronic health care transactions and operating rules.

“(3) To accelerate the early adoption and implementation of administrative transactions and operating rules designated by the Secretary and that have been adopted pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191), including transactions and operating rules described in section 1173(a)(2) of the Social Security Act.

“(4) To accelerate the early adoption and implementation of additional or updated administrative transactions, operating rules, and related data exchange standards that are being considered for adoption under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 or are adopted pursuant to such Act, or as designated by the Secretary, including the electronic claim attachment.

“(5) To conduct pilot projects to test approaches to implement and use the electronic health care transactions and operating rules in practice under a variety of different settings. With respect to the electronic attachment transaction, priority shall be given to pilot projects that test and evaluate methods and mechanisms to most effectively incorporate patient health data from electronic health records and other electronic sources with the electronic attachment transaction.

“(6) To assess barriers to the adoption, implementation, and effective use of electronic health care transactions and operating rules, as well as to explore, identify, and plan options, approaches, and resources to address barriers and make improvements.

“(7) The facilitation of public and private initiatives to reduce administrative costs and accelerate the adoption, implementation, and effective use of electronic health care transactions and operating rules for State programs.

“(8) Developing, testing, implementing, and assessing additional data exchange specifications, operating rules, incentives, requirements, tools, mechanisms, and resources to accelerate the adoption and effective use of the transactions and operating rules.

“(9) Ongoing needs assessments and planning related to the development and implementation of administrative simplification initiatives.

“(e) COORDINATING ENTITY.—

“(1) FUNCTIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall designate a coordinating entity under this subsection for the purpose of—

“(A) providing technical assistance to States relating to the simplification of administrative transactions and operating rules, increased standardization, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the transmission of health care information;

“(B) evaluating pilot projects and other efforts conducted under this section for impact and best practices to inform broader national use;

“(C) using consistent evaluation methodologies to compare return on investment across efforts conducted under this section;

“(D) compiling, synthesizing, disseminating, and adopting lessons learned to promote the adoption of electronic health care transactions and operating rules across the health care system; and

“(E) making recommendations to the Secretary and the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics regarding the national adoption of efforts conducted under this section.

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—The entity designated under paragraph (1) shall be a qualified nonprofit entity that—

“(A) focuses its mission on administrative simplification;

“(B) has demonstrated experience using a multi-stakeholder and consensus-based process for the development of common, uniform specifications, operating rules, best practices, and conventions, for the efficient, effective exchange of administrative transactions that includes representation by or participation from health plans, health care providers, vendors, States, relevant Federal agencies, and other health care standard development organizations;

“(C) has demonstrated experience providing technical assistance to health plans, health care providers, vendors, and States relating to the simplification of administrative transactions and operating rules, increased standardization, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the transmission of health care information;

“(D) has demonstrated experience evaluating and measuring the adoption and return on investment of administrative transactions and operating rules;

“(E) has demonstrated experience gathering, synthesizing, and adopting common, uniform specifications, operating rules, best practices, and conventions for national use based on lessons learned to promote the adoption of electronic health care transactions and operating rules across the health care system;

“(F) has a public set of guiding principles that ensure processes are open and transparent, and supports nondiscrimination and conflict of interest policies that demonstrate a commitment to open, fair, and nondiscriminatory practices;

“(G) builds on the transaction standards issued under Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996; and

“(H) allows for public review and updates of common, uniform specifications, oper-

ating rules, best practices, and conventions to support administrative simplification.

“(f) PERIOD AND AMOUNT.—A grant awarded to a State under this section shall be for a period of 5 years and shall not exceed \$50,000,000 for such 5-year period. A grant awarded to the coordinating entity designated by the Secretary under subsection (e) shall be for a period of 5 years and shall not exceed \$15,000,000 for such 5-year period.

“(g) REPORTS.—

“(1) STATES.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under this section, and biennially thereafter, a State shall submit to the Secretary a report on the outcomes experienced by the State under the grant.

“(2) COORDINATING ENTITY.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under this section, and at least biennially thereafter, the coordinating entity shall submit to the Secretary and the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics a report of evaluations conducted under the grant under this section and recommendations regarding the national adoption of efforts conducted under this section.

“(3) SECRETARY.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the States and coordinating entity submit the report required under paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary, in consultation with National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report on the outcomes achieved under the grants under this section.

“(4) GAO.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Secretary submits the final report under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report on the outcomes of the activities carried out under this section which shall contain a list of best practices and recommendations to States concerning administrative simplification.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$250,000,000 for the 5-fiscal-year period beginning with fiscal year 2020.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, as a mom, I have spent hours in doctors' offices with sick kids. Nothing is more frustrating than when a doctor has to spend more time looking at their computer screen than helping our children.

I have taken time off work only to end up sitting in waiting rooms because a doctor is running behind, all because of a mountain of paperwork that they must do for every single person that they see. And I have seen doctors who are frustrated at their computers trying to find the information they need.

I have also heard from my constituents in Iowa that when they go to the doctor's office, they don't want to feel like it is an oil change, a quick “check under the hood” and then a mountain

of forms. And it is not the doctor's fault. They have to comply with all of these administrative rules and codes.

Parents like myself, those doctors, and everyone in the healthcare industry, know that something has to change. And that is why I am offering my amendment today.

My goal is to create a grants program to help reduce all this excessive and unnecessary paperwork on doctors and healthcare workers. It will help doctors spend more time with their patients, including children like mine and those across Iowa. It will save money, because it makes required medical administration more efficient. My amendment will reduce the time crying kids have to wait for their parents to fill out that paperwork before they go into the doctor's office. And my amendment will cut red tape and Federal spending.

This amendment cuts Federal healthcare administrative work by 50 percent in 10 years. I spent 10 years working for the State of Iowa, and I focused on making government more efficient, so I absolutely know how to find government waste and how to cut it, and I think it is important that we look at that.

As an efficiency expert and a mom of two boys, I am proud to introduce this amendment today. Health administration costs are out of control. We spend \$500 billion on all types of duplicate administration every year. My amendment creates \$250 million in grants for States each year, because when excess administrative work costs nearly \$250 billion per year, that is 1,000 times more. In other words, if we reduce administrative waste by more than 0.1 percent, these grants would already pay for themselves. And this amendment is going to cut away way more waste than 0.1 percent.

I have the opportunity to travel all 16 counties in my district every month, and I have met with doctors, nurses, and physician assistants, they have all told me how exhausting and unnecessary all that extra work is.

In 2016 doctors said they are spending almost twice as much time on administrative work than they are with their patients. That is just wrong. And that same study also found that when a doctor is in the exam room, more than one-third of that time is spent on desk work.

Our rural and small communities are struggling to hire enough doctors, and I am already working on attracting doctors to our State, but we also need to protect and keep the doctors that we have, and doctors want to help patients, not do paperwork.

Last month, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services released new guidance to help reduce documentation burdens and ensure doctors have more time with their patients. That was the first time in 25 years we have updated these regulations with the specific purpose of reducing paperwork. My amendment creates grant programs to get that done.

Look, I get it, Mr. Chair, if you are filling out 30 pages of paperwork, you probably won't like this amendment if you like doing that. If your favorite place is a doctor's waiting room and you want to spend more time there, I will understand you not wanting to support my amendment. Or if you always dreamed of being treated like you are a computer code and not a patient, then you can vote "no" on this amendment.

But I am pretty confident you are like me and you hate those things. So vote "yes" if you want doctors to focus on your kids. Vote "yes" if you want shorter wait times and more time with your doctor. Vote "yes" for all that, while you are also saving Federal Government money. And by the way, if you are going to miss the waiting room, I would be happy to sign you up for a "Highlights" magazine subscription to come to your home.

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, though I oppose the dangerous fewer cures act by Speaker PELOSI because it was written in secret, it is partisan and it will delay or kill the cures that our patients are hoping and praying for with Alzheimer's, ALS, Parkinson's, and so many cancers.

This amendment reduces unnecessary costs, administrative burdens across the healthcare system. I share this goal with my colleague from Iowa. This amendment includes a lot of just smart ways to achieve this goal, including identifying best practices, reviewing existing regulations to see if they are adding unnecessary burdens, and studying how we might be able to standardize and just automate certain of these administrative actions.

All of this is pretty good common sense. This amendment would help the public and, I think, the private sectors and the Federal Government and States work better together. I hope Mrs. AXNE offers this amendment again on another legislation, maybe one that will become law, because, obviously, H.R. 3 will not.

And, of course, impeachment has poisoned the water and delayed so many bipartisan things that are important to the American people. I hope she continues to offer it. I imagine that that "Highlights" magazine on the doctor's table will be all about impeachment. We want to make it all about healthcare.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time. Let's vote.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative BRADY for his support for this amendment.

I appreciate anybody who also wants to look at efficiencies within government. It is something that we need to spend more time on, so I am grateful for your support and I look forward to working with you and moving this agenda forward.

Mr. Chair, I would still continue to urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3, so that we can make this a reality, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. FINKENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 812. REGULATIONS REQUIRING DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS TO INCLUDE TRUTHFUL AND NOT MISLEADING PRICING INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (referred to in this section as the "Administrator"), shall promulgate final regulations requiring each direct-to-consumer advertisement on television (including broadcast, cable, streaming, and satellite television) for a prescription drug or biological product for which payment is available under title XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act to include a textual statement, which shall be truthful and not misleading, indicating the list price, as determined on the first day of the quarter during which the advertisement is being aired or otherwise broadcast, for a typical 30-day regimen or typical course of treatment (whichever is most appropriate).

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In promulgating final regulations under subsection (a), the Administrator shall determine—

(1) whether such regulations should apply with respect to additional forms of advertising;

(2) the manner and format of textual statements described in such subsection;

(3) appropriate enforcement mechanisms; and

(4) whether such textual statements should include any other price information, as appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to start, before I get to the amendment, to actually talk about why all of this is so important here today.

You see, I hold prescription drug roundtables all across the district, and there is a recent one that comes to mind and a story that I want this body to hear.

We were doing a roundtable in DuBouque, where we invited folks to come and talk about their issues with drug prices and how that is impacting their lives personally. And there was a family that came, a young woman who was in her teens, with her mom and her dad. You see, she has diabetes, and they struggle every month to try to figure out how they are going to keep affording insulin and her meters, and different meters with different insurances happen almost every single year.

And they are telling me these stories, and in the middle of the roundtable, the young woman and her mother had to leave to go to a doctor's appointment, and it was her dad that stayed for the rest of it. And as I am going around saying "thank you for coming and sharing your story today," I shook the dad's hand, and he looked at me and he said, "Please do everything you can to fight for my daughter and fight to make sure that she is going to be able to afford the care that she needs."

He told me he is very worried about when she turns 26, and if she is not on their insurance what does that look like. Is she going to be able to keep affording it? And he told me that he wanted to be able to walk his daughter down the aisle one day at her wedding, not her funeral.

□ 1215

I will never forget that conversation, and I will never stop fighting to make sure that we lower the costs of these lifesaving medications that so many folks across our country and in my district need and rely on.

It is why I am so proud to support the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019, which puts measures in place to make sure that drug companies aren't charging us double, triple, or quadruple what countries like Canada and Australia currently pay.

However, H.R. 3 is currently missing a bipartisan drug pricing reform that has been supported by Senator GRASSLEY, by President Trump, and Members of both parties alike. It is requiring drug companies to disclose pricing information on prescription drugs when they advertise directly to consumers like us and folks in my district.

We have all seen the TV commercials that promote prescription drugs. What we may not realize is that pharmaceutical companies spend billions on this advertising. Last year, they spent over \$6 billion, and a lot of that was actually to encourage people to get expensive, brand-name drugs.

My amendment would require TV advertisements for prescription drugs to include the list price for a 30-day regimen or a typical course of treatment. With this transparency, we can all be empowered to make informed choices

and bring down costs to our healthcare system.

When drug companies use advertising to boost demand for drugs whose prices just keep going up, the American people deserve to know what these drugs cost. My amendment will ensure that we get a complete picture of the prescription drug options we see on TV.

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, I would like to claim the time in opposition, even though I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, this is a good amendment. It would require H.R. 3 include a provision requiring each drug ad on TV to include the list price of the drug.

I support this policy; Republicans do, as well. It is just a simple way to increase openness in healthcare, transparency that patients are, I think, searching for.

In fact, this bipartisan approach is already in the Republican bill in front of us today, H.R. 19. I don't know why it was rejected in the initial Democrats' bill. I think perhaps it was written in secret. It was all partisan measures.

We know, at the end of the day, it is deader than a doornail. But I think, after that is done, after impeachment—I don't know how many years that thing goes on and wastes our lives. But after all that foolishness is done, I hope our Democrat friends will come back to the negotiating table so we can work on more commonsense, bipartisan ideas like this one.

Despite my strong opposition to H.R. 3—it is such a cruel and false choice to force people to choose between lower drugs and lifesaving cures for Alzheimer's, ALS, Parkinson's, and so many cancers; that is just wrong—I do support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it, too.

And I hope the gentlewoman from Iowa will continue to demonstrate her support for more openness by also supporting the bipartisan H.R. 19 when it comes to a vote later today.

Let's vote.

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

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Chair, may I check the balance of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Iowa has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am happy to hear that my colleagues across the aisle will be supporting this important amendment, and I would like to end with another story that I heard at another roundtable, one from one of our farmers in our district who came to our Waterloo roundtable and came with his wife, Heidi, who is battling MS, and was so

concerned about how he was going to continue to make it with the ongoing trade war with China that has been taking his soybean markets, and the attacks on renewable fuels that have been hurting him every single day as a corn grower as well, and the \$80,000 every 6 months that they were going to have to pay for the MS medication that he went to his lawyer and asked his lawyer how is he going to keep the farm and make sure his wife gets what she needs. His lawyer looked at him and said: If you want to keep your farm, you should consider divorcing your wife.

That is another story that I will never forget. These are the reasons we are here today, that we fight for legislation like this, that we get these things done, and that we put our constituents and people over the politics that we continue to see here from folks who like to divide us instead of unite us.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Ms. LURIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 101(b), add the following:

(3) FEHBP.—Section 8902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) A contract may not be made or a plan approved under this chapter with any carrier that has affirmatively elected, pursuant to section 1197 of the Social Security Act, not to participate in the Fair Price Negotiation Program established under section 1191 of such Act for any selected drug (as that term is defined in section 1192(c) of such Act).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019. My amendment would ensure that Federal employees benefit from the same contracting practices as stated in the fair price negotiation program established by the underlying bill.

Close to 30,000 of our constituents in Virginia's Second Congressional District are Federal employees, and they should all be able to benefit from this monumental legislation to lower prescription drug costs.

Making healthcare more affordable is among my top priorities in Congress.

As the costs of prescription drugs seem to skyrocket, I know I must do everything I can to ease that burden on coastal Virginians. Nobody should need to choose between lifesaving medications or bankruptcy.

A vote in favor of this amendment is one to support broader access to affordable prescription drugs. I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I do rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to make a couple of points.

According to the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, the FEHB program, the Federal Employee Health Benefits program, is, in fact, the largest employer-sponsored group health insurance program in the world. It covers nearly 9 million—9 million—Federal employees and their families.

This amendment says that any private health plan that chooses to offer coverage in the FEHB program must accept the government price controls for prescription drugs established under this bill, H.R. 3.

So, clearly, we are not satisfied in this amendment with only setting prices for Medicare and private businesses. It also creates another harmful mandate and expands the already-radical scope of H.R. 3 to other programs as well.

As my colleagues have noted again and again today and yesterday, governments don't negotiate; they dictate. Taxing up to 95 percent of a drug manufacturer's revenue if it refuses to agree with a government-mandated price is not free market negotiation.

And, as we have heard from both the CBO—nonpartisan body, Congressional Budget Office—and the CEA, they tell us that we are going to lose drugs that will solve cures, as they just won't happen with this bill.

Government price controls lead to lower and fewer cures; and, as the CEA said, nearly 100 cures for rare and difficult diseases like Alzheimer's, ALS, and cancer just aren't going to happen, or they are going to be much delayed under H.R. 3.

So I would ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I stand here today in strong support of H.R. 3, in opposition to my colleague.

If, in fact, we are going to offer lower prescription drug costs to those covered by Medicare and private insurance, it is the least that we can do to include our Federal employees in these cost-saving benefits.

Federal employees live in nearly every district in this country, and we must ensure that they, too, can benefit

from lower drug prices secured by this landmark legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would also just like to say that the CRS, Congressional Research Service, has found that price controls in this bill, H.R. 3, the underlying bill, may be unconstitutional under the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause and the Eighth Amendment Excessive Fines Clause.

So, instead of considering yet another amendment which expands radical government-mandated price controls at the expense of developing life-saving cures, our time would be better spent considering bipartisan policies such as what is in the substitute, H.R. 19.

So I would encourage my colleagues to, instead, vote for the amendment on H.R. 19 and vote against H.R. 3.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:

(4) OPTION OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PURCHASE COVERED DRUGS AT MAXIMUM FAIR PRICES.—Section 8126 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “, subject to subsection (j),” after “may not exceed”;

(B) in subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, subject to subsection (j)” after “for the procurement of the drug”; and

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

“(j)(1) In the case of a covered drug that is a selected drug, for any year during the price applicability period for such drug, if the Secretary determines that the maximum fair price of such drug for such year is less than the price for such drug otherwise in effect pursuant to this section (including after application of any reduction under subsection (a)(2) and any discount under subsection (c)), at the option of the Secretary, in lieu of the maximum price (determined after application of the reduction under subsection (a)(2) and any discount under subsection (c), as applicable) that would be permitted to be

charged during such year for such drug pursuant to this section without application of this subsection, the maximum price permitted to be charged during such year for such drug pursuant to this section shall be such maximum fair price for such drug and year.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘maximum fair price’ means, with respect to a selected drug and year during the price applicability period for such drug, the maximum fair price (as defined in section 1191(c)(2) of the Social Security Act) for such drug and year.

“(B) The term ‘negotiation eligible drug’ has the meaning given such term in section 1192(d)(1) of the Social Security Act.

“(C) The term ‘price applicability period’ has, with respect to a selected drug, the meaning given such term in section 1191(b)(2) of such Act

“(D) The term ‘selected drug’ means, with respect to a year, a drug that is a selected drug under section 1192(c) of such Act for such year.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to ensure that the VA and the veterans that it serves are able to take advantage of lower drug prices made possible by H.R. 3.

I am proud to support the underlying bill, which will result in lower drug prices for millions of Americans, but we cannot forget those who have sacrificed so much for our country. Veterans have earned our support, and they should never have to compromise on healthcare.

H.R. 3 will establish a fair price negotiation program which will enable the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate with drug companies and obtain a fair price for Medicare recipients as well as the privately insured. My amendment would simply allow the VA to purchase drugs at the same price if it is lower than what they would otherwise pay on their own.

□ 1230

Put simply, everyone deserves to pay a fair price for their lifesaving medication.

This is not just about fiscal responsibility. It is about moral responsibility. The hard-earned tax dollars Americans are willing to put toward caring for their veterans should be spent on veterans, not on lining the pockets of drug companies.

The Lowcountry is home to over 80,000 veterans, and I want them to know that when they seek VA care, they are receiving the best care at the best price. I, for one, refuse to allow Big Pharma to profit off our veterans. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in ensuring our veterans have access to the lowest possible drug prices.

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

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that prescription drug prices in this country are too high and that too many Americans cannot afford the lifesaving medications that they need, and I wish the bill we were debating today would solve that problem. Sadly, it does not.

The premise of this amendment is that the VA should be able to lower drug costs if the savings predicted materialize. But make no mistake about it, a bill that stops cures from coming to market and discourages innovation is bad for veterans and bad for America, regardless of the effects of this amendment.

Further, with this amendment, we would be putting the brave men and women who have served our Armed Forces and are seeking care from the Department of VA at risk. Congressman CUNNINGHAM's amendment would expand the scope of this bill to include the prescription drugs provided by VA. As well intentioned as Congressman CUNNINGHAM's amendment might be, this is the wrong thing for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, let me reminisce a little bit. When I graduated from medical school, there was a disease out there we did not know the name of. We didn't even know the name of it. We later discovered it was hepatitis C. We have gone from not even knowing the name of this disease to being able to cure it in 8 to 12 weeks.

Let me tell you what this incredible innovation has done for our Nation's veterans. The VA has cured more than 100,000 veterans of hepatitis C since 2014, remarkable, cutting the death rate by 50 percent.

That is innovation that has done that. Because of this treatment, veterans cured are estimated to have a 72 percent less likely chance of developing cancer of the liver. Fewer than 25,000 veterans out there are now untested that are at risk, and the VA is to be applauded for this.

Let me digress to my first pediatric rotation in medical school in Memphis many years ago. My first inpatient rotation was St. Jude Children's Hospital. At that time when I saw those children, 80 percent of them, Mr. Chairman, died of their disease. Because of innovation and research, and doctors and nurses and others who went in every day and saw these children die, today, 80 percent of those children live. If we don't stifle innovation, my prayer is that 100 percent of these children live.

My concern with this bill, H.R. 3, is not what it will do. It is what will be left undone when we don't have these cures. I know that is not the intent of my friend. We serve on the committee together, and I know that is not his intent. My concern is that is exactly what will happen.

I submit for the RECORD this list of drugs right now that the VA does not have on its formulary because it is closed.

TOP MEDICARE PART B DRUGS NOT COVERED
BY THE VA (EXCLUDING VACCINES)

BRAND NAME/GENERIC NAME

Remodulin/Treprostinil Sodium
Provence/Sipuleucel-T/Lactated Ringers
Soliris/Eculizumab
Synvisc/Hylan G-F 20
Tyvaso/Treprostinil
Abraxane/Paclitaxel Protein-Bound
Actemra/Tocilizumab
Advate/Antihemophil.FVIII, full Length
Aloxi/Palonosetron HCL
Brovana/Arformoterol Tartrate
Budesonide/Budesonide
Entyvio/Vedolizumab
Erbitux/Cetuximab
Faslodex/Fulvestrant
Injectafer/Ferric Carboxymaltose
Kadcyla/Ado-Trastuzumab Emtansine
Neulasta/Pegfilgrastim
NPlate/Romiplostim
Orencia/Abatacept
Prolia/Denosumab
Remicade/Infliximab
Simponi Aria/Golimumab
Xolair/Omalizumab
Yervoy/Ipilimumab

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, further with this amendment, we have a system now that works, and I would encourage my colleagues to not support this amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues on the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor for their work on this historic piece of legislation, which will save lives. I also thank Chairman MCGOVERN and my colleagues on the Rules Committee for ruling my amendment in order.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to lower the exorbitant cost of prescription drugs for every single American.

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

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleagues that we should do everything possible to lower prescription drug costs, but I can tell you that H.R. 3 will not do it. One of the problems I have with this bill is to stifle the incredible innovation that I have seen in my career.

Let me give another example before I close, Mr. Chairman. I had a professor in medical school, Dr. Lemuel Diggs, my hematology professor. He spent his entire career trying to cure sickle-cell anemia. I have sat by the bedside of pregnant women and done exchange transfusions on women nearing term who have sickle-cell disease so they can deliver a baby that is well and the mother would be healthy. I have done that.

Dr. Diggs passed before we found out incredible research that has been done, that we can do alterations of the HIV virus, an attenuated virus it is called, and place the right code in the genetic code and potentially cure sickle-cell disease for African Americans. We do not want to stifle this innovation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116-334.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ms. SCANLON, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title VIII the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 812. IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY AND PREVENTING THE USE OF ABUSIVE SPREAD PRICING AND RELATED PRACTICES IN MEDICAID.

(a) PASS-THROUGH PRICING REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) PASS-THROUGH PRICING REQUIRED.—A contract between the State and a pharmacy benefit manager (referred to in this paragraph as a ‘PBM’), or a contract between the State and a managed care entity or other specified entity (as such terms are defined in section 1903(m)(9)(D)) that includes provisions making the entity responsible for coverage of covered outpatient drugs dispensed to individuals enrolled with the entity, shall require that payment for such drugs and related administrative services (as applicable), including payments made by a PBM on behalf of the State or entity, is based on a pass-through pricing model under which—

“(A) any payment made by the entity or the PBM (as applicable) for such a drug—

“(i) is limited to—

“(I) ingredient cost; and

“(II) a professional dispensing fee that is not less than the professional dispensing fee that the State plan or waiver would pay if the plan or waiver was making the payment directly;

“(ii) is passed through in its entirety by the entity or PBM to the pharmacy that dispenses the drug; and

“(iii) is made in a manner that is consistent with section 1902(a)(30)(A) and sections 447.512, 447.514, and 447.518 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) as if such requirements applied directly to the entity or the PBM;

“(B) payment to the entity or the PBM (as applicable) for administrative services performed by the entity or PBM is limited to a reasonable administrative fee that covers the reasonable cost of providing such services;

“(C) the entity or the PBM (as applicable) shall make available to the State, and the Secretary upon request, all costs and payments related to covered outpatient drugs and accompanying administrative services incurred, received, or made by the entity or

the PBM, including ingredient costs, professional dispensing fees, administrative fees, post-sale and post-invoice fees. Discounts, or related adjustments such as direct and indirect remuneration fees, and any and all remuneration; and

“(D) any form of spread pricing whereby any amount charged or claimed by the entity or the PBM (as applicable) that is in excess of the amount paid to the pharmacies on behalf of the entity, including any post-sale or post-invoice fees, discounts, or related adjustments such as direct and indirect remuneration fees or assessments (after allowing for a reasonable administrative fee as described in subparagraph (B)), is not allowable for purposes of claiming Federal matching payments under this title.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (xiii) of section 1903(m)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and (III)” and inserting “(III)”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (IV) pharmacy benefit management services provided by the entity, or provided by a pharmacy benefit manager on behalf of the entity under a contract or other arrangement between the entity and the pharmacy benefit manager, shall comply with the requirements of section 1927(e)(6)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection apply to contracts between States and managed care entities, other specified entities, or pharmacy benefits managers that are entered into or renewed on or after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SURVEY OF RETAIL PRICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1)(A)(i) and all that precedes it through “(1)” and inserting the following:

“(1) SURVEY OF RETAIL PRICES.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of retail community drug prices, to include at least the national average drug acquisition cost, as follows:

“(A) USE OF VENDOR.—The Secretary may contract services for—

“(i) with respect to retail community pharmacies, the determination on a monthly basis of retail survey prices of the national average drug acquisition cost for covered outpatient drugs for such pharmacies, net of all discounts and rebates (to the extent any information with respect to such discounts and rebates is available), the average reimbursement received for such drugs by such pharmacies from all sources of payment, including third parties, and, to the extent available, the usual and customary charges to consumers for such drugs; and”;

(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following:

“(F) SURVEY REPORTING.—In order to meet the requirement of section 1902(a)(54), a State shall require that any retail community pharmacy in the State that receives any payment, administrative fee, discount, or rebate related to the dispensing of covered outpatient drugs to individuals receiving benefits under this title, regardless of whether such payment, fee, discount, or rebate is received from the State or a managed care entity directly or from a pharmacy benefit manager or another entity that has a contract with the State or a managed care entity, shall respond to surveys of retail prices conducted under this subsection.

“(G) SURVEY INFORMATION.—Information on retail community prices obtained under this paragraph shall be made publicly available and shall include at least the following:

“(i) The monthly response rate of the survey including a list of pharmacies not in compliance with subparagraph (F).”

“(ii) The sampling frame and number of pharmacies sampled monthly.”

“(iii) Characteristics of reporting pharmacies, including type (such as independent or chain), geographic or regional location, and dispensing volume.”

“(iv) Reporting of a separate national average drug acquisition cost for each drug for independent retail pharmacies and chain operated pharmacies.”

“(v) Information on price concessions including on and off invoice discounts, rebates, and other price concessions.”

“(vi) Information on average professional dispensing fees paid.”

“(H) PENALTIES.—

“(i) FAILURE TO PROVIDE TIMELY INFORMATION.—A retail community pharmacy that fails to respond to a survey conducted under this subsection on a timely basis may be subject to a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$10,000 for each day in which such information has not been provided.”

“(ii) FALSE INFORMATION.—A retail community pharmacy that knowingly provides false information in response to a survey conducted under this subsection may be subject to a civil money penalty in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for each item of false information.”

“(iii) OTHER PENALTIES.—Any civil money penalties imposed under this subparagraph shall be in addition to other penalties as may be prescribed by law. The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subparagraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceedings under section 1128A(a).”

“(I) REPORT ON SPECIALTY PHARMACIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress examining specialty drug coverage and reimbursement under this title.”

“(ii) CONTENT OF REPORT.—Such report shall include a description of how State Medicaid programs define specialty drugs, how much State Medicaid programs pay for specialty drugs, how States and managed care plans determine payment for specialty drugs, the settings in which specialty drugs are dispensed (such as retail community pharmacies or specialty pharmacies), whether acquisition costs for specialty drugs are captured in the national average drug acquisition cost survey, and recommendations as to whether specialty pharmacies should be included in the survey of retail prices to ensure national average drug acquisition costs capture drugs sold at specialty pharmacies and how such specialty pharmacies should be defined.”

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, including payments rates under Medicaid managed care plans,” after “under this title”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and the basis for such dispensing fees” before the semicolon; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter,” after “2010”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on the 1st day of the 1st quarter that begins on or after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) MANUFACTURER REPORTING OF WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST.—Section 1927(b)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subclause (II), by adding “and” after the semicolon;

(C) by moving the left margins of subclause (I) and (II) 2 ems to the right; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) in the case of rebate periods that begin on or after the date of enactment of this subclause, on the wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for covered outpatient drugs for the rebate period under the agreement (including for all such drugs that are sold under a new drug application approved under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act);”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “and clause (vii) of this subparagraph” after “1847A”;

(B) in clause (v), by striking “and” after the comma;

(C) in clause (vi), by striking the period and inserting “, and”;

(D) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

“(vii) to the Secretary to disclose (through a website accessible to the public) the most recently reported wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for each covered outpatient drug (including for all such drugs that are sold under a new drug application approved under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), as reported under subparagraph (A)(i)(III).”

Page 195, line 9, strike “\$500,000,000” and insert “\$680,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 758, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment sponsored today by my friend and neighbor, Ms. SCANLON from Pennsylvania. This commonsense amendment has two parts.

First, it would require pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs, to pass discounts on drugs through to State Medicaid programs. PBMs are an important part of our drug pricing system, but Republicans and Democrats alike agree on the need for PBM reform. This provision is a feature of the Senate’s bipartisan drug pricing bill.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, Pennsylvania taxpayers paid \$2.86 billion to PBMs for Medicaid enrollees in 2017. That is a 100 percent increase over 4 years. Under current law, PBMs can bill Medicaid one price for a drug, reimburse the pharmacy at a lower price, and profit, as a result, millions from the difference.

This amendment would stop that practice from Medicaid plans and simply require PBMs to pass along any discounts they get from pharmaceutical companies to the State’s Medicaid program.

The amendment also requires pharmacies to participate in the CMS survey of acquisition costs for drugs so that States, consumers, and lawmakers alike all can have greater transparency

into what these prescription drugs should cost.

Again, this is a feature of the Republican drug pricing proposals included in Mr. WALDEN’s proposal, and it is all about increasing transparency into costs, especially PBM pricing.

Lastly, this amendment invests in NIH research for new cures and treatments, especially for high-need conditions.

I am a proud cosponsor of my friend Ms. SHERRILL’s Biomedical Innovation Expansion Act, which would invest \$10 billion over 10 years in the NIH. As an engineer and former chemistry teacher, I know how important both basic and applied research is to advancing science and medicine. I am very pleased that this bill builds off Ms. SHERRILL’s legislation and establishes a pilot program at NIH that provides additional funding for clinical trials.

This stage of development is often costly and complicated, and this amendment would provide \$900 million to this important program. With this investment, we are boosting support for an initiative that will assist the development of new cures and treatments.

Mr. Chairman, for our Medicaid beneficiaries, for the patient out there right now with a condition that has no cure, I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I stand here in strong support of Ms. SCANLON’s amendment to H.R. 3 and in strong support of H.R. 3, as well.

I can say, as a freshman Member of this delegation and this Congress, the number one thing that all of our constituents ask of us each and every day is to address this issue of prescription drug pricing and transparency into that process.

This bill and the underlying amendment therein support and affirm both those things. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and its underlying amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, we certainly support clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. In fact, the Republicans have led on this issue. In fact, Republicans have led for decades in increasing the funding for NIH, going clear back to about 1995 when then-Speaker Gingrich led an effort to double the funding for the NIH.

Our colleague Mr. UPTON from Michigan led the effort to dramatically increase the funding for NIH. We know that is extraordinarily important to do.

Of course, while that is important, it is kind of the basic science. The real

work that gets done takes that and then turns it into drugs eventually through a whole clinical trial process with lots more innovation and investment.

Tragically, H.R. 3 rips \$1 trillion out of that innovation funding cycle. That is why, for the life of me, I can't understand why my friends are voting for that knowing that, and how they can vote for H.R. 3 knowing that upward of 100 or more cures, lifesaving drugs, medicines never will be developed.

Those aren't my numbers. Those are the numbers of the Council of Economic Advisers. Those are the numbers from CBO. They tell us in literally the next 20 years, 38 new drugs will never be developed, at a minimum, upward of 38. It could be more. I suppose it could be less. After that, it is 10 percent every year that don't get developed. We think it is actually higher than that, but those are the facts. Those are facts.

I want to emphasize that the ban on spread pricing in Medicaid offered here as a Democratic amendment is actually, as my friend recognizes, in H.R. 19. We agree. There are 138 Democrats who have sponsored different provisions that are bipartisan in the substitute amendment, and it should do no damage.

Why would you vote against your own stuff? I mean, it is in here. It is good policy. It is bipartisan. I hope that some will have the opportunity to be strong and vote for really good bipartisan legislation. I would argue that H.R. 19, the substitute, is the most bipartisan bill on the floor today, the only bipartisan bill on the floor today.

This comprehensive collection of bipartisan policies from both the House and the Senate are contained in the substitute, H.R. 19. We looked a lot at the work that Senator GRASSLEY and my own State Senator RON WYDEN put together in their legislation. We probably got 90 percent of that one way or the other incorporated in here.

I have learned over the years, from the time I got here as a freshman until now, you don't get everything. Sometimes, you can make more progress by getting together and getting what you can agree on done and then continuing to work on the issues where you don't agree, and I would say that is an issue that we face right now.

We have before us a substitute that could become law, and the President basically indicated he would sign it. He clearly has indicated he will veto H.R. 3. We have had word out of the Senate that they have no plans to take up H.R. 3. To me, it makes it a nonstarter.

I also believe it is dangerous to innovation. It will cost 88,000 jobs U.S.-wide, and 80-something percent of new drugs coming out of California won't be developed. That is according to the people who do this work, California Life Sciences.

□ 1245

I don't think you have to trade that reduction in innovation and new cures

for lower prices. I think you can actually have both.

We have a common commitment here to lower drug prices. We have a common commitment here to increase investment in NIH and to stop the bad behaviors by the pharmaceutical companies, to stop them from withholding samples so that generics don't get to market or actually paying all generic brands not to come to market.

I wrote the legislation last Congress that modernized the FDA's approval process for medical devices, generic devices, so we couldn't get stuck—that is a bit of a pun—by another EpiPen issue. Because there was no competitor, they raised the price the way they wanted to, and they stuck it to people like my wife, who used to use an EpiPen, and many other consumers.

We now have competition in that space, and the FDA has approved more generic drugs as a result of our unanimous work on the FDA reform. More generic drugs in the last year than at any time in the history of the FDA were approved, over 1,100 new generic drugs, because, I think, when you get more competition in the market, consumers benefit with more choice and lower price.

Now, there is still some gaming that goes on, and we agree on that, and we are putting a stop to that wherever we can find it. But I don't want to vote for H.R. 3 as an unconstitutional measure, as we have been warned by our own Congressional Research Service lawyers who looked at it. They said it likely violates two provisions of the Constitution because it is so punitive and damaging.

We had the outside science people look at it and say it is going to cost cures.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-334 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. O'HALLERAN of Arizona.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 10 by Ms. LURIA of Virginia.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN)

on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 223, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]

AYES—201

Abraham	Granger	Palmer
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pence
Allen	Graves (LA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Peters
Amodei	Green (TN)	Posey
Armstrong	Griffith	Radewagen
Arrington	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Babin	Guest	Reed
Bacon	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Baird	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Balderson	Harris	Riggleman
Banks	Hartzler	Roby
Barr	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rouda
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Brady	Hudson	Roy
Brindisi	Huizenga	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Simpson
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Schrader
Buck	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Bucshon	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Budd	Joyce (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Joyce (PA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Katko	Simpson
Calvert	Keller	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	King (IA)	Smucker
Cheney	King (NY)	Spano
Cline	Kinzinger	Staubert
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Stefanik
Cole	LaHood	Steil
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Steube
Comer	Lamborn	Stewart
Conaway	Latta	Stivers
Cook	Lesko	Suzuki
Crawford	Long	Taylor
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Curtis	Lucas	Thornberry
Davidson (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marshall	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Upton
Duncan	McAdams	Van Drew
Dunn	McCarthy	Wagner
Emmer	McCaul	Walberg
Estes	McClintock	Walden
Ferguson	McHenry	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meadows	Waltz
Flores	Meuser	Watkins
Fortenberry	Miller	Weber (TX)
Foxx (NC)	Mitchell	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gallagher	Mullin	Williams
Gianforte	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Newhouse	Wittman
Gohmert	Norman	Womack
Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes	Woodall
Gooden	Olson	Wright
Gottheimer	Palazzo	Yoho
		Young

NOES—223

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Allred	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Axne	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Barragán	Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright
Bass	F.	Case
Beatty	Brown (MD)	Casten (IL)
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Beyer	Bustos	Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer

Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter

Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Burchett
Gabbard
Gosar
Hunter

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
McNerney
Rooney (FL)

Sablan
San Nicolas
Serrano
Zeldin

□ 1318

Mses. SLOTKIN, PLASKETT, Messrs. GALLEGO, CASTRO of Texas, CLEAVER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mses. BONAMICI, DELAURO, MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, SCHWEIKERT, PETERS, and SUOZZI changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 676.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN
The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTWRIGHT). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 351, noes 73, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

AYES—351

Adams
Agullar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Axne
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buchan
Burgess
Bustros
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig

Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings

Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LatTA
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski

Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley

Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber

Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
SuoZZi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—73

Abraham
Aderholt
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Byrne
Carter (TX)
Cloud
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson (OH)
Estes
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz

Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (PA)
LaHood
Lamborn
Marchant
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Miller

Mitchell
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Ratcliffe
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Steube
Taylor
Timmons
Walker
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Williams
Womack
Wright
Young

NOT VOTING—12

Burchett
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Gosar

Hunter
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Rooney (FL)

Sablan
San Nicolas
Serrano
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MCGOVERN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1324

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 45, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

AYES—380

Abraham	Cooper	Graves (LA)
Adams	Correa	Graves (MO)
Aguilar	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Allen	Courtney	Griffith
Allred	Cox (CA)	Grijalva
Amodei	Craig	Grothman
Arrington	Crenshaw	Guest
Axne	Crist	Guthrie
Bacon	Crow	Haaland
Baird	Cuellar	Hagedorn
Balderson	Cunningham	Harder (CA)
Banks	Curtis	Hartzler
Barr	Dauids (KS)	Hastings
Barragán	Davidson (OH)	Hayes
Bass	Davis (CA)	Heck
Beatty	Davis, Danny K.	Hern, Kevin
Bera	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Bergman	Dean	Higgins (LA)
Beyer	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hill (AR)
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Himes
Blumenauer	DelBene	Hollingsworth
Blunt Rochester	Delgado	Horn, Kendra S.
Bonamici	Demings	Horsford
Bost	DeSaulnier	Houlihan
Boyle, Brendan	DesJarlais	Hoyer
F.	Deutch	Hudson
Brady	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Brindisi	Dingell	Huizenga
Brooks (AL)	Doyle, Michael	Hurd (TX)
Brooks (IN)	F.	Jackson Lee
Brown (MD)	Duncan	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Buchanan	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Buck	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Budd	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)
Burgess	Españillat	Joyce (OH)
Bustos	Estes	Joyce (PA)
Butterfield	Evans	Kaptur
Calvert	Finkenauer	Katko
Carbajal	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Keller
Carter (GA)	Fletcher	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Case	Foster	Kelly (PA)
Casten (IL)	Foxx (NC)	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Frankel	Khanna
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Kildee
Chabot	Fulcher	Kilmer
Cheney	Gaetz	Kim
Chu, Judy	Gallagher	Kind
Ciциlline	Gallego	King (IA)
Cisneros	Garamendi	King (NY)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Kinzinger
Clarke (NY)	Gianforte	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Gibbs	Krishnamoorthi
Cleaver	Golden	Kuster (NH)
Cline	Gomez	Lamb
Clyburn	Gonzalez (OH)	Langevin
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Cole	González-Colón	Larson (CT)
Collins (GA)	(PR)	Latta
Comer	Gooden	Lawrence
Connolly	Gottheimer	Lawson (FL)
Cook	Graves (GA)	Lee (CA)

Lee (NV)	Pappas	Speier
Lesko	Pascrell	Stanton
Levin (CA)	Payne	Stauber
Levin (MI)	Perlmutter	Stefanik
Lipinski	Peters	Stell
Loeb sack	Peterson	Stevens
Lofgren	Phillips	Stewart
Long	Pingree	Stivers
Loudermilk	Plaskett	Suoizzi
Lowenthal	Porter	Swalwell (CA)
Lowe y	Posey	Takano
Lucas	Pressley	Taylor
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Luján	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Luria	Radewagen	Thompson (PA)
Lynch	Raskin	Thornberry
Malinowski	Reed	Timmons
Maloney,	Reschenthaler	Tipton
Carolyn B.	Rice (NY)	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)	Tlaib
Marshall	Richmond	Tonko
Mast	Riggleman	Torres (CA)
Matsui	Roby	Torres Small
McAdams	Rodgers (WA)	(NM)
McBath	Roe, David P.	Trahan
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Trone
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McCollum	Rose (NY)	Underwood
McEachin	Rose, John W.	Upton
McGovern	Rouda	Van Drew
McHenry	Rouzer	Vargas
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
McNerney	Ruiz	Vela
Meadows	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Meeks	Rush	Visclosky
Meng	Ryan	Wagner
Meuser	Sánchez	Walberg
Miller	Sarbanes	Walden
Mitchell	Scalise	Walorski
Moolenaar	Scanlon	Waltz
Mooney (WV)	Schiff	Wasserman
Moore	Schneider	Schultz
Morelle	Schrader	Waters
Moulton	Schrier	Watkins
Mucarsel-Powell	Schweikert	Watson Coleman
Mullin	Scott (VA)	Webster (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Scott, Austin	Welch
Hayes	Scott, David	Wenstrup
Napoli tano	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Neal	Sewell (AL)	Wexton
Neguse	Shalala	Wild
Newhouse	Sherman	Williams
Norcross	Sherrill	Wilson (FL)
Norman	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Norton	Sires	Wittman
Nunes	Slotkin	Womack
O'Halleran	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (NJ)	Wright
Omar	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Palazzo	Smucker	Yoho
Pallone	Soto	Young
Palmer	Spanberger	Zeldin
Panetta	Spano	

NOES—45

Aderholt	Garcia (IL)	McClintock
Amash	Gohmert	Murphy (NC)
Armstrong	Granger	Olson
Babin	Green (TN)	Pence
Biggs	Harris	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Hice (GA)	Pocan
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Jayapal	Roy
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Rutherford
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Schakowsky
Conaway	LaHood	Shimkus
Crawford	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Doggett	Lamborn	Steube
Ferguson	Lamont	Walker
Flores	Marchant	Weber (TX)
	Massie	

NOT VOTING—11

Burchett	Hunter	Sablan
Cardenas	Lewis	San Nicolas
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
Gosar	Rooney (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1328

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

AYES—231

Adams	Finkenauer	McBath
Aguilar	Fitzpatrick	McCollum
Allred	Fletcher	McEachin
Axne	Fortenberry	McGovern
Barragán	Foster	McNerney
Bass	Frankel	Meng
Beatty	Fudge	Moore
Bera	Gallego	Morelle
Beyer	Garamendi	Moulton
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell
Blumenauer	Garcia (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Golden	Nadler
Bonamici	Gomez	Napoli tano
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez (TX)	Neal
F.	Gottheimer	Neguse
Brindisi	Green, Al (TX)	Norcross
Brown (MD)	Grijalva	Norton
Brownley (CA)	Haaland	O'Halleran
Bustos	Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Butterfield	Hastings	Omar
Carbajal	Hayes	Pallone
Cárdenas	Heck	Panetta
Carson (IN)	Higgins (NY)	Pappas
Cartwright	Himes	Pascrell
Case	Horn, Kendra S.	Payne
Casten (IL)	Horsford	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Houlihan	Perry
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Peters
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Peterson
Ciциlline	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Cisneros	Jayapal	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Plaskett
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clay	Johnson (TX)	Porter
Cleaver	Kaptur	Pressley
Clyburn	Keating	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Connolly	Kennedy	Raskin
Cooper	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kildee	Richmond
Costa	Kilmer	Rose (NY)
Courtney	Kim	Rouda
Cox (CA)	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Craig	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Crow	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Cuellar	Lamb	Ryan
Cunningham	Langevin	Sánchez
Davids (KS)	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Davis, Danny K.	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Dean	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Schneider
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Schrader
DeLauro	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DelBene	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
Delgado	Lipinski	Scott, David
Demings	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Shalala
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Dingell	Lowey	Sherrill
Doggett	Luján	Sires
Doyle, Michael	Luria	Slotkin
F.	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Engel	Maloney,	Soto
Escobar	Carolyn B.	Spanberger
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Españillat	Matsui	Stanton
Evans	McAdams	Stevens

Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)

Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Kinzinger
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden

NOT VOTING—13

Burchett
Gabbard
Gosar
Hunter
King (NY)

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Malinowski
Meeks
Rooney (FL)

Sablan
San Nicolas
Serrano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1332

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 680]

AYES—234

Adams
Agullar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenaue
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher

Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Kinzinger
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo

Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Burchett
Gabbard
Gosar
Hunter

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Rooney (FL)
Sablan

San Nicolas
Serrano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1339

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAYNE).
There being no further amendments, under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) having assumed the chair,

Mr. PAYNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3) to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 758, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. UPTON. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Upton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title VIII, insert the following new section (and update the table of sections accordingly):

SEC. ____ . EFFECTIVE DATE CONDITIONED ON CERTIFICATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the provisions of this Act shall go into effect unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services certifies that the implementation of such provisions are not projected to result in fewer new drug applications with respect to unmet medical needs and life saving cures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, here is the beef: Tomorrow marks the third anniversary of the enactment of 21st Century Cures, a bill that passed this House at 392-26. In looking back at that legislation now, 3 years later, we have made wonderful strides in finding the cures for the diseases that have impacted every family, be it cystic fibrosis, Alzheimer's and pancreatic cancer, just to name a few.

And just last week, a number of us met with a young girl who had been in a trial for SMA. That is often a fatal disease known as spinal muscular atrophy. She was in a wheelchair, barely able to talk. But after 15 days on this trial, she could actually move her head

and her neck for the first time in more than a decade, all really because of what we did on 21st Century Cures.

The CBO/CEA and Scott Gottlieb, in today's "Wall Street Journal" writes that H.R. 3, the underlying bill: "The price-control approach would increase uncertainty and reduce returns from biotech investment, raising the cost of capital for these invaluable endeavors."

You know, we are on the cusp of gene therapy for deadly inherited diseases like MS, literally, finding cures to solve blindness. But let's not stop. Let's build on what we did.

The language in this motion to recommit assures that cures will not be slowed down, because we have the requirement that unless the Secretary of HHS certifies the implementation of such provisions are not projected to result in fewer new drug applications. That is what this amendment is about.

We want to make sure that we have the resources to develop the cures that all of us want for the thousands of diseases where we don't have a cure.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman from Texas to talk about his personal story, that many of us did not know until this bill came up in the last couple of days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in staunch opposition to H.R. 3.

I can add to what my colleagues have said with statistics and legalese, but I would rather offer you my personal experience.

I was diagnosed with Stage 4 lung cancer. I was told that the average life expectancy was 16 months. That was 16 months ago. By the grace of Almighty God and American biotech ingenuity, I am still here, and I will get to spend another Christmas with my family.

I was prescribed a rigorous regimen of chemotherapy and an immunotherapy wonder-drug called Keytruda, which had only just been approved for my regimen in May of 2017. Keytruda's discovery is as a result of significant financial investment by the private sector, not the government. Today, I feel great. My last CAT scan showed nothing in my liver and lymph nodes, and the primary tumor had shrunk to about the size of a raisin.

Now, 5 years ago, my diagnosis would have been a death sentence. Today, I am beating it. Millions of Americans are diagnosed with life-threatening illnesses every year. And thanks to medical innovation in the United States, miraculous outcomes like mine are not uncommon either.

If H.R. 3 becomes law, stories like mine would be rare. If these socialist policies had been implemented earlier, I probably would not be here. For too many in this Chamber, this has become part of their political agenda, but for me and millions of Americans, this is a matter of life or death.

H.R. 3 will not save American lives. It will end them. I urge my colleagues

to think of their loved ones who will face deadly diseases in the future. Many cures are on the horizon. We cannot stop. We cannot slow down. We cannot stifle research and development of new cures by onerous government control. Too many lives hang in the balance.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, and let's take action that will actually save lives.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that my colleague from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, is well and I am so glad that he could afford the treatment that he needed.

But we have people suffering from the cost of prescription drugs now, and intentionally holding up this bill hurts them. We absolutely must remain the leader in the world in innovation, but the thing is, we can reduce drug prices and still have money for research.

The money U.S.-based drug companies made in 2015 by charging Americans high prices was nearly double what was needed to fund their global R&D. An H.R. 3 uses the savings to reinvest billions in the research and clinical trials needed to get cures faster.

I am so excited about H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act. I am the first pediatrician ever elected to Congress, and currently the only female doctor here. I am also a patient with type 1 diabetes. My life depends on insulin, so the high cost of prescription drugs affects me and people like me every day.

I have driven over 7,000 miles this year traversing my district talking to people about what matters to them. And you know what the biggest thing is? The cost of prescription drugs. Because it doesn't matter if you are a Democrat or Republican if you cannot afford your medication.

I understand this issue both as a doctor and a patient, because it is not theoretical for me or for my patients. When we talk about the cost of insulin, I have felt that personally. I have seen the price of my insulin go from \$40 a bottle to \$300. That is the price for a bottle that holds 10 milliliters, 2 teaspoons.

Before being elected to Congress, I worked for nearly 20 years as a pediatrician in the suburbs of Seattle, just 3 hours from the Canadian border. Mostly, I sent electronic prescriptions, but when patients asked for paper ones, I knew it was because they were going to Canada to fill it. EpiPens are \$600 here; \$50 there. In Canada, insulin costs \$50.

Right now, we pay three to four times what our colleagues overseas pay, and that is why we must use the negotiating power of Medicare to bring prices down. Our districts are alike.

And we need to take on this out-of-control pricing. The people who sent us here asked us to do it. Let's deliver today. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this MTR and "yes" on H.R. 3.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), my colleague, a champion of this bill.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I respect my Committee on Energy and Commerce colleagues, but I cannot support this motion to recommit. What we have today is an opportunity to live up to our promise.

Democrats promised.

Republicans promised.

Even the President promised to lower prescription drug costs.

Let's not get this confused or mixed up. Colleagues, I want to just make it plain: The Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, H.R. 3, is about three things: Fairness, hope, and legacy.

Fairness: Is it fair that the United States pays 2, 3, or 60 times more for the same drug as other countries?

Is it fair that in a capitalist country our government can't negotiate? We can negotiate for planes, but we can't negotiate for insulin?

The Congressional Budget Office says that H.R. 3 will lower out-of-pocket costs and premiums for those on Medicare and it will reduce premiums for 180 million Americans who have private insurance. American households will save \$120 billion over 10 years.

Let me put it another way: These same Americans will see their cash wages increase by \$116 billion. It is about fairness. H.R. 3 is about hope.

As AARP has shared, it gives seniors hope that with savings from this bill, we will modernize and expand Medicare and cap part D out-of-pocket costs. The \$2,000 cap could be the difference between a lifesaving pill and somebody's rent.

Hope: With the savings generated from this bill, we can expand Medicare coverage to include hearing, vision, and dental.

Hope: We can accelerate the great American tradition of innovative research for scientific breakthroughs and cures for the National Institutes of Health.

And with H.R. 3, we will provide patients like David Mitchell, who testified before our committee about his personal experience with cancer. And what he said is that it taught him something: Drugs don't work if people can't afford them. In other words, if you can't afford it, you don't have it.

So, lastly, this will provide us a legacy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 226, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 681]

YEAS—196

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Allen	Graves (MO)	Pence
Amodei	Green (TN)	Perry
Armstrong	Griffith	Posey
Arrington	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Babin	Guest	Reed
Bacon	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Baird	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Balderson	Harris	Riggleman
Banks	Hartzler	Roby
Barr	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rouzer
Bost	Hollingsworth	Roy
Brady	Hudson	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Ruthford
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Buchanan	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Jordan	Sherrill
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Calvert	Katko	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Keller	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Cheney	King (IA)	Spano
Cline	King (LA)	Staubert
Cloud	King (NY)	Staubert
Cole	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Coleman	Kustoff (TN)	Steil
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Steube
Comer	LaMalfa	Stewart
Conaway	Lamborn	Stivers
Cook	Latta	Taylor
Crawford	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	Long	Thornberry
Curtis	Loudermilk	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Turner
DesJarlais	Marchant	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan	Massie	Walberg
Dunn	Mast	Walden
Emmer	McAdams	Walker
Estes	McCarthy	Walorski
Ferguson	McCaull	Waltz
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Watkins
Fleischmann	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Flores	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wenstrup
Fox (NC)	Meuser	Westerman
Fulcher	Miller	Williams
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Mullin	Woodall
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Yoho
Gooden	Norman	Young
Gottheimer	Nunes	Zeldin
Granger	Olson	

NAYS—226

Adams	Beatty	Boyle, Brendan
Agullar	Bera	F.
Allred	Beyer	Brindisi
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Axne	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragan	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield

Carbajal	Horn, Kendra S.	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Horsford	Peters
Carson (IN)	Houlihan	Peterson
Cartwright	Hoyer	Phillips
Case	Huffman	Pingree
Casten (IL)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Porter
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Pressley
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Johnson (TX)	Quigley
Cisneros	Kaptur	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Clay	Kennedy	Rose (NY)
Cleaver	Khanna	Rouda
Clyburn	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kilmer	Ruiz
Connolly	Kim	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kind	Rush
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Ryan
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Cox (CA)	Lamb	Scanlon
Craig	Langevin	Schakowsky
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Crow	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Cuellar	Lawrence	Schrader
Cunningham	Lawson (FL)	Schrier
Davids (KS)	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lee (NV)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Dean	Levin (MI)	Shalala
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Loebsock	Sires
DeLauro	Lofgren	Slotkin
DelBene	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Delgado	Lowey	Soto
Demings	Luján	Spanberger
DeSaulnier	Lurla	Speier
Deutch	Lynch	Stanton
Dingell	Malinowski	Stevens
Doggett	Maloney	Suozy
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Swalwell (CA)
F.	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Engel	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McColum	Titus
Espallat	McEachin	Tlaib
Evans	McGovern	Tonko
Finkenauer	McNerney	Torres (CA)
Fletcher	Meeks	Torres Small
Foster	Meng	(NM)
Frankel	Moore	Trahan
Fudge	Morelle	Trone
Galleo	Moulton	Underwood
Garamendi	Mucarsel-Powell	Van Drew
Garcia (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Vargas
Garcia (TX)	Nadler	Veasey
Golden	Napolitano	Vela
Gomez	Neal	Velázquez
Gonzalez (TX)	Neguse	Vislosky
Green, Al (TX)	Norcross	Wasserman
Grijalva	O'Halleran	Schultz
Haaland	Ocasio-Cortez	Waters
Harder (CA)	Omar	Watson Coleman
Hastings	Pallone	Welch
Hayes	Panetta	Wexton
Heck	Pappas	Wild
Higgins (NY)	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Himes	Payne	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Burchett	Hunter	Rooney (FL)
Gabbard	Lewis	Serrano
Gosar	Lieu, Ted	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1401

Mrs. DEMINGS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG). This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 682]

YEAS—230

Adams	Golden	Omar
Aguilar	Gomez	Pallone
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Axne	Gottheimer	Pappas
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrell
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Beatty	Haaland	Perlmutter
Bera	Harder (CA)	Peters
Beyer	Hastings	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Phillips
Blumenauer	Heck	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Herrera Beutler	Pocan
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Porter
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Pressley
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Price (NC)
Brindisi	Horsford	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Raskin
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Huffman	Richmond
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rose (NY)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Rouda
Cardenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Case	Kaptur	Rush
Casten (IL)	Keating	Ryan
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Scanlon
Cicilline	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schneider
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schrader
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cohen	Lamb	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Langevin	Shalala
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Costa	Lawrence	Sires
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Craig	Lee (NV)	Soto
Crist	Levin (CA)	Spanberger
Crow	Levin (MI)	Speier
Cuellar	Lipinski	Stanton
Cunningham	Loeb sack	Stevens
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Suo zzi
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Dean	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lynch	Titus
DeLauro	Malinowski	Tlaib
DelBene	Maloney,	Tonko
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
DeSaulnier	Matsui	(NM)
Deutch	McAdams	Trahan
Dingell	McBath	Trone
Doggett	McCollum	Underwood
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Van Drew
F.	McGovern	Vargas
Engel	McNerney	Veasey
Escobar	Meeks	Vela
Eshoo	Meng	Velázquez
Espallat	Moore	Visclosky
Evans	Morelle	Wasserman
Finkenauer	Moulton	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Nadler	Welch
Frankel	Napolitano	Wexton
Fudge	Neal	Wild
Gallego	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Norcross	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	O'Halleran	
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—192

Abraham	Babin	Biggs
Aderholt	Bacon	Bilirakis
Allen	Baird	Bishop (NC)
Amash	Balderson	Bishop (UT)
Amodi	Banks	Bost
Armstrong	Barr	Brady
Arrington	Bergman	Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Reed
Buchanan	Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler
Buck	Holding	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Riggleman
Budd	Hudson	Roby
Burgess	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Roe, David P.
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Chabot	Jordan	Rouzer
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Cloud	Katko	Scalise
Cole	Keller	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	King (IA)	Shimkus
Cook	King (NY)	Simpson
Crawford	Kinzinger	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Curtis	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Spano
DesJarlais	Latta	Stauber
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Stefanik
Duncan	Long	Stell
Dunn	Loudermilk	Steube
Emmer	Lucas	Stewart
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Ferguson	Marchant	Taylor
Fleischmann	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Flores	Massie	Thornberry
Fortenberry	Mast	Timmons
Foxo (NC)	McCarthy	Tipton
Fulcher	McCaul	Turner
Gaetz	McClintock	Upton
Gallagher	McHenry	Wagner
Gianforte	McKinley	Walberg
Gibbs	Meadows	Walden
Gohmert	Meuser	Walker
Gonzalez (OH)	Miller	Walorski
Gooden	Mitchell	Waltz
Granger	Moolenaar	Watkins
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Graves (MO)	Murphy (NC)	Wenstrup
Green (TN)	Newhouse	Westerman
Griffith	Norman	Williams
Grothman	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Guest	Olson	Wittman
Guthrie	Palazzo	Womack
Hagedorn	Palmer	Woodall
Harris	Pence	Wright
Hartzer	Perry	Yoho
Hern, Kevin	Posey	Young
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Hunter	Rooney (FL)
Gabbard	Serrano
Gosar	Lieu, Ted

□ 1408

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE MOURNING THOSE KILLED IN TERRORIST ATTACK AT NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA ON DECEMBER 6, 2019

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here with members of the Florida, Georgia, and Alabama delegations because on December 6, in the early hours of the day, our Nation learned of a terrorist attack unfolding at Naval Air Station Pensacola. The attack took the lives of Ensign Joshua Kaleb Watson of Coffee County, Alabama; Airman Mohammed Sameh Haitham of St. Petersburg, Florida; and Airman Apprentice Cameron Scott Walters of Richmond Hill, Georgia.

We congregate here today to honor the memory of those who lost their lives and those who were wounded during the course of this egregious attack.

Those who wear the uniform inspire the best within us because they are truly the best among us. They are our sons and daughters, our fathers and mothers. Last Friday, three of them were taken from us, and we shall not forget their names, or those who have been impacted by that terrible attack.

I request all present, both on the floor and in the gallery, to rise for a moment of silence; and I am proud and honored to be joined by my colleagues.

□ 1415

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that no votes are expected in the House on Monday. Again, no votes on Monday, but we will do legislative business. We will be debating suspension bills, and the votes will be rolled until the following day.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Let me stress that so that every Member understands. We normally go in at noon for a schedule like this on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, but we will be going in at 9 a.m. on those days, as well as Friday.

Members are advised that the first votes of the week on Tuesday are expected between 9 and 10. Again, I want to emphasize that, although we do not have any votes on Monday night, we expect Tuesday to be a full workday, so Members really ought to come into town on Monday.

We will consider several bills, Mr. Speaker, under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

As Members know, the current continuing resolution expires on December 20. The House will consider some appropriation measures. Hopefully, and my expectation is, they are making progress in the Appropriations Committee on coming to a resolution on the 12 appropriation bills.

It is my hope that we will consider those appropriation bills on the floor on Tuesday, perhaps a series of minibus packages to fund all of government for the remainder of the fiscal year.

I would urge all of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to do

everything they can in the next 24 hours, frankly, to bring this matter to a close and agreement so that the staff will have an opportunity to put the bills together for consideration next week.

This week, negotiators were able to reach an agreement on a new trade agreement. The Republican whip has been asking me about that agreement. I have assured him we wanted to get to yes, and we have gotten to yes. We are pleased at that, this trade agreement with Canada and Mexico.

It is possible that the USMCA trade agreement could be brought to the floor next week. The only reason it is possible and not assured is the administration is working on submitting implementing legislation to the Congress. My presumption is they will have that legislation to us in the relatively near term. It will be, therefore, available for consideration next week.

This week, the House Judiciary Committee began markup, as the House knows and the country knows, of two Articles of Impeachment. Following committee action on these articles, the Judiciary Committee will make a recommendation to the full House of Representatives. We will determine a path forward on the floor following that recommendation.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, as is always the case in the last week, at least the last scheduled week of a session, there may well be other pieces of legislation that will ripen for consideration and that may well be considered next week. We will announce those as soon as we know which, if any, bills qualify for that treatment.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we are encouraged by the progress that we are seeing and involved in on the appropriations bills to properly fund the government.

As we have both discussed for some time now, the important job of Congress exercising its power of the purse is critical. The willingness for all sides to work together—House, Senate, Republican, Democrat, along with the White House—to get to a place where we can reach an agreement on how to properly fund our troops not for a month or two at a time but for the entire year, the value that it gives those men and women in uniform, the ability for our generals to acquire the tools that are necessary so that they can train safely and defend our country effectively, it is well served when we reach this agreement.

I am encouraged by the progress the gentleman reflected. Hopefully, we can get to that point where, early next week, those bills are agreed upon, finalized, passed with large bipartisan majorities, which I have no doubt we will produce, and then get those signed by the President and move to USMCA, as the gentleman talked about. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman making the comment with respect to the Defense Department and

the importance of funding them, and I agree with that.

I want to point out that the same challenge applies to all the other agencies of government. The more quickly they can be funded, the more they know what their funding is for the next 9 months—that is, between December 20 and September 30—and the more able they are to plan and rationally run their agencies. So I appreciate his observation about the Defense Department. It applies to all of government.

We are hopeful that we can fund, and our intention is to fund, all of government with full-year or at least the balance of the year appropriation bills.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I share full agreement with what the gentleman talked about in regard to all the agencies as we have had these negotiations and look forward to seeing them come to fruition early next week, to get that approved then.

Of course, the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement is a critical step to show the world that we can come together, build better trade relationships with our neighbors, create over 160,000 new jobs for hardworking families, get our economy moving even stronger, allow us to sell products into countries like Canada and Mexico that we can't sell today, and also send a message to our friends around the world like Japan, Great Britain, and so many others that want to get better trade deals with us as well. It tells them that we are fully able to not only negotiate those better deals but pass those deals through Congress.

Then, as we all know and all agree, I would imagine, we focus our efforts on China to get China to play by the rules that everybody else has, with a stronger agreement that allows our country to be even more secure and our economy to thrive even more.

All of that is critical to get additional economic growth.

I would ask, does the gentleman know the timeframe? We are, as you mentioned, trying to get the final details worked out with the administration. Hopefully, those final pieces get put in place today or tomorrow so that it can get sent down to Congress. If that does happen, is there a timeframe, as you look at the calendar for Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday? Is there a place where the majority is looking at putting it on the calendar more than other places so we can prepare as we look to whip that bill and produce, obviously, the votes to pass it?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question. We don't have a specific day, but I will tell him that it is our intention, assuming that the administration gets the enabling legislation to us in a timely fashion, which is my expectation they will do, to consider that next week. Now, which day next week has not been decided, but we do intend to consider it next week. We want to pass it before we leave here.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. We stand ready to continue this work in good faith, which it has been from the beginning.

Obviously, President Trump negotiated this deal, but his trade representative, Ambassador Lighthizer, has done yeoman's work, working tirelessly with all of us in Congress—Republican, Democrat, House, Senate—to work through the final details that we all had.

A trade deal is always complicated. It always has pieces that some like more than others. Ultimately, when it is better for the country than the current deal we are in with NAFTA, I think there is broad agreement that we finally got there, so hopefully we can get that completed next week and then start yielding the economic benefits.

If the gentleman had something else, I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. Ambassador Lighthizer, as I have said all along, we have perceived as an honest broker. I think he has dealt with us fairly and openly.

Very frankly, we believe that the agreement that has now been finalized is substantially stronger and better than it was when it was first given to us for consideration. I say that in the sense that we took the position, and I have taken this position on the floor, the gentleman knows, that enforcement was critical.

The Chamber of Commerce has said, if you have a trade agreement without effective enforcement, you don't have a real agreement. What we were able to achieve was, we think, real enforcement, which protects workers, which protects the environment, which protects other aspects of the agreement.

We also are pleased that some of the things that were in the bill that we thought were harmful to consumers, in particular, were dropped.

But it was an honest negotiation, as the whip has pointed out. It was a hard negotiation, not so much between Mr. Lighthizer and ourselves, but between Mr. Lighthizer and some of the other interest groups, including our friends in Mexico.

We have now reached that agreement. Hopefully, we can pass this next week. Our friends in labor have endorsed this agreement. The Maryland/D.C. AFL-CIO has endorsed this agreement because they have the confidence that, unlike NAFTA—for which I voted, Mr. Speaker—in which there was no successful enforcement action over the last two decades, this will have the opportunity for successful enforcement for economic reasons and for other reasons. And I hope that this will move forward.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, anytime we can make an agreement better for the hardworking families of this country, it will be a Christmas gift well received by families all across the Nation. I look forward to getting this done and then hopefully, like I said, getting others done with other countries. We definitely have that opportunity and will seek it.

I want to shift gears and talk about impeachment and where we are, where the committee is right now. There are a number of items that I wanted to discuss, but one that has been an issue raised in the Judiciary Committee last night and today that continues to be a concern is that, under the rules, the minority was promised an actual day of hearings, and that has yet to happen. Multiple requests have been made, letters sent to the chairman. For whatever reason, the chairman has rejected and, in appearance, violated the rules by not allowing what has historically been granted as a minority day of hearing.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he was aware of this. It has been raised in the committee multiple times, why not only that tradition but why that rule is not being followed, and I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman very candidly, I have not discussed with Mr. NADLER or others on the Judiciary Committee that issue. So I really can't give you the rationale that was articulated by the chair or by others.

I will say, however, that the President has indicated he wants to move with dispatch on this issue. We are doing that, and we have little time left. Very frankly, there were other witnesses to come forward, and very frankly, there were a lot of witnesses who were precluded from coming forward that we thought would amplify, frankly, people who work for and with the President who may have had information to give. But I can't specifically articulate the rationale, but we can get that for you.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that. It just seems an odd break from the rule that is designed to ensure that both sides are heard, and that is why there is an opportunity for a minority day of hearing.

The opportunity was requested, and the opportunity was denied, and then the committee today is going to be voting. The committee is acting as a jury to remove a President of the United States. Clearly, there were witnesses that we sought to bring forward that we were not allowed to bring forward, breaking from the custom and tradition of all the other impeachments that we have had. Clearly, the Nixon rules were repeated with Clinton so that both sides were treated fairly.

For whatever reason, this majority chose not to follow that custom and tradition, so the minority was not allowed to bring all the witnesses that we requested, and so the minority day of hearing was the only opportunity to present additional evidence that was sought.

□ 1430

And so if the jury, in essence, today is going to give a verdict, which they are, I would expect that the committee is going to pass the Articles of Impeachment.

You had over 70 percent of this committee, the Judiciary Committee, over 70 percent of the members of this jury

already voted to impeach the President on various votes that have been taken on this House floor. So if the jury doesn't want to hear the other side's argument, it begs the question: Was the jury rigged?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Because, out of fairness, but also out of the actual rules of the House, that opportunity is in the rules for the minority to have a day of hearings, and it was denied. That means that the evidence that was going to be submitted to the jury who is voting to remove a President was also denied.

And why both sides weren't able to be heard, why the chairman did not want both sides to be heard, I think begs a lot of questions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman on this.

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

First of all, of course, this is not the jury in the sense of a petit jury that is going to decide guilt and innocence. It is, from a lawyer's standpoint, more analogous to a grand jury, which simply decides whether or not there is probable cause to believe the President abused his power in the exercise of his authority and, secondly, in the second Article, refused to cooperate with the Congress exercising its constitutional responsibility of oversight.

Secondly, let me say to the gentleman, as the gentleman knows, the President was given the opportunity to appear with counsel and to call such witnesses as he wanted to call—I believe that is correct—but to appear and defend against the allegations that are incorporated in the Articles of Impeachment, and the President chose not to appear.

The President chose not to have counsel present. Mr. Cipollone, counsel to the White House, in fact, responded to the offer to appear and said: We have chosen not to do so.

So to say that the respondent in this case—I won't call him a defendant. But the respondent in this case, the President of the United States, chose not to respond, chose not to appear, chose not to produce evidence in his defense. One could conclude that perhaps they decided they didn't have any, but I won't conclude that, but that could be one conclusion drawn.

But I will tell the gentleman, first of all, this is not a jury that is deciding guilt or innocence; it is a jury deciding probable cause whether or not there is cause to believe.

And, of course, we had extensive hearings at which many witnesses testified, some of whom worked for the administration, with the administration, in the White House, who testified to the facts, which most constitutional experts believe, if believed, constitute an abuse of power.

But, again, I will say to the gentleman, the central reality is the President refused to appear.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the President, like any other person who is

requested to provide information, did comply.

When you look at the Articles of Impeachment, at the beginning of all of this, of course, there was the Mueller investigation for 22 months, which alleged many things. And, ultimately, the results turned out that there were no crimes committed by the President, as we had looked into when we were in the majority and knew that years ago, but for whatever reason, others wanted to continue making assertions. Those assertions turned out to be false.

So, instead of dropping it there, then you had the whistleblower complaint and the allegations of all of these things that happened on a phone call.

The only problem is the President then released the transcript of the phone call. And not only did those things not get reflected in the transcript, but the two people who actually participated, who should be listened to the most, both said there was nothing wrong with the call.

President Zelensky was asked was there any pressure applied. He said no. He got the money. He got the money, and he also got the Javelin missiles. He thanked President Trump on the phone call for the aid that allowed him to push back Russia.

As I will point out, President Trump sold 360 Javelin missiles to Ukraine so they could defend themselves, pushing back against Russia. President Obama and Vice President Joe Biden sold zero Javelin missiles to Ukraine to help them push back from Russia.

So all of this assertion of one President not allowing Ukraine to get the aid they need to stand up to Russia turned out to be true. President Obama is the one who didn't allow Ukraine to have the tools they need. He sold them zero.

They asked: Please sell us the Javelin missiles so we can defend ourselves against Russian aggression. And President Obama and Vice President Biden said no.

Why? That is a good question, and maybe somebody needs to open an investigation into that.

But in the meantime, President Trump said yes. He actually sold them 360 Javelins. President Zelensky, on the call, thanked him.

Was there pressure applied? Actually, there were thanks involved, President Zelensky thanking President Trump for allowing him the tools to stand up to Russia. He said: We may buy more. But he thanked him for the ones that he sold.

There was no quid pro quo. There were no investigations. They asked for help, and President Trump said: Absolutely. We will help you stand up to Russia.

And the facts are there.

Then you look at the catchall Articles of Impeachment. It wasn't the bribery and the quid pro quo that were alleged for months, because there was

none, and so that is not in the Articles of Impeachment. So you see these catchall phrases like “abuse of power,” “obstruction of Congress.”

Then you read what they allege to be obstruction of Congress: it is the President exercising his rights.

The different Federal agencies that were asked for information—this is the obstruction of Congress—these Federal agencies all responded. They responded to the committee. They said: Here. Let’s have a conversation about how to get you information that you want without violating the executive privileges that every President has been afforded.

These are letters right here: White House, December 1, 2019; December 6, 2019; October 15, 2019, Office of the President:

Including invoking privileges that are held by the President in no way manifests evidence of obstruction; otherwise warrants, offered to negotiate about what information you want.

Secretary of State, October 1, 2019, sent a response to the committee.

Department of Energy, October 18, 2019, sent a response to the committee. Never heard back from the committee, so clearly the committee must have been okay with the response.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Defense on October 15, 2019:

The Department is prepared to engage in the process consistent with longstanding practice and provide the responsive information should there be resolution of this matter.

The Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense said: Here. What do you need? Let’s talk and work through it.

They didn’t get a response from the committee. The committee didn’t say: No. We want more. The committee didn’t say: We disagree with you—which means, by the way, there is a third branch of government. That is, the judicial branch.

If the two branches disagree, historically, in all these impeachments—by the way, you don’t have to wonder about it. You can go back and look at history: Nixon, Clinton. Go back to Andrew Johnson.

The White House and the legislative branch negotiated what kind of information they wanted, and if there was a disagreement—and sometimes there is—you go to the courts and you say: Let’s resolve it.

There were some people who the committee asked to come and testify before the committee. They issued subpoenas. In some cases, they withdrew those subpoenas. So that person wasn’t out of compliance; they weren’t asked to come. But in some cases, they went to the courts, and the courts are actually still working to resolve that difference. The courts haven’t worked it out.

That is an obstruction of Congress, to actually send a response to a question?

The legislative branch asked the executive branch a question. The execu-

tive branch, in letter after letter after letter, responds. The committee didn’t then go back and say: No. You didn’t give me what I wanted.

These were all responses. They might not have gotten the answer they wanted, but they got an answer. And if they didn’t agree with the answer—the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) knows, historically, how that works—you ask again.

Maybe you ask for something different. Maybe you narrow it. Maybe you say: You know what, you have to give that to me, and if you don’t, I am going to go to the courts and make it happen.

They didn’t do any of that. They didn’t do any of that. They just filed Articles of Impeachment: Impeach the President. We don’t like the answer.

They gave us answers, answer after answer. And instead of saying, “Well, we disagree with your answer. This is what you need to send,” they just said, “Let’s impeach the President,” because that was the objective all along, as we know, in this whole sham. It has always been about impeachment, not about facts.

So when you have a process, if you don’t want to follow the process, you don’t want to actually go and try to get answers to questions, you just want to end at a conclusion of impeachment, that is where we are.

And that is why you see these two articles that don’t list crimes. All the alleged crimes were debunked. They are not in the Articles of Impeachment. And so we end up with abuse of power and obstruction of Congress.

Then you look at the things that are alleged, and there are actual answers from the different Federal agencies to the questions that were asked. The committee never went back and followed up. They just said: We are going to impeach the President because that is what we were going to do from the beginning.

Seventy-one percent of the members of the committee had already voted to impeach the President before the call with President Zelensky.

So why didn’t the majority go through the normal process? Why didn’t the majority allow us, the minority, our own day of hearings to counter some of these false allegations? I think the American people have figured it out. Because it was never about getting to the facts.

If that was the case, they would have worked with the executive branch to get those answers to those questions. They didn’t. They would have worked with us to allow us to have the minority day of hearing that the rules of the House allow us, but they didn’t. And so this is where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend articulates many things that have no basis in fact and believes, in my view, that if he

says it enough times that people will believe them. To that extent, I think he mirrors the President of the United States, who does the same thing.

First of all, the rules have been followed. Secondly, the evidence that has been adduced is overwhelming and has not been controverted.

John Bolton, when talking about this deal, which we believe is an abuse of power, said that this was the equivalent of a drug deal. That is John Bolton.

My friend has talked for many weeks about how the Mueller report found nothing.

First, let me read from the Mueller report something that was not part of an article but certainly informs us as to the intent and the feelings of the President of the United States.

The Mueller report said this: “Our investigation found multiple acts by the President that were capable of exerting undue influence over law enforcement investigations, including Russian interference and obstruction investigations.

“The incidents were often carried out through one-on-one meetings in which the President sought to use his official power outside of usual channels.

“These actions,” the Mueller report said, “ranged from their efforts to remove the special counsel and to reverse the effect of the Attorney General’s recusal, to the attempted use of official power to limit the scope of the investigation, to direct and indirect contacts with witnesses and the potential influence of their testimony.

“The special counsel did not reach conclusions because”—and this is critical, and the whip constantly ignores this when he says the Mueller report found nothing.

“The special counsel,” it says, “did not reach conclusions because Department of Justice guidelines prohibit indicting a sitting President. Therefore, the Mueller report makes clear, however, that it does not exonerate the President by saying this. If we had confidence”—the whip may want to hear this.

The Mueller report said: “If we had confidence after a thorough investigation of the facts that the President clearly did not commit obstruction of justice, we would so state. But, based upon the facts and the applicable legal standards, we are unable to reach that judgment that the President did not, in fact, participate in obstruction of justice.”

□ 1445

But because DOJ, for whom the counsel worked—not a special prosecutor, the special counsel—counsel demurred, essentially refused to make a judgment that he thought he was unable to make. But he made it clear that they could not find that the President did not obstruct justice.

Let me say something else. There are a number of people who thought the Mueller report and the Mueller investigation had great effect:

Paul Manafort, pled guilty to lying;
Roger Stone, convicted;
Michael Cohen, the President's counsel, convicted, in jail;

Michael Flynn, convicted of lying, the national security adviser appointed by President Trump, convicted;

Rick Gates, the deputy campaign manager for President Trump, convicted;

George Papadopoulos, who the President claimed was his foreign policy adviser—or one of his foreign policy advisers—convicted, pled guilty, served a short period of time, and now is a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket in the State of California.

They all think that the Mueller report had some consequences. That is the context in which we see this crowd. No wonder so many of them didn't want to testify.

And when Mr. Sondland testified the first time and then, after that, he saw some of these convictions, he amended his testimony.

He came in and said, oh, yes, there may have been some discussion about a so-called quid pro quo or a bribery or extortion. He didn't say those words. Those are my words. He talks about obstruction of Congress and how there was no back and forth, and he says, well, they could have gone to court.

As a matter of fact, we have gone to court time after time after time. And guess what, Mr. Speaker, the court has said that Congress is entitled to that discovery. Now, they keep appealing it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the President's modus operandi, which he has pursued all of his adult life. When people said he owed them money; when people said he didn't fulfill a contract; when people said he should do this, that, or the other, he almost invariably took them to court and delayed and delayed and delayed.

There is an editorial in "USA Today" which says this: "Trump has met the impeachment investigation with outright and unprecedented defiance." We share that view.

No President in history has refused to cooperate with the Congress of the United States in the exercising of its constitutional responsibility of oversight other than this President. Those are the facts.

This is not "The Washington Post" or "The New York Times." That editorial went on to say: "Allowing this obstruction to stand unchallenged would put the President above the law and permanently damage Congress' ability to investigate misconduct by Presidents of either party."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would again reflect that Articles of Impeachment under the Constitution of the United States are what Mr. Mueller said was the appropriate option if the Congress believed that this President ought to be held accountable for abuse of power, because he said he couldn't do it because the Justice Department policy said he couldn't do it.

We have had hearings. Those hearings were participated in by the Repub-

lican side of the aisle and the Democratic side of the aisle. Time was divided equally between the sides for questioning of witnesses.

The witnesses were an ambassador hired by Secretary Pompeo, appointed by the President to represent us; Mr. Sondland, a close friend of the President's, apparently, or at least a big contributor of the President's, appointed by the President, who came back and said no.

Certainly, I believe there was a quid pro quo that, if you didn't start an investigation, if you didn't announce that in public, then there wouldn't be the \$391 million that you needed to defend your country and to defend freedom in Ukraine, which this Congress had, in a bipartisan way, sent to the President of the United States and that the Defense Department and others had certified reforms contemplated by that legislation had been effected, and they recommended the payment of that money.

And in addition, you could not have a meeting with the White House if this didn't happen.

So my friend continues to say no wrongdoing; nothing; no crimes; no this, that, and the other. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. And no matter how many times he says it, whether it is an editorial in "USA Today" or an editorial in some other paper or articles in some other paper or—I will tell my friend—people with whom I talk on your side of the aisle—I will not name their names—they, like Zelensky, would be afraid of retribution, just as Mr. Sanford found out that disagreeing would incur the wrath of the President of the United States and get a response, either in a tweet or some other way.

Mr. Zelensky is in a very difficult position. The freedom of his country, the security of his people, he believes, are contingent upon whether President Trump will treat him fairly and as consistently as the Congress would want them treated.

So I say to my friend: We are going to move ahead. We will all have a chance to vote on these articles, and we will have a chance to debate them. And then the Senate will have a trial, if, in fact, articles pass this House. And that trial will be where the President, presumably, will offer witnesses.

But I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that Republican Senators are quoted frequently saying, we ought to have no witnesses. Republican Senators are saying, we ought to have no witnesses. Perhaps they just want to pass it so quickly. But it is as well, I think, because they don't know of any witnesses who will absolve the President from the actions that have been testified to without effective opposition to those premises.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can debate this. We are going to debate it, I am sure, next week. It will be debated in the United States Senate, and we can continue to debate it here today. But the

evidence, in the perception of many, is overwhelming and uncontradicted.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman says the evidence is overwhelming, the gentleman cites the Mueller report, the whole investigation that went on for 22 months with thousands of subpoenas, witnesses, and innuendos. And at the end of the day—with the full authority, by the way, Mr. Mueller had to file any criminal charges, if there were any laws broken that he saw—not one charge was filed.

What is the most interesting and maybe the most telling is that, in your Articles of Impeachment, the eight pages that you filed, not one time did you mention the Mueller report, because there is nothing criminal in the Mueller report. If there was, you would have put it in the Articles of Impeachment.

You are trying to remove a President of the United States from office, and the Constitution says the standard should be treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors, which you would think means you would list high crimes and misdemeanors—or treason or bribery. There is not a word of bribery or high crimes and misdemeanors listed in this.

Not one time is the Mueller report mentioned. So if there is all that rich data, it would be here, and it is not, because there wasn't anything that came out of the Mueller report.

The gentleman mentions the Department of Justice—

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I am going to go through a few points because the gentleman made a lot of assertions that are not accurate, and I think it is important to go through them.

The Department of Justice did not say that a President can't be removed. The Attorney General made that clear, that the President can be indicted.

But what the Attorney General said was—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman tell me where he did that?

Mr. SCALISE. Through the Department of Justice, he said there was no obstruction. There was no obstruction. That is what the Department of Justice said.

Again, if there was, you would have put those findings from the Mueller report in this document. And there is nothing in there, no mention of the Mueller report.

Then the gentleman opened up by saying the rules have been followed. The rules have been followed. That is what the gentleman from Maryland said. The only problem is, just today, yet another rule has been broken.

House rules, clause 2(j)(1) of rule 11, provides that, once the demand is made for a minority day of hearing, minority members shall be entitled—"shall" means it has to happen—to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Well, guess what? That didn't happen. We requested it multiple times, and the rules that the gentleman said "the rules have been followed"—the only problem is the rule has been broken.

"Shall be entitled to a hearing," and it has been denied. The chairman denied it again today in committee.

So you can't say the rules have been followed when, just today, that very committee broke the rules of the House allowing us to have the opportunity to present the alternative case.

You want to talk about abuse of power. What is going on in that Judiciary Committee right now is an abuse of power: denying the minority the ability to even present the other side of an argument. You have got two sides of any argument, and maybe you think you made a strong case if you only present yours.

You look at what is going on across the country when only one side has been presented. The country still thinks this is a waste of time, not going after a President because he broke the law but going after a President because you don't like him, you are unhappy that he got elected in 2016, and you are afraid that he might get elected again in 2020.

I trust the people of this country to make that decision again next year, and they will—not Members of Congress who have expressed that they wanted him impeached before he took the oath of office, Members of Congress on your side who said impeachable offenses aren't required to impeach a President.

So, when we talk of abuse of power, absolutely, that is an abuse of power.

The gentleman expresses concern for the people of Ukraine, maybe expresses that the President of Ukraine himself might be afraid to speak candidly. I have more confidence in the President of Ukraine that, if he says something, I believe it. We have worked with him on a number of things: cleaning up corruption. He is actually delivering on his promise, like this President has been delivering on his promise.

But let's talk about all the disdain, the concern for the people of Ukraine not having the tools to defend themselves. I am curious: Where was that disdain when President Obama and Joe Biden were in office and not one single time did they heed Ukraine's request to sell them Javelin missiles? Not one of them. They didn't sell one.

And Ukraine asked multiple times: Please allow us to defend ourselves against Russia. President Obama and Vice President Biden said no. I never heard anybody on that side expressing concern about the ability of the people of Ukraine to defend themselves then.

Good thing, when President Trump was asked that question, he said yes. No quid pro quo, just yes: Here are 360 Javelin missiles sold, so that they can push back Russia. And I am glad they are doing it. I am glad they are able to defend themselves.

Then you look at something equally alarming that has come out that deserves real attention in this Congress, and that is the Horowitz report: 17 listed abuses of the FISA process.

The gentleman knows, I supported the FISA process to allow us to combat terrorists. It is a controversial program, a program that has got a very narrow scope to allow the United States to protect our national security, but it also has a very strict requirement from our intelligence agencies. The FBI and the CIA have the ability to go unfettered and ask the judge for the ability to surveil people.

□ 1500

The judge trusts that they are giving him the full information. And we saw abuses listed in the Horowitz report of the FISA process. Even more, Mr. Durham is initiating and conducting his own criminal investigation.

And what the Attorney General talked about this week is that they know that there are people in those intelligence agencies who were spying on the Trump campaign. I mean, imagine Federal agencies—FBI, CIA—spying on the campaign of a candidate for President.

Republican or Democrat, we should equally be alarmed that that happened. I hope it gets rooted out. I hope whoever did that and abused their power goes to jail. But it happened, and it is being investigated in a criminal way.

But Horowitz, himself, pointed out where there were abuses of the FISA process. And you know what, that is coming back up to this Congress early next year for renewal. Parts of that program are going to come back up again, important tools to combat terrorism, but tools that now have been identified to have been abused. We need to work together to clean that up so that doesn't happen again. But that happened, and it was used against the Trump campaign.

I haven't heard the disdain and outrage from both sides. I am surely outraged. Our side is surely outraged. I would hope that we are all outraged that that happened.

But when we talk about those reports, again, if there were all of those things that the gentleman asserts in the Mueller investigation and, ultimately, report, I am curious that not one of those—there is not any mention of the Mueller report in these Articles of Impeachment that we will be facing on the House floor next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I think I am speaking English. Let me repeat. What the Mueller report said was the Department of Justice policy was that they could not indict a sitting President of the United States. It went on to say, as I quoted, that did not mean that they could assert that there was no obstruction of justice. And if they thought they could assert that, they would have asserted it.

And Attorney General Barr then mischaracterized the Mueller report before it was released to put, in my opinion, the President's spin on the Mueller report, which, very frankly, the gentleman's side of the aisle has continued to spin all the time.

I mentioned the six people who were convicted of lying to the investigation, close associates of the President of the United States, now in jail or waiting to be sentenced. Mr. Stone falls into that category.

Mr. BARR said that there was no obstruction. He was wrong. He mischaracterized, misstated, and misled the American people. And Mueller said in his report that was not what he found.

Collusion is not a crime. Conspiracy is a crime.

But there were, in addition to the six people I have talked about, 10 Russians indicted for participating in trying to undermine the integrity of the elections in our country on behalf of Mr. Trump.

Now, the gentleman indicates that the Mueller report has not been mentioned. The Mueller report is not the gravamen or the central—we lawyers say "gravamen"—but the central tenet here.

The central tenet is, on July 25 and, frankly, leading up to that and succeeding that, the President of the United States involved himself in a way to enrich himself in terms of the election that was coming up, 2020—not the 2016 election, the 2020 election.

The evidence has not been rebutted that that was the fact; and, in fact, people close to the President of the United States confirmed it.

What the articles say is there was an abuse of power, which is what almost every constitutional scholar says was the central concern of our Founding Fathers when they included the impeachment provision in the Constitution of the United States: to be a check on authoritarian power serving its own interests, not the people's interest. That is what the central claim here is.

And with respect to the other Article of Impeachment, it does not mention the Mueller report because what it was focused on—although Mueller focused on the obstruction of justice evidence, not the charge, but the evidence.

What we are focusing on is the biggest attempt to prohibit the Congress of the United States and the exercise of its legitimate constitutional responsibility of oversight from getting information, either in testimony or in documents. And almost every scholar of past Presidents—including President Nixon and including President Clinton and the extraordinary discovery that was exercised against President Obama on a regular basis—found that this President has stonewalled more than any other President and with less justification than any other President, because most Presidents referred to executive privilege.

This President went much more broadly than those who dealt with him

personally, but simply wanted to preclude information from getting to the Congress so that it could make decisions based upon that evidence.

And, of course, the other suit that we have is a President who said he was going to release his tax information to the American people. He has fought in every forum to prevent that from happening, notwithstanding the legislation, which was not adopted by us—it is very old legislation—which says the tax writing committee can get that information.

And I would suggest the American people ought to have that information so they can determine for themselves whether this President is acting for his benefit or for their benefit, which is his constitutional responsibility.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, but when the gentleman talks about stonewalling, acting as if President Trump is the only President in history to seek alternatives to a question that is asked by Congress—

Mr. HOYER. I didn't say that. Don't mischaracterize what I said. I did not say that.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman said that this President has tried to defy more than any other President. Those were roughly the words he said.

Mr. HOYER. That is accurate.

Mr. SCALISE. Let's keep in mind, President Obama, it took us 6 years to get to the bottom of the Fast and Furious scandal, and we still didn't get all of the information we wanted. For 6 years, President Obama fought various ways in the court.

Was that impeachable? Of course, we didn't try to impeach the President.

Every President, I am sure, including George Washington, had differences with Congress. We have multiple branches of government.

So the legislative branch has powers. When we exercise those powers in regard to the executive branch, the executive branch also has an equal opportunity to have a discussion, first of all, to see if we can come to an agreement.

Again, if you go back to the Clinton impeachment or you go back to the Nixon impeachment, both sides reached an agreement. Your majority never tried to go reach an agreement with the White House on how to get access to whatever it is you might have wanted to get access to.

What is a fair process?

Allowing the President to have his legal counsel in the room to ask questions to witnesses, that was denied. But that negotiations didn't happen.

It did happen in Nixon. It did happen in Clinton. And so you had a fair process of back and forth, where, ultimately, they agreed on rules of the game during an impeachment. It didn't happen here.

So when your majority asked, through various committees, for information from the White House, the White House has the ability to exercise other rights.

Again, letter after letter. The gentleman used the term "stonewalling." It is not stonewalling to respond to the committee and say: Okay, these are the things that we can get you. Here, look, DOD, we will work with you.

You never tried to work with DOD, but they said: Call us.

Didn't call them. Agency after agency, the Secretary of State responded. All of these agencies sent letters in response. That is not stonewalling. That is complying with the law. You might not have liked the answer.

And, again, if you didn't like the answer—I think we all know when you pull out the Constitution, there is not just two branches of government—you could have gone to the third branch of government and said: Courts, make them comply because they are not.

You didn't do that. So then you just rushed to impeach the President because you didn't like the answer.

If you go to the Mueller investigation, the gentleman lists those six people who were convicted. Not one of them had anything to do with accusations made against the President. In fact, they are not listed. They are not listed in the Articles of Impeachment.

The gentleman talked about Russia. Yes, we know Russia tried to meddle in our election in 2016. I think people on the gentleman's side might think Donald Trump was President back then. Barack Obama was President. Joe Biden was Vice President when Russia did try to interfere with our election. Why didn't they do more to stop it?

It is a good question to ask, but go ask President Obama and Vice President Biden. Don't go impeaching Trump because Russia tried to interfere with the 2016 election.

There were, absolutely, things that were going on in Ukraine that raised concerns. You had the Ambassador, the Ukraine Ambassador to the United States wrote an op-ed against candidate Trump. They were trying to interfere with the election against Donald Trump when he was a candidate for President. I didn't see any attempt to be concerned about that by the gentleman's side.

But again, just go impeach Donald Trump because so many on the gentleman's side didn't like the fact that he won in 2016 and are afraid he is going to win again in 2020.

Again, that is not why you impeach a President.

So when you talk about these facts, it is important to point out all of the other sides.

Sondland, who has been brought up multiple times, Sondland testified under oath. He asked the President: Is there anything you want?

The President responded to him—he said this under oath. The President said: "I want nothing, no quid pro quo." That was Sondland's testimony.

So, again, as these people are being brought up, let's look at the whole context.

When the rules are being brought up, I haven't heard a response from the

gentleman when I read him a House rule that is, today, being violated.

In committee, they took a vote to violate House rules. The committee doesn't have that power. The House has that power, and it hasn't exercised it. That is still a rule of the House that is being broken today, not allowing the minority to have a day of hearing, trying to hide the facts from the American people.

If they were so serious about impeaching the President because you have this overwhelming evidence, then let both sides present their case. But, no, that House rule, today, is being violated. And there are many examples of that.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The irony is that the reason we got cooperation in the Nixon case and in the Clinton case is because those administrations cooperated. This administration has absolutely not cooperated.

The gentleman has those letters, and he put them down as if they mean something. They are further evidence of delay. The committee requested legitimately.

What the gentleman didn't say—he said we ought to go to court. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman knows what happened when we went to court, because we have gone to court five or six times. We haven't lost a case yet. We have not lost a case yet where the court has said that Congress is entitled to that information.

So these letters are fine, but they are delay and dissemble as we throw them on the table, as if they mean something.

The gentleman says the Russians interfered in our election. They did. The irony is, one of the reasons that the Obama administration didn't get more involved in that is because there was knowledge by some that they were interfering on behalf—or suspicion of—Mr. Trump because of some of the evidence we have heard.

Mr. Stone's case, Mr. Gates testified about the knowledge that the President had about WikiLeaks and of the President's invitation for WikiLeaks to release information.

Sondland changed his testimony. We have gone to court. The administration has refused to cooperate.

□ 1515

The gentleman ignores those facts. They are facts, and they are facts that are generally accepted across the land, even by those who are supporters of the President.

So we are going to have this discussion. They are going to have this discussion in the Senate. But the President chose not to come to the House to defend against the allegations. His counsel said they weren't going to participate. They had the opportunity; they did not take it. We will see what happens from there.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would not discount things like this letter from the Secretary of Defense, who, on October 7, 2019, received a subpoena and on October 15, 2019, responded. That is not delay, and that is not obfuscation.

A week later, they responded and said that the Department is prepared to engage in the process, consistent with longstanding practice, and provide the responsive information should there be a resolution to this matter.

It was a week later. That doesn't sound like somebody trying to run away from a request or a subpoena. A week later, the majority got a response. The gentleman might not have liked the response, but there was not a follow-up: We are going to work with you, Department of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense sent this a week after the majority's request, and the majority is going to impeach a President because they didn't like this answer and say: Oh, he is obstructing.

Again, I go back to Fast and Furious, one example: President Obama, 6 years we fought to get the information—6 years. We didn't try to impeach him for that. It doesn't mean he was breaking the law or committing high crimes and misdemeanors.

Maybe he delayed a lot longer than we would have liked. Six years is a lot longer than it should have taken to get answers to real questions about people who died. But for 6 years, we waited and worked and went and got those answers. That is the legal process.

And maybe we should work together, if we think that is too long, to try to speed it up.

But that was 6 years. This was 1 week after the subpoena the Secretary of Defense himself sent the majority this letter and said: Call us and work with us to get you this information.

The majority didn't follow up. They just said: Nope, we don't like it. That is too late. It is delaying.

A week later, the majority got an answer, and they didn't like the answer, so the majority said: Let's impeach the President of the United States.

There is letter after letter like this from other agencies—the Department of Energy. We can go down the list. But this wasn't 3 years later the majority got an answer. Yes, maybe the majority could raise questions then and go to the courts, but the majority didn't.

The majority got an answer a week later. That is delaying to the point where the majority would impeach a President of the United States?

And my friend doesn't think those conversations happened during Nixon?

My friend doesn't think those conversations with the White House happened during Clinton, where there were things that they didn't feel that they had to give that were subpoenaed and they went back and forth, but they came to an agreement?

Mr. Speaker, it means you have to sit down and work with people that I might not like.

It has been clear on the other side that there are some on the majority side who hate this President and who don't want him to be President. We understand. We have elections for that. We had an election in 2016, and he was duly elected.

Then the majority alleged that he conspired with Russia, but he didn't. Russia tried to interfere on President Obama's and Joe Biden's watch. It was their watch when it happened. President Trump didn't have any involvement in that, and the Mueller Report made that clear.

But then the majority kept going on making assertion after assertion, just like in these two Articles of Impeachment, and the majority comes up with abuse of power.

To quote Professor Turley, one of the witnesses from last week: The only abuse of power is by this majority trying to remove a President from office for exercising his rights under the law.

A week after the majority's request, their subpoena, a week after, they got a letter from the Secretary of Defense himself, and that is enough to impeach a President?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we could go, I guess, all day on this. But the fact is, let me say, with that letter, the gentleman says 1 week. The fact of the matter is this President has been defying Congress for years in terms of giving it information it constitutionally had the right to have. He has not responded. In fact, we have gone to court, and we have won every case. It is not like the court said: Oh, well, they have the right to do this; they can talk back and forth for days, years, and months.

The court said: No, they are entitled to that information.

Don't send me a letter; send me the information I request.

For my friend to pretend that that was just 1 week's delay—it has been years of delay to responding to information requested legitimately by the Congress of the United States.

After months of going to the court, the courts have come to a conclusion over and over and over again that the Congress is entitled to that information.

Two courts have now decided that we are entitled to his tax information and to his financial information. We haven't gotten it.

Why? Because he appeals again.

Why? Because that is his modus operandi, as I said. He did it in the private sector, and he is doing it in the public sector.

What surprises me is that—I am not wishing it, but my friend may be in charge someday again, and my friend is going to be very upset with the precedent that the gentleman is arguing for at this point in time in terms of not cooperating with the Congress of the United States in conducting its constitutional duties.

As I say, we could go on and on on this. We are going to have additional hearings. I would repeat again, from a USA Today editorial: "Trump has met the impeachment investigation with outright and unprecedented defiance," which is one of the reasons I suppose he didn't appear and he instructed people who have information, like John Bolton, like Secretary Pompeo, and like so many others: Don't appear. Don't testify. Don't provide information. That is obfuscation and refusal to cooperate. But we will have an opportunity to deal with these in the future.

I would hope that, at this point in time, Mr. Whip, we might cease and desist so our friends could have an opportunity to say what they want to say. But I am prepared to proceed if my friend is so disposed.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I just hope the gentleman isn't asserting that the President of the United States, like any other American has the right, shouldn't have the right to appeal a decision. Ultimately, the courts at some level will resolve any issue before them. Courts do that, and that is the legal right of every American.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Of course he is.

Mr. SCALISE. By the way, if the President is victorious in the courts, would the gentleman recognize that he did lose that case, or would the gentleman say that was obfuscation, following the legal process?

Again, President Obama, for 6 years on Fast and Furious—just one case, 6 years.

The gentleman hasn't been in the majority for a year yet, and somehow that is so long, a week later response is so long that the majority should impeach a President, when, just on Fast and Furious, we didn't get questions we wanted answered from the White House, and in some cases it took 6 years. Some of that went through the courts.

We won some of those cases, by the way. We didn't win all of them, but we surely did win some of those cases.

But when we won a case against the President, meaning he violated some component of the law, we didn't impeach him for it, but we got the information, eventually. It took a lot longer than we would have liked.

But the President, just like President Obama, had the legal right to appeal decisions that he might not have agreed with in courts like the Ninth Circuit, which has one of the highest overturn rates of any circuit in the country.

So, if a circuit got it wrong and ultimately somewhere up higher they get it right, is that somehow something we should impeach a President of the United States for because they exercised their Article III powers to go to a judicial branch to get an answer to a question?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. This could go on forever.

Of course not. I didn't make that assertion. Don't put it in my mouth.

My friend has every right, not only the President, but every citizen has the right to repair to the courts of the United States for redress of their grievances and the pressing of their case, period. The President has that right.

I never asserted that the President ought to be impeached on that basis, nor do I assert it now, nor do we assert it in our articles which have yet to be voted on, so we will see what they do on that vote.

But let me remind the gentleman and let me remind Mr. Speaker of the House, we had a vote in 2017, we had a vote in 2018, and we had a vote in 2019. Those votes were on whether or not we ought to move Articles of Impeachment forward to impeach the President of the United States. I voted "no" on each one of those votes. Over 60 percent of the Democrats voted "no" on each one, some higher, on each one of those votes in '17, '18, and '19.

So when you assert, Mr. Speaker, that somehow the Democrats were just frothing at the bit to impeach the President—I don't want to impeach this President. I wish this would pass from us. No one ran for Congress to impeach the President of the United States. But no one ought to shirk their responsibility.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, my belief is that there is not a single Republican in this House, not one, confronted with these facts against President Obama who wouldn't have voted to impeach President Obama—not one of the minority. I am convinced to my bones, and I have been here a long time and served with a lot of people, that not one of them would have voted against either one of these articles if President Obama had done the same fact pattern with the same evidence. Not one of the minority would have voted against one of these articles.

That is my view, Mr. Speaker, but we will see.

I said this morning, quoting the papers, that we are not whipping this. This is not about whipping some partisan vote. This is about each Member having to decide for themselves, with their conscience, with their moral values, and with their oath of office to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, whether or not—and my friend quotes one witness, one constitutional expert. Three constitutional experts said, if you do not move forward on impeachment, effectively, the executive power will be unchecked and you will create a king, not a President.

Three times this Congress said: We are not going forward. But then, on July 25, a phone call occurred in which this President clearly said to an ally to whom we wanted to give \$391 million to defend himself and his people and his

country, but withheld because: I would like you to do me a favor.

That favor was not to help America, and that favor was not to clean up corruption, because he already had certified by his departments that they had met that criteria. It was, as the evidence is almost uncontroverted, to help him in the coming election and to undermine somebody he perceived to be one of his, if not the, principal opponent.

This is a heavy decision this Congress and this House will have to make, and each one of us will have to make it. Let us hope that each one of us makes it honestly and unrelated to politics or party, but related to patriotism and oath of office.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record clear, when the President made that phone call, the oft-misrepeated quote was this: "I would like you to do us a favor though because our country has been through a lot and Ukraine knows a lot about it. I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine, they say CrowdStrike . . . I guess you have one of your wealthy people . . . The server, they say Ukraine has it. There are a lot of things that went on, the whole situation. I think you are surrounding yourself with some of the same people."

The President expressed some concern with what happened in 2016 and concern about what happened to our country. "I would like you to do us a favor," and then he said, "our country."

There is no mention of Joe Biden in there, no mention of him. It is about getting to the bottom of the corruption that we all know happened. We might not have all the answers we want. We sure would like to get those answers, but it happened. It happened under Barack Obama and Joe Biden's watch. For whatever reason, they didn't do enough to stop it.

□ 1530

But when the gentleman asked if one of us would vote against Articles of Impeachment if it was President Obama, not one of us would have because we would have never brought these Articles of Impeachment. We didn't bring these kinds of Articles of Impeachment.

Again, I just listed one case, 6 years for Fast and Furious, where people died; Benghazi where people died, where we didn't get the answers we wanted, where the administration rebuffed, over and over again. But not one time did we bring Articles of Impeachment, because they were not impeachable offenses, just like there are no impeachable offenses here.

And so, we are proudly whipping against it because this is not the way to abuse Congress' power of impeachment, as one of those witnesses last week said.

In the call—some of the other witnesses, constitutional scholars, when

one of them tried to make fun of the son of the President of the United States, tried to bully and make fun of his name. Shameless. Shameless. It happened. To call that person a Presidential scholar or impartial, when some of those witnesses gave money to candidates running for President against President Trump, if that is the definition of impartial Presidential scholars, I think we all take their perception of whether or not this President should be removed from office a little bit differently than somebody who truly is impartial.

Even Professor Turley, who acknowledged that he didn't vote for President Trump, but said it would be abuse of Congress' power to move forward with impeachment because there are no impeachable offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. The good news is they didn't bring impeachment against President Obama because he did nothing to warrant such an action. How proud I am of that.

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

IN HONOR OF KALEB WATSON, CAMERON WALTERS, MOHAMMED HAITHAM—VICTIMS OF PENSACOLA SHOOTING

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with a grieving nation to honor the lives of three Navy sailors whose lives were tragically cut short in the heinous act of terrorism at the Naval Air Station in Pensacola, Florida.

Kaleb Watson of Coffee County, Alabama, and a recent graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy was 23 years old, and an aspiring pilot.

Mohammed Sameh Haitham was an all-star athlete and always anxious to help others. His 20th birthday would have been next week.

Cameron Walters of Richmond Hill, Georgia, was 21 and hoped to become an airman. According to Cameron's father, nothing made him prouder than to be able to wear the uniform of a United States sailor.

When confronted with the mortal threat of an active shooter, these sailors charged the gunman, an action that is credited with saving countless lives.

Mr. Speaker, Naval Station Great Lakes is in my district. Each year, more than 40,000 pass through Great Lakes to become sailors in the United States Navy. Cameron Walters and Mo Haitham were two such sailors.

The men and women who hear the call to duty and volunteer to wear the cloth of our Nation are role models for all of us. Let us take this time to recognize their commitment and let us commit as a Nation to ensure the heroic sacrifices of Kaleb Watson, Cameron Walters, and Mohammed Haitham will never be forgotten.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2333. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 98-183, as amended by Public Law 103-419, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on Civil Rights:

Gail Heriot from California.

SCOTTS BLUFF NATIONAL MONUMENT—100TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Scotts Bluff National Monument's official designation.

Having grown up in Gering, Nebraska, I am proud of the monument and the uniquely American story of the role it played in our westward migration. As one of the highest points in Nebraska, dominating the landscape, it stood as an unmistakable part of the Oregon Trail. When I look at the monument, I can't help but think of the brave pioneers of the Oregon Trail.

Stunning sights and Oregon Trail landmarks, such as Scotts Bluff Monument, must have been a source of awe on the arduous journey west. It had to have served as motivation to keep going and a relief to know they were well on their way.

Scotts Bluff was named for Hiram Scott, a fur trader who died nearby in 1828. Just as the monument's name comes from early economic activity in our region, the monument is still important to our regional economy, drawing 150,000 people from across America and around the world each and every year.

I thank the great folks who dedicate their time and hard work to keep the park in great condition so others may enjoy it for generations to come. It is with great pleasure I join with all Nebraskans to celebrate the centennial of this Oregon Trail icon.

STARFISH EQUINE RESCUE

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to recognize a nonprofit organization in my district providing a home

and a future for horses who have experienced abuse and neglect. Starfish Equine Rescue works to rehabilitate and ultimately adopt unwanted, abused, and neglected horses.

Since 2012, this organization has been rescuing horses from the most deplorable conditions and giving them a second chance at life. Starfish Equine Rescue works hard to bring these horses back to health and identify caring and supportive homes in south Jersey and in surrounding states.

In addition to rescuing horses from abuse and neglect, Starfish Equine rescues horses that were slated for slaughter and are saved. And this is a practice that I have joined with Representative SCHAKOWSKY and other House colleagues in opposing under H.R. 961, which I hope someday will be the law of the land.

The volunteers at Starfish and the adoptive homes of these once vulnerable horses have provided a great service to south Jersey and into the future. We are proud of them. May God bless them.

IN RECOGNITION OF BO BIGGS OF LUMBERTON, NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to recognize my friend, Mr. Bo Biggs of Lumberton, North Carolina, on the occasion of his ascension to the chairmanship of the Golden LEAF Foundation, and in doing so, to acknowledge the significance to North Carolina of the organization he now leads.

Bo is an indefatigable servant of his community and state in business, professional, and civic leadership. Bo's life of service includes Antioch Baptist Church of Lumberton, the Lumberton Rotary Club, of which he is past president, the Lumberton Area Chamber of Commerce, the North Carolina Association of Certified Public Accountants, the FreeEnterprise Foundation, the Retail Merchants Association, and still others.

Time and again, Bo has invested himself in the State of North Carolina and its citizens, and that is why I am honored to recognize his new role with an organization that is committed to the same. I have seen firsthand the impact of Golden LEAF in North Carolina. It promotes cutting edge agriculture, creates new jobs, and provides scholarships for future leaders.

The Golden LEAF Foundation has a 20-year history of investing in Carolinians with over 60,000 jobs created, \$624 million in new payroll stimulated in economically distressed areas.

IN MEMORY J. DOYLE CORMAN

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District, I rise to offer our condolences on the passing of former State representative J. Doyle Corman.

Senator Corman represented the 34th senatorial district, including areas within Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District from 1977 to 1998. While in the State Senate, Senator Corman championed lower taxes, transportation issues, local government, and reforming the State's welfare system.

More importantly, Senator Corman was a family man who prided himself on titles other than "senator." Titles like: Public servant, husband, father, grandfather, great grandfather. These titles are Senator Corman's lasting achievements. Even more so fitting, as an example for his son, Jake, who ran for and won his Senate seat following his father's retirement and has served as the Pennsylvania State Senate majority leader for the last three legislative sessions.

A family man, community servant, and friend—that is the legacy of Senator J. Doyle Corman.

On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District, I again send our heartfelt condolences to the Corman family for the loss of such a great figure and public servant.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STATE SENATOR CORMAN

(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, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of former Pennsylvania State Senator J. Doyle Corman, who passed away peacefully on Sunday, December 8, at the age of 87. Doyle leaves behind his wife, Becky, with whom he raised five children. He was the proud grandfather of 13 grandchildren and 9 great grandchildren.

A Bellefonte native, Doyle faithfully served the people of Centre County for more than 20 years as State Senator, and 10 years prior to that as county commissioner. He was a man of principle, deeply committed to service and the betterment of his community. He left his mark on Harrisburg by championing critical transportation legislation, helping to make Pennsylvania a safer, more connected Commonwealth.

I can attribute Doyle's mentorship to where I am today, as he convinced me, in 2002, to follow in his footsteps to run for Centre County Republican Party chairman. Through the outpouring support from fellow Pennsylvanians, it is clear Doyle will be sorely missed but his legacy not soon forgotten.

I offer my prayers and deepest condolences to Becky and the entire Corman family.

CAROLS BY CANDLELIGHT

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, on December 13 through December 15, First Baptist Church of Jackson will present Carols by Candlelight, a much-loved Christmas music tradition in Mississippi that shares the good news of the birth of our Savior, Jesus Christ, through a magnificent Christmas concert.

This year, Carols by Candlelight celebrates its 50th anniversary, with more than 325 choir members, 60 orchestra members, and hundreds of volunteers. They will present five live performances for more than 16,000 people while many more will watch online.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate First Baptist Jackson on achieving this special milestone.

May God bless this 50th anniversary performance of Carols by Candlelight.

“Soli Deo Gloria.” To God alone be the glory.

FAIR PRICES, BETTER CURES

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEYER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I went to the doctor recently for a common ailment, and he prescribed an antibiotic.

I said, Well, Doc, let's check the price on that before we go any further. He said, Oh, don't worry about it. It is commonly used throughout the world. It is about \$6.

Well, guess what? It was \$6 dollars in the year 2011; and now the list price is about \$430.

Now, I have insurance provided by the House of Representatives, which I am thankful for, but even with that, it is still close to \$200. And then you have to start searching for a coupon to try to bring it down a little bit more.

So why does an antibiotic, that just a few years ago cost \$6 now cost over \$400 if someone has to pay cash?

Why? Why?

This is one of the premier questions before this body. And we debated this today in a prescription drug bill, and it was a robust debate and a good debate. And as I said earlier, I commend my Democrat colleagues for raising the issue and putting something on the table.

There were substantive policy disagreements with that bill. There is a realistic fear that if that bill became law, which the President said he will not sign, that we would undermine America's leading role in inventing lifesaving drugs. But there are real considerations as to how to contain costs.

□ 1545

We should be focused on negotiations and government programs.

I also commended my Republican colleagues for having an alternative

answer by coalescing all the bipartisan solutions that are innovative, that have come from both sides, and putting it together in one package that presented an alternative. But that didn't pass, either.

So we are stuck. We are right back to where we are.

But I only tell my own personal story not because this is about me. That is a simple issue, the little problem that I had. Many other Americans are suffering grievously from this ever-escalating, skyrocketing prescription drug problem.

Let's just take, for instance, the case of insulin. About 30 million Americans suffer from diabetes and need insulin.

I want to show you something here. Here is an important chart, Mr. Speaker. It starts down here in the year 2011. Basically, this is a chart that shows the price of insulin in 2001, about \$35, and here we are today, approaching \$300.

So, what is happening? That is about a 1,000 percent increase. Is insulin pretty much the same drug? Yes, there have been some modifications and improvements. There have been. Justifying a 1,000 percent increase? No, absolutely not.

What is going on here? The price of insulin has gone up dramatically, and there has to be a reason for it. Big pharmaceutical companies and middle management, responding to bad government policy, have created a huge mess in this healthcare space.

Not just this problem with insulin, but the average annual cost of a brand name drug has more than tripled in the past decade. Families with diabetic children, seniors on Medicare, and others face prohibitively high costs for these lifesaving drugs, and they deserve better.

I want to show you something else right quick, if I could. This is a chart of the last 5 years. Going back to the issue of insulin again, 30 million or so Americans need this drug.

This is a difference between what is called the average net price and the average list price. We have about \$400 here 5 years ago. Now, we are up to almost \$600.

But look at this net price. What does that mean? Well, the net price is the price, basically, that the manufacturer is getting. The middle sector here, the marketing sector here, is getting a much higher price.

So what is a solution? We didn't come up with a good solution today in debate on the House floor. So what is a real solution? Well, because we can't seem to solve the overall problem with one large piece of legislation, why don't we start with something very small? But it is not small to people affected by diabetes.

Why don't we just take this particular drug and allow the manufacturer to sell it directly to the patient? Again, we have an average price of about \$600 and a net price of \$135. That huge cost savings that could be at-

tained by a person in need by simply being able to pay this price is what I am talking about here.

I have dropped a piece of legislation, and I am really hopeful that it rallies Republicans and Democrats away from the big construct that we can't necessarily agree on, but we should continue to work toward, which involves major structural change. Why don't we do something that is very, very specific to one group of Americans that is suffering from exorbitantly high prices?

Basically, now, under this one-line bill, manufacturers would be allowed to sell insulin directly to a patient. It is just one line.

I am from Nebraska. Many people write to me and ask: Why does legislation have to be so complicated? Why don't you make it a single page? I have made this a single line, one line.

What we do when we do this is we begin to cut out these layers upon layers of management and bureaucracy that have driven the price upward, while being fair to the manufacturer and without undermining America's system of innovation that leads the world in producing lifesaving drugs.

Nonetheless, we have added this problem, or this middle management, if you will, to the way in which we dispense drug prices. That is part of the problem of why they have gone up so fast, especially around drugs like this. Again, not necessarily a brand-new formula. No extraordinary innovation has happened over the last number of decades, some changes, some modifications and improvements, but no way to justify these price increases.

I think this would be a good idea that actually could unite us, to get us away from the large philosophical differences when we discuss how we move forward, ensuring that we both find fair prices and better cures without undermining the good, innovative, leading industry in the United States, but an industry that has a real problem, that really ought to be rallying around solutions that I am suggesting here.

That is just one idea, but I am hopeful it is a start because this idea actually pulls a thread. It is specific enough to affect tens of millions of Americans. It would be so beneficial to lower costs, yet without infringing upon the dynamics of a good market system that we have.

I think this is an answer. Perhaps, this could be a good start.

Besides this one-line solution, Mr. Speaker, another obvious solution here should be the acceleration of generic drugs. Drug companies, however, have a long history of slow-walking generic drug approval through legal maneuvers, anticompetitive prices, and patent extensions.

I have been given a unique responsibility in helping to lead the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, which has oversight responsibility for the Food and Drug Administration. Through our focused efforts,

the FDA is reforming the generic approval process.

Cracking down harder on pharmaceutical companies that are exploiting loopholes to modify patents for not-so-unique drugs is one way to grow generics. Currently, even a small modification in a drug can be enough to get it approved by the Patent and Trademark Office.

In 2018, an analysis found that patent protection for 70 percent of the 100 best-selling drugs was extended at least once. This is a significant cost driver.

According to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, when generic competition exists, prices are often 80 percent to 85 percent less than brand-name drugs. With 90 percent of generic prescriptions available for less than \$20 for patients with insurance, that translates into very real savings for families across this country.

The Government Accounting Office says that generics can save the United States healthcare system—get this—well over \$1 trillion in a 10-year window.

We could spend another hour speaking about the financial difficulties that we are having. We have a good, strong, growing economy. Many people are finally, thankfully, finding access to meaningful work, and there is an appropriate upward pressure on wages in this country.

But what erodes that? The escalating cost of healthcare. For people who are in need of lifesaving drugs, this is fundamentally unfair.

Again, our efforts at trying to move generics faster to market, identify abuse, and stop it can result in savings like this. This is huge. This is good public policy, and we are working on it.

Another important piece of legislation allows the pharmacist to tell a patient about therapeutically equivalent but less costly drugs as an alternative method that is less expensive. For a small number of lifesaving but rarely used what we call orphaned drugs, we also need to prevent single corporations from exploiting a small market niche of desperate patients who sometimes find themselves in a life-or-death struggle.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest this: Getting at another root cost driver of prescription drugs, we need to change how we procure drugs in large public programs. Our government, through Medicare, Medicaid, TRICARE, and other programs, is the largest purchaser of prescription drugs in the world. The Department of Health and Human Services, however, is prohibited by law from negotiating with manufacturers what it pays, but not the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the way.

There is broad bipartisan consensus in Congress, as well as with the White House, that this policy needs to change. We should be negotiating. I should note that was part of the earlier bill submitted to the floor—again, substantive policy disagreements that

could potentially undermine America's leading role.

But that aspect of this in the Democratic bill that was submitted is an important public policy initiative. Again, I commend my colleagues in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, a prescription drug should do two simple things. It should cure disease, but at a fair price. And as we have seen today, there were two very large bills debated, but unfortunately, in this political environment, one is a Democratic bill, and one is a Republican bill, and no consensus exists.

But after the smoke clears, I hope that reasonable people will make way and will make a pathway for the right solutions and not political anger.

This system is sick. Our people deserve better cures at fairer prices.

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

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, with love of country at heart and my mnemonic notes in hand.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, remembering something from my childhood. My grandfather was a minister, and he reminded the grandchildren that there is no one so blind as he who chooses not to see. 20/20 vision, but the person who chooses not to see is the blindest of all. No one is so blind as those who choose not to see.

I bring this to the attention of those who are listening for a specific reason. I cannot impose understanding. I cannot cause people to say that they understand that which they already understand but choose not to acknowledge.

What I can do is this: I can encourage us to open our eyes and see what is happening to our country, the country that I assume we all love. I encourage us to see what is happening to public discourse, to pay attention to things that are happening in the public arena that are greatly different than the things we have been acclimated to.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we should have, in our public discourse, the Chief Executive Officer saying things that we don't want our children to repeat. The Chief Executive Officer is to be a leader in many ways.

We tell our children: One day you can grow up and be the Chief Executive Officer. You can be the head of state. And we want people to look up to the Chief Executive Officer, to the head of state.

□ 1600

I don't think most of us would have our children go to a public rally and engage in some of the discourse that we have seen, some of the scatology,

the profanity that seems to become a part of this discourse and is almost commonplace now from the Chief Executive Officer.

My dear friends, there is something happening to us. While it may not occur all in 1 day, over a period of time, it can become commonplace.

Have you not noticed how on the various talk shows people are using a level of discourse that we would find unacceptable, that I find unacceptable, that was not commonplace some years ago, not so very long ago? I am hearing more profanity being used.

I am not a perfect servant. I am a public servant. I am not a perfect person. I don't claim to be perfect. But I can say to you that I want to live in a country where children are proud to grow up and say they want to be like that person who happens to be the Chief Executive Officer.

At some point, something has to say to us that something is going on here that is unacceptable. When you weaponize hate so that you can have an advantage, there is something wrong. We ought not weaponize hate and bigotry to gain an advantage. We ought not try to, with intentionality, create ashes on the dreams of others, turn them into ashes so that we can fulfill some desire. We ought not, with intentionality, say things that we know are not true that can be harmful to others.

I am not a perfect servant, but I see something happening to my country, and I beg that we open our eyes and look at this for what it is. The level of hate is increasing. The level of harm being done to people by others that they don't know who will traverse great distances just to hurt them because they happen to be of a certain ancestry, who go into a certain neighborhood to hurt people because they happen to be of a certain religion, we are seeing more of this level of hate.

I say to you that we must open our eyes and see what is happening to our country. There is a desire to believe that this is just something that we can laugh at, that it is just amusing. This discourse that we see when the Chief Executive Officer has throngs of people around him making light of things that at one time we would not tolerate.

There is something wrong when you start to tolerate this. Those who tolerate hate perpetuate hate. We are going to be a part of the reason why this continues to grow, to propagate, to infect our society.

We can do something about this. We should not allow this level of discourse to continue.

By the way, the something that we can do about it is not allow it to be something that we accept. We don't have to do anything more, for some of us, than change the channel. Maybe that will send a message, when they don't get good ratings. Or don't attend events where these kinds of things are taking place. We don't have to make this something that is acceptable to any one of us.

I mention all of these things because I know that this level of ugly discourse is going to be something that we are going to have to live with for a lot longer than we choose, unless we choose to do something about it.

I ask of you just to pay attention to what is happening to our society. Pay attention to the words that are being said and the way people are being demeaned by the Chief Executive Officer, who sets the standard, who is a standard-bearer. Pay attention to what is going on.

I beg that, please, let's open our eyes and see how a single person is corrupting the discourse, not only, by the way, at rallies and among those who are on talk shows but also here in the Congress of the United States of America.

I arrived here in 2005. Since then, the discourse in Congress has changed to the extent that people are saying things that I thought we would never hear in the Congress in terms of scatology, profanity, demeaning commentary.

Now, I am not saying don't speak truth. Speak truth. But what I am saying is what we are saying to hurt people just to be harmful, to let people somehow be demeaned just to demean people, I find that unacceptable.

I just beg that we would not be so blind as those who choose not to see. I think that society is not lost overnight, but the genesis of the loss is discourse, public discourse that degenerates to the extent that the humanity of every person is lessened, where people at some point conclude: Those people, they don't belong. Those people, they don't count.

Every human being means something and counts. We ought not allow ourselves to allow things to happen to babies in cages. We ought not allow ourselves to conclude that certain religions are unacceptable. What can happen to one religion can happen to any religion. Every child is precious. We ought to respect the humanity of every person and accord a certain amount of decency to all people. I cannot believe some of the things that we are now tolerating.

There was a time in this country when we would not tolerate having a person acknowledge that, among racists and bigots, there were some very fine people or nice people. There was a time when we wouldn't tolerate that, but we do now. There was a time when certain tropes that are being used and propagated, we wouldn't tolerate it, but we do now.

My comment to America, to our country, and to the people who care is, at some point, this level of hate is going to become a bigger problem than we care to deal with, unless we deal with it now. We should. We should deal with it. We cannot allow it to become something that future generations will have to contend with. It is easy to believe that this is a temporary condition until it is no longer a temporary condition.

"Irreparable harm" is a term that we use in law. At some point, this becomes irreparable harm. At some point, there are some people who will suffer to the extent that they can't recover.

I know of people in the Latino community who live with a great degree of apprehension. People born in this country, Americans, live with a great degree of apprehension because of what happened in El Paso.

I know of people who are of a certain faith, citizens of this country, who live with apprehension because of what happened in Charlottesville.

We ought not allow the discourse, this incitive discourse, to create circumstances where people are harmed. We are seeing it happen, but I think that some of us choose not to see the harmful impact that it is having on our society.

My message is very simple today. I beg, let's take a look, just open our eyes and let's look at what is happening to our country. If we can do this, we can change this.

This ought not be the case in the greatest country in the world. There is no one so blind as he who chooses not to see. I hope that understanding will prevail and that we will decide that we will not tolerate the level of hateful discourse that we are suffering and that many people suffer from because there are other persons who hurt them after being exposed to this incitive discourse, this incendiary language, this weaponization of hate. People are hurting.

I don't say these things because I want to make sure I personally am protected. I come to this podium to bring these words and this message because I know of the suffering in various communities.

Those who are suffering from anti-Semitism, I know about it. Those who are suffering from racism, I know. Those who are suffering from the various insidious forms of hate related to who you happen to be, I know about it. The homophobia, the Islamophobia, the xenophobia, all of the various phobias that are harmful to people, I know.

I have constituents, and I know that they expect me to do this. They expect someone to say that people are quietly suffering. They expect us to do this. They send us to Congress to do this. We ought not tolerate this level of hate because we perpetuate it, and we ought to do something about it.

In the beginning was the word. This is the word. I am talking about it now. But there is much more that we can do, and I pray that we will become, each of us, a committee of one to do something about the hate that is being perpetrated among people in this country that is causing harm to other people in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

EXPLANATORY MATERIAL STATEMENT ON INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION MEASURES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018, 2019, AND 2020, SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHIFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the explanation of the Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020 (hereinafter, "the Act").

This explanation reflects the result of negotiations and disposition of issues reached between the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) (hereinafter, "the Agreement"). The explanation shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The explanation comprises three parts: an overview of the application of the annex to accompany this statement; unclassified congressional direction; and a section-by-section analysis of the legislative text.

PART I: APPLICATION OF THE CLASSIFIED ANNEX

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the HPSCI and SSCI (collectively, the "congressional intelligence committees") from publicly disclosing many details concerning the conclusions and recommendations of the Agreement. Therefore, a classified Schedule of Authorizations and a classified annex have been prepared to describe in detail the scope and intent of the congressional intelligence committees' actions. The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds not altered or modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations as requested in the President's budget, subject to modification under applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified annex is the result of negotiations between the congressional intelligence committees. They reconcile the differences between the congressional intelligence committees' respective versions of the bill for the National Intelligence Program (NIP) for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020. The Agreement also makes recommendations for the Military Intelligence Program (MIP) and the Information Systems Security Program (ISSP), consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, and provides certain direction for these two programs. The Agreement applies to IC activities for Fiscal Year 2020.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the bill pursuant to Section 5102 of Subdivision 1. It has the status of law. The classified annex supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the bill and the classified Schedule of Authorizations. The congressional intelligence committees view direction and recommendations, whether contained in this explanation or in the classified annex, as requiring compliance by the Executive Branch.

PART II: SELECT UNCLASSIFIED CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Unclassified Direction related to Subdivision 1 of the Act relates to Fiscal Year 2020. Unclassified Direction related to Subdivision 2 originated in Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The term "Committees" refers to both SSCI and HPSCI.

UNCLASSIFIED DIRECTION RELATED TO
SUBDIVISION 1

Plans for Operations During Government Shutdowns by All Elements of the Intelligence Community.

The Committees have an active interest in the impact of government shutdowns on the intelligence mission. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-11, Section 124, outlines how agencies are supposed to plan for operations during government shutdowns, and Section 124.2 provides that agencies must share those plans with OMB. Additionally, Section 323 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 requires the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and IC elements within the Department of Defense (DoD) to share those same plans with specified congressional committees, including the congressional intelligence committees.

These requirements, however, omit IC elements that are not separate “agencies” for the purposes of OMB Circular A-11, Section 124, and are not ODNI, CIA, or elements within the DoD for the purposes of the IAA for Fiscal Year 2014. As a result, no such reporting requirement currently exists for IC elements within the Departments of Justice, Treasury, Energy, State, and Homeland Security. For that reason, when portions of the federal government were shut down between December 2018 and February 2019, the Committees had little to no insight into the effects of the shutdown on these and other important segments of the IC.

Therefore, the Committees direct IC elements within the Departments of Justice, Treasury, Energy, State, and Homeland Security to submit to the congressional intelligence committees—on the same day as the host department’s issuance of any plan for a government shutdown—the number of personnel in their respective elements that will be furloughed.

Program Manager-Information Sharing Environment Review.

Section 1016 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 (IRTPA) created a Program Manager-Information Sharing Environment (PM-ISE), administered from within the ODNI, to better facilitate the interagency sharing of terrorism-related information. Section 1016 also designated the PM-ISE as a presidentially-appointed position. Section 6402 of Subdivision 2 of the Act amends the IRTPA, so that the PM-ISE is subject to appointment by the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), not the President. Since the establishment of the PM-ISE, the Federal government has created entities, procedures, and processes to address directly the mandate for improved terrorism information sharing. Accordingly, the Committees find it appropriate to reconsider the future of the PM-ISE’s mission.

Therefore, the Committees direct the ODNI, in consultation with appropriate Federal departments, agencies, and components, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, to conduct a review of the PM-ISE’s terrorism information sharing mission, associated functions, and organizational role within the ODNI and provide findings and recommendations on the future of the PM-ISE to Congress.

Leveraging Academic Institutions in the Intelligence Community.

The Committees encourage the DNI and the Director of the DIA to ensure that IC elements continue to forge tighter partnerships with leading universities and their affiliated research centers in order to enhance mutual awareness of domestic and international challenges, leverage subject matter experts

from higher education in a manner that uses cutting edge technologies and methods, and bolsters the recruitment of top-notch, diverse, and technically proficient talent into the IC’s workforce.

The Committees further believe that IC-sponsored academic programs such as the Intelligence Community Centers for Academic Excellence (IC-CAE) should work closely with educational institutions that offer interdisciplinary courses of study and learning opportunities in national and international security; geopolitical affairs, international relations and national security; interdisciplinary courses of study in the culture, history, languages, politics, and religions of major world regions; foreign language instruction; computer and data science; or cybersecurity.

The DNI shall ensure that such programs are facilitated via the streamlining of the security clearance process for graduating students from such universities who receive offers of employment from IC elements, provide for the temporary exchange of faculty and IC professionals, including as visiting fellows, and technical training opportunities for faculty, students, and IC personnel.

Therefore, the Committees direct all IC agencies to support the IC-CAE effort by tracking recruits and new hires who have graduated from IC-CAE-designated institutions, promptly reporting these numbers to the office in charge of IC-CAE implementation, and increasing all IC agencies’ efforts to recruit from such institutions.

Access to Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities.

The Committees remain concerned about impediments for companies with appropriately cleared personnel being able to perform work for government entities and the effects of these impediments on IC access to innovative products and services. For example, businesses without access to a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF), which includes many small businesses and non-traditional contractors, find it difficult to perform classified work for the IC. Construction and accreditation of SCIF spaces may be cost-prohibitive for small business and non-traditional government contractors.

Additionally, SCIF construction timelines often exceed the period of performance of a contract. A modern trend for innovative and non-traditional government contractors is the use of co-working space environments. Additionally, public and private entities are partnering to create emerging regional innovation hubs to help identify technology solutions and products in the private sector that can be utilized by the DoD and IC. These innovation hubs currently produce an agile, neutral, but largely unclassified, development environment.

Therefore, the Committees direct the ODNI to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on:

1. Processes and procedures necessary to build, certify, and maintain certifications for multi-use sensitive compartmented facilities not tied to a single contract and where multiple companies can securely work on multiple projects at different security levels;

2. Analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of issuing DoD Contract Security Specification (DD Form 254s) to Facilities” as opposed to Contracts”;

3. Options for classified co-use and shared workspace environments such as innovation, incubation, catalyst, and accelerator environments;

4. Pros and cons for public, private, government, or combination owned facilities that can operate at different classification levels; and

5. Any other opportunities to support companies with appropriately cleared personnel but without effective access to a neutral SCIF.

Inclusion of Security Risks in Program Management Plans Required for Acquisition of Major Systems in the National Intelligence Program.

Section 5305 of Subdivision 1 of the Act adds security risk as a factor for the DNI to include in the annual Program Management Plans for major system acquisitions submitted to the congressional intelligence committees pursuant to Section 102A(q)(1)(A) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(q)(1)(A)). The Committees are increasingly concerned with the security risks to IC acquisitions. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 directed updates to Intelligence Community Directive 731, Supply Chain Risk Management, and Committee leadership has engaged senior industry representatives about the threats to the national security industrial base posed by adversaries and competitors, including China. Over the past few years, the Department of Defense has been elevating security as a “fourth pillar” (to complement cost, schedule, and performance) in reviewing defense acquisitions, embodied in the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence’s “Deliver Uncompromised” initiative.

Section 5305 of the Act extends that focus to the IC, requiring the annual Program Management Plans to include security risks in major system acquisitions, in addition to cost, schedule, and performance. The Committees recognize that security can be applied across a number of areas (facilities, personnel, information, and supply chain) and may vary by program, to appropriately ensure system integrity and mission assurance.

Therefore, for the purposes of implementing section 5305 of the Act, the Committees direct the Director of National Intelligence, with the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, to develop parameters for including security risks (and risk management measures) in the annual Program Management Plans to assist congressional oversight.

Intelligence Community Public-Private Talent Exchange.

The Committees fully support section 5306 of Subdivision 1’s implementation in accordance with applicable federal ethics laws, regulations, and policies.

Expansion of Scope of Protections for Identities of Covert Agents.

Section 5303 of Subdivision 1 of the Act removes temporal and geographic limitations on the definition of “covert agent”, as that term was defined by Section 606 of the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982, P.L. 97-200 (Jun. 23, 1982) (IIPA).

Such limitations originally carved out of the IIPA unauthorized disclosures of certain kinds of classified identity information—those generally involving persons who have not served or acted abroad in the last five years—on grounds that such disclosures are generally less harmful to national security, and therefore undeserving of IIPA protections. But experience since then has proven otherwise. With the benefit of experience, the Committees have concluded that any disclosure of currently classified identity information, without regard to the location or recency of the activities of the person whose information is disclosed, can risk serious harm to national security. That being the case, such disclosures should potentially present a basis, under appropriate circumstances, for prosecution under the IIPA.

The Committees wish to stress, however, that the change does not imply any enhanced risk of IIPA liability for journalists.

In the thirty-seven years since enactment, the statute has never been used to prosecute members of the media. In fact, prosecutors have charged violations of the IIPA in only two cases, both of which involved unauthorized disclosures by former federal government employees of classified information obtained during their employment. The Committees view this sparse record, so far as traditional newsgathering and publication is concerned, as reflecting the heavy, constraining influence of the First Amendment's Press Clause. Journalists continue to this day to report aggressively on intelligence matters.

The IIPA's enforcement history also reflects the narrowness of Section 601(c), a provision which some have interpreted to expose traditional journalists to the risk of liability under the statute. But in the Committees' view, that provision does not cover responsibly investigating and reporting news in the public interest. There is a high burden for conviction under Section 601(c). It requires a prosecutor to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, among other things, that a defendant engaged in a "pattern of activities": a series of acts with the common purpose or objective of identifying and publicly exposing covert agents. Such conduct entails "engag[ing] in a purposeful enterprise of revealing covert identities" or being in the "business of naming names," as the Conference Report to the IIPA put it in 1982. H.R. Rep. No. 97-580, at 9 (1982).

Traditional news gathering and publication—including on abuses of power, violations of law and civil liberties, and other controversial activity—does not require, or even typically involve, such conduct. Indeed, as the Conference illustrated the point:

The reporters who have investigated the activities of Wilson and Terpil, former CIA employees who allegedly supplied explosives and terrorist training to Libya, would not be covered even if they revealed the identity of covert agents if their pattern of activities was intended to investigate illegal or controversial activities, and not to identify covert agents. Similarly, David Garrow would not be within the scope of the statute even though he purported to give the identity of covert agents in his book, "The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.: from 'Solo' to Memphis." His intent presumably was to explain what drove the FBI to wiretap Martin Luther King and not to identify and expose covert agents.

H.R. Rep. No. 97-580, at 10. The same holds true for traditional, responsible journalists today. Even after amendments made by the Act, their work does not risk liability under the revised IIPA.

Furthermore, section 5303 has no effect on what information may be withheld under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (FOIA). Section 5303 expands the universe of "covert agents" whose classified relationship with the United States Government is protected by the criminal law. All of the people protected by the expanded "covert agent" definition have a relationship with the United States government that is already classified. If an individual's relationship with the government is classified, it may be withheld under FOIA. Consequently, even before passage of section 5303, identifying information for all of the individuals covered by the IIPA expansion could already have been withheld under FOIA's (b)(1) exemption for national security information. In general, when justifying withholding under FOIA information that tends to identify covert agents, agencies should use (b)(1) classification exemptions, not (b)(3) exemp-

tions regarding the IIPA and other statutes. 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(1), (3).

Section 5303 is not intended to—and does not—affect Congress' authority to oversee the IC. Section 5303 is not intended to—and does not—affect the protections afforded to whistleblowers to disclose violations of law and waste, fraud, and abuse to Inspectors General or to Congress.

Intelligence Community Cooperation with the Government Accountability Office.

The Committees believe the Government Accountability Office (GAO) adds significant value to the Committees' oversight efforts. For example, the GAO's designation in 2018 of the government-wide Personnel Security Clearance process to its high-risk list of federal areas needing reform to prevent waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement, was important to the Committees' efforts to legislate on security clearance reform, including in this Act. The Committees expect that all IC elements will fully and promptly comply with requests from the GAO made to support studies requested by, or of interest to, the Committees.

Clarification of Death Benefits for Survivors of Central Intelligence Agency Personnel.

The Committees concur with the Executive Branch that section 5341 of Subdivision 1 of the Act shall apply retroactively from the date of enactment of this Act.

Intelligence Community Leave Policies.

The Committees find it imperative that the federal government, to include the IC, recruit, hire, and retain a highly qualified workforce. That depends in part on offering federal personnel a competitive benefits package—including with respect to parental leave and related benefits. Toward that end, the Committees strongly believe the federal government must align such benefits to the fullest extent possible with those of leading U.S. private sector companies and other industrialized countries.

In furtherance of that objective, the Committees in their respective bills supported a provision to provide twelve weeks of paid parental leave to all IC employees. The Committees further support the succeeding provision in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2020 that provides government employees, to include those in the IC, with twelve weeks of paid administrative leave in the event of birth of a child, or the placement of a child for purposes of adoptive or foster care. This is consistent with, and supersedes, provisions that were contained in the House-passed and Senate-passed Intelligence Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020. Importantly, that NDAA provision does not modify or otherwise affect the eligibility of an IC employee for benefits relating to leave under any other provision of law, to include the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), 29 U.S.C. § 2601, *et seq.*

Moreover, so far as concerns the provision's implementation, the Committees direct the DNI, within 180 days after enactment of this Act, to provide a briefing for the Committees on how each element of the IC will implement 5 U.S.C. section 6382(d)(2), as provided by this Act.

Transfer of National Intelligence University.

The Committees have been closely watching the evolution of how the IC provides for advanced intelligence education. The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) has hosted an intelligence college since 1962, which has been academically accredited since 1983. When the ODNI was created in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, ODNI created a separate National Intelligence University (NIU) under its auspices as a complement to DIA's intel-

ligence effort. In response to a report from the President's Intelligence Advisory Board that accused the ODNI of being inadequately focused, the ODNI in 2011 transferred the NIU to DIA's intelligence college and rebranded the new combined institution as NIU.

Pursuant to the Joint Explanatory Statement to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, an independent panel offered alternative governance models to enhance NIU, to include a more prominent role for ODNI. In parallel, analyses of DIA by the Secretary of Defense and the HPSCI during the 115th Congress concluded that DIA would benefit from moving NIU elsewhere in the IC.

The Committees believe transferring NIU to ODNI is now appropriate if certain conditions, contained in section 5324 of Subdivision 1 of the Act, are met. The Committees believe that clear commitment from the DNI and Principal Deputy DNI is critical to NIU's success at ODNI. The Committees look forward to working with ODNI and DoD on the successful transfer of NIU.

Associate Degree Program Eligibility.

The Committees are concerned that students enrolled in, or who have graduated from, Associate Degree programs have insufficient opportunities to gain employment in the IC. Therefore, the Committees direct the ODNI to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on how to expand the number of opportunities for students pursuing or having earned an Associate Degree eligible for IC academic programs. The Committees also direct the ODNI to make information about these academic programs publicly available.

Exposing Predatory and Anticompetitive Foreign Economic Influence.

The Committees are concerned about the significant threat posed by foreign governments that engage in predatory and anticompetitive behaviors aimed to undercut critical sectors of the United States economy. Therefore, the Committees direct the DNI, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report identifying top countries that pose a substantial threat to the United States economy regarding technology transfer issues, predatory investment practices, economic espionage, and other anticompetitive behaviors. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, but may include a classified annex.

Furthermore, the DNI, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury and other agencies that the Director deems appropriate, shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees assessing the costs and benefits of requiring a foreign person or entity that invests in the United States (and is subject to the jurisdiction of a country that poses a substantial threat to the United States economy) to submit annual disclosures to the Federal Government. Such disclosures would include all investments that the foreign person or entity made in the United States during the preceding year; the ownership structure of the entity; and any affiliation of the entity with a foreign government. The report should detail how such information could be used by the IC and other elements of the Federal government working to identify and combat foreign threats to the United States economy, and the appropriate scope and thresholds for such disclosures. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Increasing Data Security.

The Committees are aware the IC faces challenges while trying to balance mission

and enterprise needs with IT modernization, including the migration of data and applications to the cloud. With this in mind, the Committees encourage the IC to identify and utilize technologies that increase the security posture of data and workloads and reduce cyber risks.

The Committees further recommend that:

1. IC elements identify, develop, and implement tools for bi-directional data migration and division interoperability between data center and cloud environments;

2. These tools include, but are not limited to, encryption of data while both at rest and in motion, and micro-segmentation of networks and workloads; and

3. IC elements prioritize shifting resources towards automation as a way to respond more quickly to cyber threats.

Anonymous Annual Survey Regarding Workplace Climate.

IC elements obtain mission-critical information from the results of anonymous, annual surveys of their employees, on issues related to workplace climate and retention. As necessary as they are to the elements' own activities, survey results are also vital to the Committees' continuing oversight of elements' efforts to address workplace climate and retention issues, and to propose legislative and other remedies where appropriate.

The need for reliable information is especially acute with respect to sexual harassment and discrimination, given that—established policy and legal protections notwithstanding—an employee may fear that directly raising concerns about such matters risks exposing the employee to retaliatory personnel, security clearance, or other actions. The anonymous survey affords the element, and the Committees, a mechanism for inquiring further about the extent of this well-documented chilling effect against reporting; and about the effectiveness (or not) of ongoing programs to uncover and root out sexual harassment, discrimination, and other illegal and/or inappropriate activities at the workplace.

Therefore, the Committees direct that no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, the DNI must certify in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that:

1. At least once a year, each element of the IC submits a survey to its employees regarding workplace climate and retention matters, and affords employees completing such surveys the option to remain anonymous;

2. Such survey includes questions regarding employees' experiences with sexual assault, discrimination, harassment, including sexual harassment, and related retaliation, including, at a minimum, the questions covering the following topics:

a. Have you witnessed sexual harassment or sexual assault?

i. Did you report it?

ii. If not, why not?

b. Have you experienced sexual harassment or sexual assault?

i. Did you report it?

ii. If not, why not?

c. Have you experienced retaliation for reporting harassment, discrimination, or sexual assault?

i. Have you faced retribution for taking leave for family, medical, or other personal reasons?

ii. Did you fear retribution for taking leave?

3. Each element includes in its survey questions regarding the job series, position, age, gender, race or ethnicity, field, and job location at the time of the survey's completion;

4. Each element tracks employees' responses according to job series, position, age, gender, race or ethnicity, field, and location at the time of the survey's completion; and

5. Each element reports the results of its survey annually to the congressional intelligence committees.

Report to Congress on the Representation of Women and Minorities in the Workforce.

The Committees continue to strongly support IC efforts to identify, recruit, and retain a highly diverse and highly qualified workforce—including, in particular, its efforts to increase the representation within elements of the IC of women and minorities.

This is a data driven exercise. Bolstering and adjusting IC workforce diversity programs depends in part on the Committees' regularly obtaining current, detailed, and reliable information, and about specific matters relevant to the broader subject of workforce diversity—such as rates and areas of promotion of women and minority employees. However, some elements may produce such information only from time to time; others may make regular submissions to the Committees but include only general information.

Therefore, the Committees direct that every six months, the head of each element of the IC shall submit to the Committees a written report that shall include, at a minimum:

1. The total number of women and minorities hired by that element during the reporting period and a calculation of that figure as a percentage of the agency's total hiring for that period;

2. The distribution of women and minorities at that element by grade level and by job series in the element's total workforce during the reporting period, together with comparisons from the immediately preceding two years;

3. The number of women and minorities who applied for promotion at the element and the final number selected for promotion during the reporting period;

4. The proportion of the total workforce of the element occupied by each group or class protected by law, as of the last day of the reporting period;

5. The numbers of minorities and women serving in positions at the element requiring advanced, specialized training or certification, as well as the proportion of the workforce those groups occupy; and

6. To the extent that such element deploys civilian employees to hazardous duty locations, the number of women and minority employees who departed government service subsequent to a deployment undertaken by an employee in the previous two years.

Report on Geospatial Commercial Activities for Basic and Applied Research and Development.

The Committees direct the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), in coordination with the DNI, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), within 90 days of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional intelligence and defense committees a report on the feasibility, risks, costs, and benefits of providing the private sector and academia, on a need-driven and limited basis—consistent with the protection of sources and methods, as well as privacy and civil liberties—access to data in the possession of the NGA for the purpose of assisting the efforts of the private sector and academia in basic research, applied research, data transfers, and the development of automation, artificial intelligence, and associated algorithms. Such report shall include:

1. Identification of any additional authorities that the Director of NGA would require to provide the private sector and academia with access to relevant data on a need-driven and limited basis, consistent with applicable

laws and procedures relating to the protection of sources, methods, privacy and civil liberties; and

2. Market research to assess the commercial and academic interest in such data and determine likely private-sector entities and institutions of higher education interested in public-private partnerships relating to such data.

NRO Contracting Restrictions.

The Committees continue to be very concerned that NRO imposes unnecessary contractual restrictions that prohibits or discourages a contractor from contacting or meeting with a congressional intelligence committee or intelligence committee Member offices. Therefore, the Committees direct NRO to remove all restrictions that impacts contractors from contacting or meeting with the congressional intelligence committees or member offices in all current and future contracts to include pre-coordination with executive branch agencies.

Enhancing Automation at the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

The Committees strongly support efforts to leverage commercial advances in automation of imagery such as electro-optical, infrared, Wide Area Motion Imagery (WAMI), Full Motion Video (FMV), and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) products to reduce manual processing and improve information flow to users. However, the Committees are concerned that NGA does not dedicate adequate resources to integrate new automation techniques, which have resulted in years of research into the issue, but limited operation gains during day-to-day imagery processing.

Therefore, the Committees direct NGA, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, to brief the congressional intelligence and defense committees on an updated plan to reduce manual processing of imagery such as electro-optical, infrared, WAMI, FMV, and SAR to improve information flow to users. The briefing shall also address:

1. NGA's strategy to leverage commercial advances;

2. The various GEOINT automated exploitation development programs across the National System for Geospatial-Intelligence, and the associated funding and specific purpose of said programs;

3. Any similar efforts by government entities outside the National System for Geospatial-Intelligence of which NGA is aware; and

4. Which of these efforts may be duplicative.

Redundant Organic Software Development.

The Committees are concerned that NGA is developing software solutions that are otherwise available for purchase on the commercial market. This practice often increases the time it takes to deliver new capabilities to the warfighter; increases the overall cost of the solution through expensive operational and maintenance costs; and undermines the U.S. software industrial base.

Therefore, the Committees direct NGA, within 60 days of enactment of this Act, to brief the Committees, to identify all NGA developed software programs and explain why they are being developed organically instead of leveraging commercially available products.

Critical Skills Recruiting for Automation.

Although cutting edge sensors have provided the IC and Department of Defense with exquisite imagery, full motion video (FMV), and wide area motion imagery (WAMI), intelligence analysts are unable to keep pace with the volume of data being generated. This demands a transformation in the way the intelligence enterprise processes, organizes, and presents data. For that reason, the

Committees fully support the NGA's efforts to attract, recruit, and retain a highly competent workforce that can acquire and integrate new data automation tools.

Therefore, the Committees direct NGA, within 60 days of enactment of this Act, to brief the congressional intelligence and defense committees on NGA's efforts to recruit critical skills such as mathematicians, data scientists, and software engineers that possess critical skills needed to support NGA's objectives in automation.

Common Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility.

The Committees have become aware of several major impediments to companies performing work for agencies and organizations like the NRO. For example, businesses without ownership of a SCIF find it very difficult to perform classified work. Additionally, these small businesses are challenged with basic obstacles such as becoming aware of classified work opportunities because it is difficult to obtain access to the IC's and DoD's classified marketplaces such as the Acquisition Resource Center (ARC). Construction and accreditation of SCIF spaces is cost-prohibitive for small business and non-traditional government contractors. Additionally, construction timeline often exceeds the period of performance of a contract.

A modern trend for innovative and non-traditional government contractors is the increased use of co-working space environments. Additionally, public and private entities are partnering to create emerging regional innovation hubs to help identify technology solutions and products in the private sector that can be utilized by the IC and DoD. These innovation hubs currently produce an agile, neutral, but largely unclassified development environment.

Therefore, the Committees direct the DNI, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, to brief the congressional intelligence committees on the following:

1. Steps necessary to establish new 'Common SCIFs' in areas of high demand;
2. What approaches allow for SCIF spaces to be certified and accredited outside of a traditional contractual arrangement;
3. Analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of issuing Department of Defense Contract Security Specification (DD Form 254s) to "Facilities," as opposed to "Contracts";
4. Options for classified co-use and shared workspace environments such as: innovation, incubation, catalyst, and accelerator environments;
5. Pros and cons for public, private, government, or combination owned classified neutral facilities; and
6. Any other opportunities to support those without ownership of a SCIF effective access to a neutral SCIF.

Improving Use of the Unclassified Marketplaces.

Another area where the Committees have become aware of major impediments for companies to perform work for agencies and organizations like the NRO are unclassified marketplaces such as the Acquisition Resource Center (ARC). Instead of posting data to unclassified marketplaces, unclassified NRO postings often refer to the classified side for critical yet unclassified information. If the NRO is serious about embracing commercial innovation, unclassified marketplace postings should remain on the unclassified side.

Therefore, the Committees direct NRO, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, to brief the Committees on options for improving the unclassified marketplace process.

Satellite Servicing.

No later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the DNI, in consulta-

tion with the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly provide the to the congressional intelligence and defense committees a briefing detailing the costs, risks, and operational benefits of leveraging commercial satellite servicing capabilities for national security satellite systems. The briefing shall include the following:

1. A prioritized list, with a rationale, of operational and planned assets of the Intelligence Community that could be enhanced by satellite servicing missions;
2. The costs, risks, and benefits of integrating satellite servicing capabilities as part of operational resilience; and
3. Potential strategies that could allow future national security space systems to leverage commercial in-orbit servicing capabilities where appropriate and feasible.

Commercial RF Mapping and SAR.

U.S. commercial companies are now offering space-based geolocation and geospatial intelligence (GEOINT) analysis of radio frequency (RF) emitters as well as synthetic aperture radar (SAR) products. These companies can identify, locate, and analyze previously undetected activity, providing new insights for U.S. national security and defense. The IC currently has contracts that leverage commercial electro-optical satellites, however it does not have a program in place to take full advantage of these emerging commercial space-based RF GEOINT and SAR capabilities.

Therefore, the Committees direct the NRO and NGA to brief the Committees on how it will leverage these commercial companies in Fiscal Year 2020 and beyond, to include funding for, as well as testing and evaluation efforts.

Commercial Remote Sensing.

The Committees support efforts to establish a light-touch regulatory structure that enables the rapidly evolving commercial space-based imagery, RF sensing, and radar industry markets to promote U.S. leadership in these areas. However, the Committees also support the needs of the U.S. Government to protect both IC and DoD personnel and assets. The Committees believe there can be a balance that supports both national security interests and the promotion of U.S. innovation and leadership.

Therefore, the Committees direct the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to brief the Committees within 60 days of the date of enactment of the Act, on efforts that help address this balance and which streamline the IC and DoD involvement in the rapidly evolving U.S. commercial space-based imagery, RF sensing, and radar industries.

Deception Detection Techniques.

The U.S. Government does not have sufficient security screening capabilities available to determine deception in individuals that intend to harm the United States. The polygraph has been an effective investigative tool to detect deception, but the cost and time required to administer a polygraph examination is a major cause for security clearance backlogs, and often limits the frequency of periodic examinations to every 5-7 years. Entities within DoD and the IC including DIA, Special Operations Command, NGA, Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, U.S. Air Force and others have expressed a desire to begin piloting new systems such as ocular deception detection systems. However, progress is being hindered by DoD Directive 5210.91 and ODNI Security Agent Directive 2, which direct some oversight of new deception detection technologies to the DoD National Center of Credibility Assessment (NCCA), which does not have sufficient budget or other resources

to expeditiously evaluate non-polygraph technologies.

Therefore, the Committees direct the DNI in coordination with the DoD to provide the congressional intelligence and defense committees with a briefing on what steps they are taking to ensure pilot programs are established to evaluate these new technologies to help reduce our backlog, improve efficiency, and reduce overall cost. Pilot programs shall evaluate current and emerging technologies to efficiently and rapidly verify the accuracy and truthfulness of statements of candidates for employment within the DoD/IC, including for interim security clearances, for periodic screening of cleared DoD/IC personnel, to screen foreign national collaborators and contractors overseas to prevent "Green-on-Blue" attacks, for immigration screening and for other purposes.

List of Foreign Entities That Pose a Threat to Critical Technologies.

The Committees direct the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to identify, compose, and maintain a list of foreign entities, including governments, corporations, nonprofit and for-profit organizations, and any subsidiary or affiliate of such an entity, that the Director determines pose a threat of espionage with respect to critical technologies or research projects, including research conducted at institutions of higher education.

Maintenance of this list will be critical to ensuring the security of the most sensitive projects relating to U.S. national security, such as defense and intelligence-related research projects. The initial list shall be available to the head of each qualified agency funding applicable projects and will include the following entities already identified as threatening: Huawei Technologies Company, ZTE Corporation, Hytera Communications Corporation, Hangzhou Hikvision Digital Technology Company, Dahua Technology Company, and Kaspersky Lab. The DNI and the Secretary of Defense, or a delegate from each agency, shall brief the findings to the congressional intelligence and defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of the Act.

Protection of National Security Research.

The Committees believe that institutes of higher learning, laboratories, and other entities and organizations play critical roles in advancing national security within the U.S. science and technology ecosystem that is charged with delivering the best capabilities to the warfighter in the near, mid, and long-term. The Committees understand that near-peer competitors such as China and Russia attempt to exploit and benefit from the open and collaborative global research environment created by the Reagan Administration's National Security Decision Directive 189 on the National Policy on the transfer of Scientific, Technical and Engineering Information. This directive established that the products of "fundamental research"—defined as "basic and applied research in science and engineering, the results of which ordinarily are published and shared"—should remain unrestricted.

The Committees are also aware that academia is not always kept apprised by the interagency of a complete picture of potential activities and threats in the research community, such as improper technology transfer, intellectual property theft, and cyber-attacks directly attributed to nation-state governments. Elsewhere in this bill and report, the Committees include measures to promote increased information sharing across the interagency and with academia.

Therefore, the Committees direct the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional intelligence and defense committees,

within 90 days of enactment of the Act, a report listing Chinese and Russian academic institutions that have a history of improper technology transfer, intellectual property theft, cyber espionage, or operate under the direction of their respective armed forces or intelligence agencies. The report should be in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Investments in Scientific and Technological Intelligence.

The Committees remain interested in the continued efforts of the DoD to improve scientific and technological intelligence (S&TI) capabilities and tradecraft across the Defense Intelligence Enterprise (DIE). The Committees recognize S&TI is critical to strategic competition with near-peer competitors by ensuring comprehensive understanding of adversary capabilities and ability to inform development of joint force fifth-generation advanced weapons systems and other emerging technologies.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I) in collaboration with the Director of the DIA, to provide a briefing to the Committees and the congressional defense committees within 75 days of enactment of the Act, on the alignment of current and planned DIE S&TI investments and activities to DoD operational and strategic requirements.

The briefing shall also include information on how the DoD will continue the maturation of S&TI capabilities and tradecraft across the DIE.

Intelligence Support to Defense Operations in the Information Environment.

The Committees support DoD efforts to improve capabilities and tradecraft to operate in the information environment. The Committees are concerned about the Defense Intelligence Enterprise's (DIE) ability to provide the information operations community with all-source intelligence support, consistent with the support provided to operations in other domains.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with the Joint Staff's Director for Intelligence and the DNI, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 30 days of enactment of the Act, on intelligence support to information operations. The briefing should include standardized defense intelligence lexicon for intelligence preparation of the battlefield for information operations, efforts to develop a process to ensure the full scope of emerging defense information operations threat requirements are structured to be addressed through the entirety of DIE capabilities, and how the DIE perceives the future of defense operations in the information environment.

The briefing shall also include a description of how the IC, through the National Intelligence Priorities Framework, will account for a more dynamic use of defense intelligence capabilities to augment and enhance support to DoD operations in the information environment.

ROTC IC Recruitment Trial Program.

The Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program, with units or affiliates at approximately 1,600 U.S. colleges and universities, is DoD's largest commissioning source, providing approximately 6,500 new active duty officers to the military each year.

Officer candidates enrolled in ROTC programs must meet all graduation requirements of their academic institutions, enroll in military, naval, or aerospace education courses, and attend summer military training, making them ideal candidates for IC placement. Currently, ROTC cadets only have the option to utilize their training by

joining one of the military services. The Committees believe the government can find cost savings and provide a wider range of opportunities to ROTC recruits by leveraging the ROTC's existing training program for the IC.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with ODNI, to conduct a feasibility study on creating a pathway for ROTC recruits to find employment in the IC, on a reimbursable basis. The study should examine:

1. Pros and cons of instituting an ROTC IC recruitment pipeline;
2. Approximate reimbursement cost per recruit; and
3. Legislative requirements for program execution.

The Committees direct that the study results be submitted via report to the Committees and the congressional defense committees within 90 days of enactment of the Act.

Explosive Ordinance Disposal Intelligence.

The Committees are concerned that the expertise of Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD) personnel is not adequately accessible and therefore, not sufficiently utilized by the Defense Intelligence Enterprise and IC to provide the combatant commands with the required intelligence to identify, combat, and deter violent extremism and other asymmetric threats.

Explosive ordnance includes all munitions, improvised explosive devices, devices containing explosives, propellants, nuclear fission or fusion materials, biological, and chemical agents. The primary consumer of this information are military tactical explosive ordnance disposal units that employ the data for threat identification and neutralization. However, the required analysis to determine appropriate render-safe capabilities requires operational and strategic intelligence to process and analyze the data, and data management processes to promulgate the resulting information. The Committees believe DoD should modernize the processes and procedures to more comprehensively track, manage, and coordinate the capability and capacity of EOD intelligence within the IC and the DIE to support all levels of render-safe capabilities.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with the ODNI, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 120 days of enactment of the Act on the capability and capacity of EOD intelligence expertise across the DIE and IC. The briefing shall include:

1. An assessment of the coordination and integration of defense and national intelligence capabilities against EOD intelligence requirements, to include a mitigation strategy to address any identified gaps or deficiencies, information-sharing challenges, or any other impediments to integration of EOD expertise across the defense and intelligence communities; and

2. An assessment of the technical skills needed to address EOD intelligence requirements, while identifying any gaps or deficiencies in current personnel hiring and training structures, and a long-term plan to develop proficiency of EOD intelligence expertise in the defense and intelligence communities.

Information-Sharing Arrangements with India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.

International alliances and partnerships are critical to the pursuit and sustainment of the United States national security objectives, built upon foundations of shared values and intent. The Committees recognize the importance of the DoD sharing information with international allies and partners in support of the planning and execution of the

National Defense Strategy, as allies and third-party international partners enhance strategic stability across the Department's purview while increasing effectiveness of operations. The Committees believe the mechanisms to share information across the "Five Eyes" alliance continue to mature through established exercises, exchange of personnel, and virtual data sharing, while that cooperation is potentially less robust with third-party partners.

The Committees support the roles and contributions of third-party partners such as India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, and recognizes their ongoing contribution toward maintaining peace and stability in the Indo-Pacific region. The Committees are interested in understanding the policies and procedures governing the collaboration and information sharing with India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the "Five Eyes" allies, and whether opportunities exist to strengthen those arrangements.

Therefore, the Committees direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)), in coordination with the ODNI, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 60 days of enactment of the Act, on the benefits, challenges, and risks of broadening the information-sharing mechanisms between India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the "Five Eyes" allies.

Transitioning the Function of Background Investigations to the Department of Defense.

Executive Order 13869 transitions the background investigation functions of the Federal Government from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), National Background Investigations Bureau, to the DoD, Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency. The Committees recognize the importance of ensuring timely and efficient background investigations to overcome workforce staffing challenges of cleared individuals across the whole of government and private sector, and to vet personnel who come into contact with the Department's personnel, installations, and technology. The Committees are aware of the temporary establishment of the Personnel Vetting Transformation Office in the OUSD(I) to manage the transition of this activity from OPM to the Department and improve the processes and procedures related to vetting personnel for clearances across the whole of government and private sector.

However, the Committees are concerned about the potential risks to personnel management and mission such a transfer may present, and believes that appropriate protections of civil liberties and privacy must be prioritized throughout the transition, through the implementation of modern and efficient vetting measures. The Committees recognize the Department's leadership, through sharing best practices with ODNI, in reforming the vetting process using modern techniques such as continuous evaluation, and expects regular updates on the Department's progress in addressing the current background investigations backlog.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with the Director of the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 90 days of enactment of the Act, on how the DoD will transfer the background investigation mission and establish an effective personnel vetting capability to provide for the security of the Department, while maintaining the civil liberties and privacy protections of personnel under consideration to receive a clearance.

Joint Intelligence Operations Center Staffing.

The Committees recognize the evolving operational and strategic priorities of the

DoD will impact Defense Intelligence Enterprise capabilities and resources. The Committees recognize the ongoing efforts by the USD(I) to comply with direction specified by the John. S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) to reduce and prevent imbalances in priorities and mitigate against insufficient or misaligned resources within the Defense Intelligence Enterprise.

While the Committees support the efforts by the USD(I) to create efficiencies across the Defense Intelligence Enterprise organizations, to include the Service Intelligence Centers and combatant command Joint Operations Intelligence Centers, and enable those elements to plan and posture staffing requirements accordingly, the Committees are concerned that the shifts in current and future resourcing lack coherence to support the global mandate of the Department.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with DIA, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 90 days of enactment of the Act on how the OUSD(I) and DIA are managing resourcing requirements to the combatant command Joint Intelligence Operations Centers to meet current and future needs of the combatant commanders and DoD.

China's Biological Weapons Program.

The Committees remain interested in ensuring the Defense Intelligence Enterprise is providing timely, accurate, and effective intelligence to support information needs of the DoD, and are aware of a recent GAO report on long-range emerging threats facing the United States that highlighted potential pursuit by near-peer competitors of biological weapons using genetic engineering and synthetic biology.

Therefore, the Committees direct the USD(I), in coordination with the Director of the DIA, to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 30 days of enactment of the Act with an assessment of China's current and projected biological weapons program, the risks presented to the joint force, and the mitigation strategies to protect U.S. military forces against said threats.

Machine-assisted Analytic Rapid Repository System Government Accountability Office Review.

The re-emergence of great power competition will stress DIA's ability to provide foundational military intelligence for the IC and warfighters. As such, the Committees are supportive of DIA's intent to replace the Modernized Integrated Database (MIDB) with the Machine-assisted Analytic Rapid Repository System (MARS).

However, the Committees are concerned that MARS's development and procurement will entail a complex and extensive transformation that will impact the DIA's delivery of foundational military intelligence.

Therefore, the Committees direct the GAO to provide a report to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within one year of enactment of the Act that describes:

1. The envisioned users and customer base and how they will use MARS;
2. An assessment of the transition plan from MIDB to MARS with input from current and historic MIDB users, as well as customers;
3. An assessment of the resources necessary to fully implement MARS, to include funding and personnel implications;
4. An assessment of DIA's acquisition strategy for MARS to include the use of any rapid acquisition or prototyping authorities; and
5. The challenges DIA has identified that it will face in transitioning from MIDB to

MARS and whether its migration plans are sufficient for addressing these challenges.

The Committees expect DIA's full cooperation with the GAO study.

Update on the DIA Strategic Approach.

In September 2018, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) adopted a Strategic Approach to enhance workforce development, improve foundational military intelligence data management, address perennial intelligence issues and realign roles and missions. Improvements in these issue areas will enhance the Agency's ability to support both the National Security Strategy and National Defense Strategy.

The Committees support the DIA's initiative to improve those structures it assesses are critical to providing warfighters the information needed to prevent and, if necessary, decisively win wars, such as intelligence on foreign militaries' capabilities.

Therefore, the Committees direct DIA to provide quarterly briefings, beginning 45 days after enactment of the Act, to the congressional intelligence and defense committees on its efforts to enhance workforce development, improve foundational military intelligence data management, address perennial intelligence issues, and realign roles and missions.

Report on Chinese Efforts Targeting Democratic Elections and U.S. Alliances and Partnerships and Strategy to Counter Chinese Election Interference.

The Committees direct the DNI, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide a report to the Committees, the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Homeland Security, and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs on the Chinese government's influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections.

The report shall be divided into two sections, which respectively address influence operations and campaigns targeting: (1) recent and upcoming elections in the United States (dating back to January 1, 2017), and (2) military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member. The report should also include a strategy to counter these activities. The Committees further direct the Secretary of Defense to provide an interim report within 30 days of enactment of the Act, and a final report within a year of enactment of the Act.

The report shall be unclassified and appropriate for release to the public but may include a classified annex. At a minimum, the report should include:

1. An assessment of China's objectives in influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member, and how such objectives relate to the China's broader strategic aims;
2. The United States' strategy and capabilities for detecting, deterring, countering, and disrupting such Chinese influence operations (including recommended authorities and activities) and campaigns and a discussion of the DoD's and the IC's respective roles in the strategy;
3. A comprehensive list of specific Chinese state and non-state entities involved in supporting such Chinese influence operations and campaigns and the role of each entity in supporting them;
4. An identification of the tactics, techniques, and procedures used in previous Chinese influence operations and campaigns;
5. A comprehensive identification of countries with democratic election systems that

have been targeted by Chinese influence operations and campaigns since January 1, 2017;

6. An assessment of the impact of previous Chinese influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member, including the views of senior Chinese officials about their effectiveness in achieving Chinese objectives;

7. An identification of countries with democratic elections systems that may be targeted in future Chinese influence operations and campaigns and an assessment of the likelihood that each such country will be targeted;

8. An identification of all U.S. military alliances and partnerships that have been targeted by Chinese influence operations and campaigns since January 1, 2017;

9. An identification of all U.S. military alliances and partnerships that may be targeted in future Chinese influence operations and campaigns and an assessment of the likelihood that each such country will be targeted; and

10. An identification of tactics, techniques, and procedures likely to be used in future Chinese influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member.

Report on Russian Efforts Targeting Democratic Elections and U.S. Alliances and Partnerships and Strategy to Counter Russian Election Interference.

The Committees direct the DNI, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide a report to the Committees, the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Homeland Security, and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs on Russia's influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections.

The report shall be divided into two sections, which respectively address influence operations and campaigns targeting: (1) recent and upcoming elections in the United States (dating back to January 1, 2017) and (2) military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member. The report should also include a strategy to counter these activities. The Committees further direct the Secretary of Defense to provide an interim report within 30 days of enactment of the Act, and a final report within a year of enactment of the Act.

The report shall be unclassified and appropriate for release to the public but may include a classified annex. At a minimum, the report should include:

1. An assessment of Russia's objectives in influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member, and how such objectives relate to Russia's broader strategic aims;
2. The United States strategy and capabilities for detecting, deterring, countering, and disrupting such Russian influence operations (including recommended authorities and activities) and campaigns and a discussion of the DoD's and IC's respective roles in the strategy;
3. A comprehensive list of specific Russian state and non-state entities involved in supporting such Russian influence operations and campaigns and the role of each entity in supporting them;
4. An identification of the tactics, techniques, and procedures used in previous Russian influence operations and campaigns;

5. A comprehensive identification of countries with democratic election systems that have been targeted by Russian influence operations and campaigns since January 1, 2017;

6. An assessment of the impact of previous Russian influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member, including the views of senior Russian officials about their effectiveness in achieving Russian objectives;

7. An identification of countries with democratic elections systems that may be targeted in future Russian influence operations and campaigns and an assessment of the likelihood that each such country will be targeted;

8. An identification of all U.S. military alliances and partnerships that have been targeted by Russian influence operations and campaigns since January 1, 2017;

9. An identification of all U.S. military alliances and partnerships that may be targeted in future Russian influence operations and campaigns and an assessment of the likelihood that each such country will be targeted; and

10. An identification of tactics, techniques, and procedures likely to be used in future Russian influence operations and campaigns targeting democratic elections and military alliances and partnerships of which the United States is a member.

UNCLASSIFIED DIRECTION RELATED TO
SUBDIVISION 2

Management of Intelligence Community Workforce.

The Committees repeat direction from the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 that IC elements should build, develop, and maintain a workforce appropriately balanced among its civilian, military, and contractor workforce sectors to meet the missions assigned to it in law and by the president. Starting in Fiscal Year 2019, the Committees no longer authorize position ceiling levels in the annual Schedule of Authorizations.

The Committees look forward to working with the ODNI as it develops an implementation strategy and sets standards for workforce cost analysis tools.

Countering Russian Propaganda.

The Committees support the IC's role in countering Russian propaganda and other active measures. The Committees are committed to providing the appropriate legal authorities, financial resources, and personnel necessary to address these hostile acts. The Committees specifically find that language capabilities are important to the IC's efforts in countering Russia's hostile acts. The Committees encourage the IC to commit considerable resources in the future to bolstering officers' existing Russian language skills, recruiting Russian language speakers, and training officers in Russian, in particular key technical language skills. This effort will require strategic planning both in recruiting and rotating officers through language training. The Committees expect to see these priorities reflected in future IC budget requests.

Protection of the Supply Chain in Intelligence Community Acquisition Decisions.

The Committees continue to have significant concerns about risks to the supply chain in IC acquisitions. The Committees encourage the Supply Chain and Counterintelligence Risk Management Task Force recommendations to support continued efforts to develop an open, interoperable information security-sharing platform to enable real-time cross-domain sharing for the IC to

effectively share and analyze information on supply chain, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and counterintelligence risks.

The report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 directed the DNI to review and consider changes to Intelligence Community Directive (ICD) 801 ("Acquisition") to reflect the issuance of ICD 731 ("Supply Chain Risk Management") in 2013 and the issues associated with cybersecurity. It specifically recommended the review examine whether to: expand risk management criteria in the acquisition process to include cyber and supply chain threats; require counterintelligence and security assessments as part of the acquisition and procurement process; propose and adopt new education requirements for acquisition professionals on cyber and supply chain threats; and factor in the cost of cyber and supply chain security. This review was due in November 2017, with a report on the process for updating ICD 801 in December 2017. The report was completed on June 18, 2018.

As a follow-on to this review, the Committees direct DNI to address three other considerations: changes in the Federal Acquisition Regulation that may be necessary; how changes should apply to all acquisition programs; and how security risks must be addressed across development, procurement, and operational phases of acquisition. The Committees further direct the DNI to submit a plan to implement necessary changes within 60 days of completion of this review.

National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency use of VERA and VSIP Authorities.

The Committees encourage the use by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) of Voluntary Early Retirement Authority (VERA) and Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) offers to meet future goals of building a workforce more attuned to automation of data production, automation of analytic processes, and establishment of development and operations (DevOps) software development processes.

Therefore, the Committees direct the NGA to report to the Committees, within 120 days of enactment of the Act, on its use to date of VERA and VSIP incentives, to include how they have been used to develop an acquisition cadre skilled in "DevOps" software development processes, as well as a plan for further use of these incentives. The report should specify metrics for retooling its workforce, including how it measures data literacy and computational skills in potential hires, and an accounting of the numbers of new hires who have met these higher standards.

Report on Engagement of National Reconnaissance Office with University Community.

The Committees recognize that the survivability and resiliency of United States satellites is critically important to the United States intelligence and defense communities. While the NRO engages with the university community in support of basic research and developing an education workforce pipeline to help advance new technologies and produce skilled professionals, it can do more in this regard to focus on space survivability.

Therefore, the Committees direct the NRO to report, within 120 days of enactment of the Act, on NRO's current efforts and future strategies to engage with university partners that are strategically located, host secure information facilities, and offer a strong engineering curriculum, with a particular focus on space survivability and resiliency. This report should provide a summary of NRO's current and planned university engagement programs, levels of funding, and program research and workforce objectives and metrics.

The report should also include an assessment of the strategic utility of chartering a University Affiliated Research Center in this domain.

National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency Facilities.

Consistent with section 2401 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the Committees authorize the President's request for \$447.8 million in Fiscal Year 2019 for phase two construction activities of the Next National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency West (N2W) facility in St. Louis, Missouri. The Committees are pleased that the second phase of this \$837.2 million project was included in the Fiscal Year 2019 President's budget.

Clarification of Oversight Responsibilities.

The Committees reinforce the requirement for all IC agencies funded by the NIP to respond in a full, complete, and timely manner to any request for information made by a member of the congressional intelligence committees. In addition, the Committees direct the DNI to issue guidelines, within 90 days of enactment of the Act, to ensure that the intent of section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091) is carried out.

Clarification on Cooperation with Investigation on Russian Influence in the 2016 Election.

The Committees continue to reinforce the obligation for all IC agencies to cooperate in a full, complete, and timely manner with the Committees' ongoing investigations into Russian meddling in the 2016 Presidential election and cooperation with the declassification process.

Supervisory Feedback as Part of Continuous Vetting Program.

The Committees direct the DNI to review the results of ongoing pilot programs regarding the use of supervisory feedback as part of the periodic reinvestigation and continuous vetting process and report, within 180 days of enactment of the Act, on the establishment of a policy for its use across the IC.

National Security Threats to Critical Infrastructure.

The Committees are aware of significant threats to our critical infrastructure and industrial control systems posed by foreign adversaries. The sensitive nature of the information related to these threats make the role of the IC of vital importance to United States defensive efforts. The Committees have grave concerns that current IC resources dedicated to analyzing and countering these threats are neither sufficient nor closely coordinated. The Committees include provisions within this legislation to address these concerns.

Framework for Cybersecurity and Intelligence Collection Doctrine.

The Committees direct the ODNI, in coordination with appropriate IC elements, to develop an analytic framework that could support the eventual creation and execution of a Government-wide cybersecurity and intelligence collection doctrine. The ODNI shall provide this framework, which may contain a classified annex, to the congressional intelligence committees, within 180 days of enactment of the Act.

This framework shall include:

1. An assessment of the current and medium-term cyber threats to the protection of the United States' national security systems and critical infrastructure;

2. IC definitions of key cybersecurity concepts, to include cyberespionage, cyber theft, cyber acts of aggression, and cyber deterrence;

3. Intelligence collection requirements to ensure identification of cyber actors targeting U.S. national security interests, and

to inform policy responses to cyber-attacks and computer network operations directed against the United States;

4. The IC's methodology for assessing the impacts of cyber-attacks and computer network operations incidents directed against the United States, taking into account differing levels of severity of incidents;

5. Capabilities that the IC could employ in response to cyber-attacks and computer network operations incidents, taking into account differing levels of severity of incidents;

6. A policy and architecture for sharing cybersecurity-related intelligence with government, private sector, and international partners, including existing statutory and other authorities which may be exercised in pursuit of that goal; and

7. Any necessary changes in IC authorities, governance, technology, resources, and policy to provide more capable and agile cybersecurity.

Inspector General of the Intelligence Community Role and Responsibilities.

The position of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (IC IG) was codified by the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. Among other things, the IC IG's statutory purposes include "conduct[ing] independent reviews investigations, inspections, audits, and reviews on programs and activities within the responsibility and authority of the Director of National Intelligence;" keeping the Committees fully and currently informed of significant problems and deficiencies; and leading efforts of inspectors general within the IC.

The Committees have included provisions intended to strengthen the IC IG's role. The Committees will insist on full cooperation from the Director, ODNI offices, as well as those of inspectors general across the IC, in ensuring that the IC IG's prescribed functions are carried out to the fullest extent possible. The Committees further reiterate Congress's intent that the IC IG is obligated to identify and inform the Committees of significant problems and deficiencies "relating to" all intelligence programs and activities.

The Committees also remain seriously concerned about the undermining of protections and rights afforded to whistleblowers within the IC and the level of insight congressional committees have into the handling of lawful disclosures. Without exception, the Committees must be made aware of lawful disclosures made to any inspector general within the IC, consistent with provisions added to Title 50 by sections 5331-5335 of Subdivision 1 of the Act; and of all lawful disclosures made pursuant to ICWPA and Title 50 procedures, which Intelligence Community personnel intend to be submitted to the Committees. The Committees underscore in the strongest terms that all elements of the IC are obligated, as a categorical matter, to comply with both existing law as well as direction provided elsewhere in the Act and this Explanation, with respect to inspector general and whistleblower matters.

Space Launch Facilities.

The Committees continue to believe it is critical to preserve a variety of launch range capabilities to support national security space missions, and encourage planned launches such as the U.S. Air Force Orbital/Sub-Orbital Program (OSP)-3 NRO-111 mission, to be launched in 2019 on a Minotaur 1 from the Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport at Wallops Flight Facility. In the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the Committees directed a brief from the ODNI, in consultation with the DoD and the U.S. Air Force, on their plans to utilize state-owned and operated spaceports, which lever-

age non-federal public and private investments to bolster United States launch capabilities and provide access to mid-to-low or polar-to-high inclination orbits for national security missions.

The Committees direct that the ODNI supplement this brief with how state investments in these spaceports may support infrastructure improvements, such as payload integration and launch capabilities, for national security launches.

Acquisition Research Center Postings.

The Committees support a flexible NRO acquisition process that allows the NRO to choose the most appropriate contracting mechanism, whether for small research and development efforts or large acquisitions. The NRO's Acquisition Research Center (ARC), a classified contracting and solicitation marketplace that NRO and other agencies use, enables this flexible acquisition process for classified efforts.

The Committees direct the NRO, within 60 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the congressional intelligence and defense committees on options for modifying ARC posting procedures to ensure fair and open competition. Those options should include ensuring that unclassified NRO solicitations are posted on the unclassified FEDBIZOPS website, and identifying ways to better utilize the ARC to encourage contract opportunities for a more diverse industrial base that includes smaller and non-traditional companies.

Ensuring Strong Strategic Analytical Tradecraft.

The Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) has taken steps to improve the quality of its analysis, to identify its core customers, and to tailor its production to meet customer needs. The Committees concur with I&A's implementation of analytic standards and review mechanisms that have improved the tradecraft behind I&A products. The bedrock of these efforts has been the development of a yearly program of analysis (POA) and key intelligence questions, which are essential tools for providing a roadmap and boundaries for the office's production efforts.

Therefore, the Committees direct the Office of I&A to continue to prioritize, develop and hone its strategic intelligence capabilities and production, including the annual development of a POA. Within 90 days of enactment of the Act, and on an annual basis thereafter for two years, I&A shall brief the congressional intelligence committees on the development and execution of its POA. These briefings should provide an overview of the POA, how customer needs have been incorporated into the POA, and an update on execution against the POA.

Cyber/Counterintelligence Analysis.

DHS's Office of I&A's Counterintelligence Mission Center analysis focuses on counterintelligence threats posed by foreign technology companies and fills a gap in IC intelligence production. Advanced technologies are increasingly ubiquitous and necessary to the function of modern society. Consequently, the scope of the threats from countries intent on using these technologies as a vector for collecting intelligence from within the United States will continue to expand. The Office of I&A is positioned to conduct a niche analysis critical to national security that combines foreign intelligence with domestic threat information.

The Committees strongly support I&A's Counterintelligence Mission Center's continued focus on these topics and the increased resources dedicated to this analysis in Fiscal Year 2019. Therefore, the Committees direct

the I&A, in coordination with ODNI, to provide an update within 90 days of enactment of the Act on its recent analytic production related to counterintelligence threats posed by foreign technology companies, including a review of the countries and companies that present the greatest risks in this regard.

Intelligence Support to the Export Control Process.

The Committees have significant concerns that China poses a growing threat to United States national security, due in part to its relentless efforts to acquire United States technology. China purposely blurs the distinction between its military and civilian activities through its policy of "military-civilian fusion," which compounds the risks of diversion of United States technology to the Chinese military.

The Committees conclude that the United States Government currently lacks a comprehensive policy and the tools needed to address this problem. China exploits weaknesses in existing U.S. mechanisms aimed at preventing dangerous technology transfers, including the U.S. export control system, which is run by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS). The Committees have specific concerns about the lack of adequate and effective IC support to BIS's export license application review process and believe more robust IC support could have prevented many of the ill-advised technology transfers that have occurred in recent years.

Therefore, the Committees directs the DNI to submit a plan, within 120 days of enactment of the Act, to describe how the IC will provide BIS with, at a minimum, basic but timely analysis of any threat to U.S. national security posed by any proposed export, re-export, or transfer of export-controlled technology. The plan shall include detailed information on the appropriate organizational structure, including how many IC personnel would be required, where they would be located (including whether they would be embedded at BIS to coordinate IC support), and the amounts of necessary funding. In formulating the plan, the DNI should study the "National Security Threat Assessment" process that the National Intelligence Council uses to inform the actions of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. The DNI shall submit the plan to the congressional intelligence committees in classified form.

Social Media.

The Committees encourage the IC, notably the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), to both continue and enhance its efforts to assist in detecting, understanding, and warning about foreign influence operations using social media tools to target the United States. Additionally, within the scope of the IC's authorities, and with all necessary protections for U.S. person information, the Committees encourage the IC to augment and prioritize these ongoing efforts.

Trade-Based Money Laundering.

Threats to our national security posed by trade-based money laundering are concerning. Therefore, the Committees direct the DNI, within 90 days of enactment of the Act, to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on these threats, including an assessment of the severity of the threats posed to the United States' national security by trade-based money laundering conducted inside and outside the United States; an assessment of the scope of the financial threats to the U.S. economy and financial systems posed by trade-based money laundering; a description of how terrorist financing and drug trafficking organizations are advancing their illicit activities through

the use of licit trade channels; an assessment of the adequacy of the systems and tools available to the Federal Government for combating trade-based money laundering; and a description and assessment of the current structure and coordination between Federal agencies, as well as with foreign governments, to combat trade-based money laundering. The report shall be submitted in classified form with an unclassified summary to be made available to the public.

Expansions of Security Protective Service Jurisdiction of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Committees direct the CIA, in connection with the expansion of its security protective service jurisdiction as set forth in section 6413 of Subdivision 2 of the Act, to engage with Virginia state and local law enforcement authorities to ensure that a memorandum of understanding, akin to those in place at other agencies setting forth the appropriate allocation of duties and responsibilities, is in effect.

Unauthorized Disclosures of Classified Information.

The Committees are concerned by the recent widespread media reports that purport to contain unauthorized disclosures of classified information. Protecting the nation's secrets from unauthorized disclosure is essential to safeguarding our nation's intelligence sources and methods. An unlawful disclosure of classified information can destroy sensitive collection capabilities and endanger American lives, including those individuals who take great personal risks to assist the United States in collecting vital foreign intelligence.

Federal law prohibits the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, but enforcement is often lacking or inconsistent. Accordingly, the Committees desire to better understand the number of potential unauthorized disclosures discovered and investigated on a routine basis. Moreover, the Committees have little visibility into the number of investigations initiated by each IC agency or the number of criminal referrals to the Department of Justice. Accordingly, section 6718 of Subdivision 2 of the Act requires all IC agencies to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a semi-annual report of the number of investigations of unauthorized disclosures to journalists or media organizations, including subsequent referrals made to the United States Attorney General.

Additionally, the Committees wish to better understand the role of IGs within elements of the IC, with respect to unauthorized disclosures of classified information at those elements.

Therefore, the Committees direct the IC IG, within 180 days of enactment of the Act, to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a report regarding the role of IGs with respect to investigating unauthorized disclosures. The report shall address: the roles of IC elements' security personnel and law enforcement regarding unauthorized disclosures; the current role of IGs within IC elements regarding such disclosures; what, if any, specific actions could be taken by such IGs to increase their involvement in the investigation of such matters; any laws, rules or procedures that currently prevent IGs from increasing their involvement; and the benefits and drawbacks of increased IG involvement, to include potential impacts to IG's roles and missions.

Presidential Policy Guidance.

The Presidential Policy Guidance (PPG) dated May 22, 2013, and entitled "Procedures for Approving Direct Action Against Terrorist Targets Located Outside the United States and Areas of Active Hostilities" pro-

vides for the participation by elements of the IC in reviews of certain proposed counterterrorism operations. The Committees expect to remain fully and currently informed about the status of the PPG and its implementation.

Therefore, the Committees direct ODNI, within five days of any change to the PPG, or to any successor policy guidance, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written notification thereof, that shall include a summary of the change and the specific legal and policy justifications for the change.

Centers for Academic Excellence.

The Committees commend the commitment demonstrated by the program managers of the IC's Centers for Academic Excellence (IC-CAE), IC agencies that sponsored CAE interns, and all other personnel who contributed to the inaugural edition of the CAE Internship Program in summer 2017.

The Committees expect the IC-CAE Program to build on this foundation by showing measurable, swift progress, and ultimately fulfilling Congress's intent that the Program serve as a pipeline of the next generation of IC professionals.

Therefore, the Committees direct that the IC take all viable action to expand the IC-CAE Program by increasing, to the fullest extent possible:

1. The number and racial and gender diversity of IC-CAE interns;
2. The number of IC-CAE academic institutions and their qualified internship candidates participating in the IC-CAE Program; and
3. The number of IC elements that sponsor IC-CAE interns.

Report on Violent Extremist Groups.

Violent extremist groups like ISIS continue to exploit the Internet for nefarious purposes: to inspire lone wolves; to spread propaganda; to recruit foreign fighters; and to plan and publicize atrocities. As a former Director of the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) has stated publicly:

[W]e need to counter our adversaries' successful use of social media platforms to advance their propaganda goals, raise funds, recruit, coordinate travel and attack plans, and facilitate operations. . . . Our future work must focus on denying our adversaries the capability to spread their messages to at-risk populations that they can reach through the use of these platforms.

Section 403 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 required the DNI, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, to assist public and private sector entities in recognizing online violent extremist content—specifically, by making publicly available a list of insignias and logos associated with foreign extremist groups designated by the Secretary of State. The Committees believe the IC can take additional steps.

Therefore, the Committees direct the Director of NCTC, in coordination with other appropriate officials designated by the DNI, within 180 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the congressional intelligence committees on options for a pilot program to develop and continually update best practices for private technology companies to quickly recognize and lawfully take down violent extremist content online. Such briefing shall address:

1. The feasibility, risks, costs, and benefits of such a program;
2. The U.S. Government agencies and private sector entities that would participate; and
3. Any additional authorities that would be required by the program's establishment.

South China Sea.

The South China Sea is an area of great geostrategic importance to the United

States and its allies. However, China's controversial territorial claims and other actions stand to undercut international norms and erode the region's stability. It is thus imperative the United States uphold respect for international law in the South China Sea. Fulfilling that objective in turn will require an optimal intelligence collection posture.

Therefore, the direct the DoD, in coordination with DNI, within 30 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the congressional intelligence and defense committees on known intelligence collection gaps, if any, with respect to adversary operations and aims in the South China Sea. The briefing shall identify the gaps and whether those gaps are driven by lack of access, lack of necessary collection capabilities or legal or policy authorities, or by other factors. The briefing shall also identify IC judgments that assess which intelligence disciplines would be best-suited to answer the existing gaps, and current plans to address the gaps over the Future Years Defense Program.

Policy on Minimum Insider Threat Standards.

Executive Order 13587 and the National Insider Threat Task Force established minimum insider threat standards. Such standards are required for the sharing and safeguarding of classified information on computer networks while ensuring consistent, appropriate protections for privacy and civil liberties. The Committees understand there are policies in place to attempt implementation of such standards; however, the Committees have found that several elements of the IC have not fully implemented such standards. Therefore, given the several high-profile insider threat issues, the Committees emphasize the importance of such minimums by statutorily requiring the DNI to establish a policy on minimum insider threat standards, consistent with the National Insider Threat Policy and Minimum Standards for Executive Branch Insider Threat Programs, and IC elements should expeditiously establish their own policies and implement the DNI guidance.

Further, referring to the directive language found in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5515, the Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA reported by the House Armed Services Committee (HASC), the Committees direct the Chief Management Officer to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence and defense committees, no later than 90 days after enactment of the Act, on the outcomes of its cost and technical analyses required by this report, and the DoD's efforts to implement enterprise-wide programs and policies for insider threat detection, user activity monitoring, and cyber-attack detection and remediation.

Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment.

The Committees remain supportive of the goals of Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment (IC ITE) and the importance of the common, secure sharing infrastructure it creates. The Committees further understand that the path to implement a complex, technical environment such as IC ITE needs to be sufficiently flexible and agile. However, the Committees remain concerned with the lack of consistency and substance in previous reports and briefings on IC ITE. Therefore, section 6312 of Subdivision 2 of the Act requires a long-term roadmap, business plan, and security plan that shall be reported to the congressional intelligence committees at least quarterly with additional notifications as necessary.

Intelligence Community Chief Financial Officer.

The Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act of 1990 mandated best practices for decision-

making and accountability, as well as improved decision-makers' access to reliable and timely financial and performance information. The CFO Act, as amended, requires that the chief financial officers of 24 departments and agencies "report directly to the head of the agency regarding financial management matters." Section 6404 of Subdivision 2 of the Act brings the ODNI in line with the best practices implemented in the CFO Act.

Intelligence Community Chief Information Officer.

As codified in 44 U.S.C. 3506(a)(1)(A), each federal agency head is responsible for "carrying out the information resources management activities to improve agency productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness." Accordingly, section 6405 of Subdivision 2 of the Act expresses the Committee's intent to emphasize the importance of the IC Chief Information Officer (CIO), as defined in 50 U.S.C. 3032(a), in assisting the DNI with information resource management by requiring the IC CIO to report directly to the DNI.

Central Intelligence Agency Subsistence for Personnel Assigned to Austere Locations.

Section 6411 of Subdivision 2 of the Act permits the Director of the CIA to allow subsistence for personnel assigned to austere locations. Although the statute does not define "austere," the Committees believe that utilization of this authority should be minimal. Therefore, within 180 days after the enactment of the Act, the CIA shall brief the Committees on the CIA's definition of "austere" and the CIA regulations in place governing this authority.

Collocation of Certain Department of Homeland Security Personnel at Field Locations.

The Committees support DHS I&A's intent to integrate into operations across the broader DHS enterprise. Accordingly, section 6434 of Subdivision 2 of the Act requires I&A to identify opportunities for collocation of I&A field officers and to submit to the Committees a plan for their deployment.

Limitations on Intelligence Community Elements' Communications with Congress.

Effective oversight of the IC requires unencumbered communications between representatives of the agencies, members of Congress, and congressional staff. The Committees direct the DNI not to limit any element of the IC from having interactions with the congressional intelligence committees, including but not limited to, preclearance by the DNI of remarks, briefings, discussions of agency resources or authorities requirements, or mandatory reports to the DNI on conversations with the Committees.

Intelligence Community Support to the National Vetting Center.

On February 6, 2018, the President issued National Security Policy Memorandum (NSPM)-9, "Presidential Memorandum on Optimizing the Use of Federal Government Information in Support of National Vetting Enterprise." The memorandum directs the DHS, in coordination with the ODNI and other agencies, to establish the National Vetting Center. The memorandum also requires agencies to "provide the Center access to relevant biographic, biometric, and related derogatory information." It further directs DNI, in coordination with the heads of relevant IC elements, to "establish a support element to facilitate, guide, and coordinate all IC efforts to use classified intelligence and other relevant information within the IC holdings in support of the center." The Committees wish to obtain regular updates and the most current information about the activities of that support element.

Therefore, no later than 180 days after the enactment of the Act and annually there-

after, the Committees direct the DNI and the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis at DHS to brief the Committees on the status of IC support to the National Vetting Center, as established by NSPM-9.

Update on Status of Attorney General-Approved U.S. Person Procedures under Executive Order 12333.

The Committees acknowledge the difficult, labor-intensive work undertaken by certain IC elements, to ensure the current effectiveness of, and in some cases to substantially revise, final Attorney General-approved procedures regarding the collection, dissemination, and retention of United States persons information. The Committees wish to better understand the status of this project, throughout the IC.

Therefore, the Committees direct that, not later than 60 days after enactment of the Act, the DNI and the Attorney General shall brief the Committees on the issuance of final, Attorney General-approved procedures by elements of the IC. Specifically, the briefing shall identify (1) any such elements that have not yet issued final procedures; and (2) with respect to such elements, the status of the procedures' development, and any interim guidance or procedures on which those elements currently rely.

Homegrown Violent Extremists Imprisoned in Department of Defense Facilities.

The Committees are concerned about an evident gap in information sharing about individuals imprisoned in DoD facilities who are categorized by the FBI as homegrown violent extremists (HVEs). A recent FBI report underscores this gap, highlighting the case of an individual who has been convicted and sentenced to death by a U.S. military court martial and remains incarcerated in a U.S. military facility. The Committees understand that, despite his incarceration, this inmate openly communicates with the outside world through written correspondence and has continued to inspire extremists throughout the world. The Committees further understand that the FBI is unable to determine the full scope of this inmate's contacts with the outside world because only a portion of his communications have been provided by the DoD.

Therefore, no later than 180 days after the enactment of the Act, the Committees direct the FBI to work with the DoD to create a process by which the DoD provides to the FBI the complete communications of individuals imprisoned in DoD facilities and who are categorized by the FBI as HVEs.

Naming of Federal Bureau of Investigation Headquarters.

According to statute enacted in 1972, the current FBI headquarters building in Washington, D.C. must be "known and designated" as the "J. Edgar Hoover FBI Building." That tribute has aged poorly. It should be reconsidered, in view of Hoover's record on civil liberties—including the effort to disparage and undermine Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Even today, Hoover's name evokes the FBI's sordid "COINTELPRO" activities.

The Committees believe Congress should consider repealing the provision requiring the existing Pennsylvania Avenue building to be known as the "J. Edgar Hoover FBI Building." A new name should be determined, through a joint dialogue among Bureau leadership, law enforcement personnel, elected officials, and civil rights leaders.

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math careers in Defense Intelligence.

Referring to the directive language found in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5515, the HASC-reported Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA, the Committees direct the Director of DIA to provide, within 90 days after enact-

ment of the Act, a briefing to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees on a plan to develop a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math career program that attracts and maintains the defense intelligence cadre of Science and Technical Intelligence analysts to meet tomorrow's threats.

Security and Intelligence Role in Export Control.

Referring to the directive language found in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5515, the HASC-reported Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA, the Committees direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, in coordination with the USD(I), within 60 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the congressional intelligence and defense committees, on security support to export control.

Security Clearance Background Investigation Reciprocity.

Referring to the directive language found in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5515, the HASC-reported Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA, the Committees direct the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the DNI and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, within 60 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the Committees and the congressional defense committees on efforts to ensure seamless transition of investigations between authorized investigative agencies, as required by law.

Further, referring to the directive language found in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5515, the HASC-reported Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA, the Committees direct the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the DNI and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, within 90 days of enactment of the Act, to brief the congressional intelligence committees on efforts to ensure reciprocity is a consideration for implementation of continuous evaluation and continuous vetting across the federal government.

Foreign Influence Task Force.

The IC has warned of active measures taken by foreign actors to interfere with and undermine the U.S. democratic process, most recently and brazenly by the Russian Federation. The Committees appreciate FBI efforts to confront this challenge in part through creation of its Foreign Influence Task Force. The Committees believe that confronting foreign influence directed at the United States is of fundamental importance, and thus desire to engage in a close and regular dialogue with the FBI about the task force's activities.

Therefore, the Committees direct the FBI to provide detailed, quarterly briefings to the Committees regarding the task force's activities, to include its progress and any significant challenges.

Enhanced Oversight of IC Contractors.

A topic of sustained congressional intelligence committee interest has been improving the federal government's oversight of IC acquisition and procurement practices, including activities by poorly performing IC contractors.

A framework exists to ensure that IC elements do not award IC contracts to businesses that engage in negligence or even gross negligence, consistently fail to appropriately safeguard classified information, maintain poor financial practices, or other issues. For example, an IC element may maintain a list of contractors of concern, in order to ensure that proposals from such contractors are rejected or subjected to additional scrutiny. The Committees wish to build on these practices and are concerned about the existing framework's adequacy.

Therefore, the Committees direct all elements of the IC, to the fullest extent consistent with applicable law and policy, to

share with one another information about contractors with track records of concern—such as the commission of negligence or gross negligence in the performance of IC contracts, or the repeated failure to appropriately safeguard classified information in a fashion that the contractor reasonably could have been expected to prevent.

Additionally, no later than 30 days after enactment of the Act, the DNI shall brief the Committees on the authorities of IC elements with respect to contractors with track records of concern—before, during, and after procurement. An objective of the briefing will be to discuss information sharing practices in this regard, and to identify specific areas where the oversight framework can be strengthened.

Security Clearance Reporting Requirements.

The Agreement directs the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with members of the Performance Accountability Council, to report to Congress, within 90 days of enactment of the Act, on recommendations for harmonizing and streamlining reporting requirements related to security clearances that have been set forth in legislation.

PART III: SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF LEGISLATIVE TEXT

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION

The following is a section-by-section analysis and explanation of the Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020 (the “Act”).

SUBDIVISION 1—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Section 5100. Table of contents.

TITLE LI—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Section 5101. Authorization of appropriations.

Section 5101 lists the United States Government departments, agencies, and other elements for which the Act authorizes appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Year 2020.

Section 5102. Classified schedule of authorizations.

Section 5102 provides that the details of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Year 2020 are contained in the classified Schedule of Authorizations and that the classified Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President.

Section 5103. Intelligence Community Management Account.

Section 5103 authorizes appropriations for the Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA) of the ODNI for Fiscal Year 2020.

TITLE LII—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Section 5201. Authorization of appropriations.

Section 5201 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$514,000,000 for the CIA Retirement and Disability Fund for Fiscal Year 2020.

TITLE LIII—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Subtitle A—General Intelligence Community Matters

Section 5301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Section 5301 provides that the authorization of appropriations by the Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is

not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Section 5302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Section 5302 provides that funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in compensation or benefits authorized by law.

Section 5303. Expansion of scope of protections for identities of covert agents.

Section 5303 amends the definition of “covert agent” in the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3126(4)) to protect the identities of all undercover intelligence officers, and United States citizens whose relationship to the United States is classified, regardless of the location of the individuals’ government service or time since separation from government service.

Section 5304. Required counterintelligence assessments, briefings, notifications, and reports.

Section 5304 requires the DNI, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, to conduct an assessment following a United States election of any foreign government interference. Section 5304 requires the DNI to post publicly advisory reports on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to federal election campaigns. It also requires quarterly briefings to the congressional intelligence committees regarding the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s counterintelligence activities and prompt notification of an investigation carried out regarding a counterintelligence risk related to a federal election or campaign.

Section 5305. Inclusion of security risks in program management plans required for acquisition of major systems in National Intelligence Program.

Section 5305 amends the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(q)(1)(A)) to require that the annual program management plans on major system acquisitions that the DNI submits to Congress address security risks, in addition to cost, schedule, performance goals, and program milestone criteria.

Section 5306. Intelligence community public-private talent exchange.

Section 5306 requires the DNI to develop policies, processes, and procedures to facilitate IC personnel rotations to the private sector and vice versa, to bolster skill development and collaboration. Section 5306 further sets forth requirements with which agreements governing such rotations must address, including terms and conditions, including termination, duration, employment status, pay, and benefits.

Section 5307. Assessment of contracting practices to identify certain security and counterintelligence concerns.

Section 5307 requires the DNI to conduct an assessment of the authorities, policies, processes, and standards used by the IC to ensure that the IC is weighing security and counterintelligence risks in contracting with companies that contract—or carry out joint research and development—with the People’s Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, or the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Subtitle B—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Section 5321. Establishment of Climate Security Advisory Council.

Section 5321 requires the DNI to establish an advisory council to assist analytic components of the IC with incorporating analysis of climate security into their work. The

council will also facilitate coordination and sharing of data between the IC and non-IC elements related to climate change.

Section 5322. Foreign Malign Influence Response Center.

Section 5322 establishes a Foreign Malign Influence Response Center within the ODNI to analyze and integrate all U.S. Government intelligence pertaining to hostile efforts undertaken by, at the direction of, or on behalf of or with the substantial support of, the government of the Russian Federation, Iran, North Korea, China, or any other country that the Director of the Center determines appropriate, to influence U.S.-based policies, activities, or public opinion.

Section 5323. Encouragement of cooperative actions to detect and counter foreign influence operations.

Section 5323 provides the DNI, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, with the necessary authorities and ability to use up to \$30 million of NIP funds, to establish an independent, non-profit Social Media Data and Threat Analysis Center (“Center”). Section 323 further provides that this Center shall establish a central portal for social media data analysis, enabling: (1) social media companies to voluntarily share data on foreign influence operations; (2) researchers to analyze that data; and (3) information sharing between and among government and private companies. Section 5323 also requires the Director of the Center to produce quarterly public reports on trends in foreign influence and disinformation operations, including any threats to campaigns and elections, as well as an annual report to Congress on the degree of cooperation and commitment from the social media companies.

Section 5324. Transfer of National Intelligence University to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Section 5324 requires the Director of the DIA to transfer to the DNI the National Intelligence University, upon submission of required joint certifications to appropriate congressional committees by the Secretary of Defense and the DNI.

Subtitle C—Inspector General of the Intelligence Community

Section 5331. Definitions.

Section 5331 provides definitions for terminology used throughout this Subtitle.

Section 5332. Inspector General external review panel.

Section 5332 codifies the whistleblower protections contained in Part C of Presidential Policy Directive-19 to ensure an effective appeals process through external review panels and the reporting of waste, fraud, and abuse. Section 5332 further requires the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (IC IG) to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a recommendation on how to ensure that a whistleblower with a complaint against an Inspector General of an IC agency has equal access to adjudication, appellate review, and external review panels.

Section 5333. Harmonization of whistleblower processes and procedures.

Section 5333 requires the IC IG, in coordination with the IC Inspectors General Forum, to develop recommendations applicable to Inspectors General for all IC elements regarding the harmonization, where appropriate, of policies and directives related to whistleblower claims and appeals processes and procedures. Section 5333 further requires the IC IG to maximize transparency regarding these processes and procedures.

Section 5334. Oversight by Inspector General of the Intelligence Community over intelligence community whistleblower matters.

Section 5334 requires the IC IG, in consultation with the IC Inspectors General

Forum, to establish a system whereby the IC IG is provided in near real time of whistleblower complaints relating to the programs and activities under the DNI's jurisdiction, as well as any IG actions relating to such complaints.

Section 5335. Report on cleared whistleblower attorneys.

Section 5335 requires the IC IG to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on access to cleared attorneys by whistleblowers in the IC, including any recommended improvements to the limited security agreement process and such other options as the IC IG considers appropriate.

Subtitle D—Central Intelligence Agency

Section 5341. Clarification of certain authority of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 5341 clarifies current CIA authorities related to death benefits, requires the Director of the CIA to submit a report if the CIA does not modify relevant regulations, and requires a briefing on certain health care services for CIA personnel.

TITLE LIV—SECURITY CLEARANCES

Section 5401. Improving visibility into the security clearance process.

Section 5401 requires the DNI, acting as the Security Executive Agent, to issue a policy requiring the head of each Federal agency to create an electronic portal whereby the agency and its workforce applicants can review the status of their security clearance processing. An enterprise solution that is accessible to multiple agencies may meet this objective. Any portal should have appropriate security safeguards.

Section 5402. Making certain policies and execution plans relating to personnel clearances available to industry partners.

Section 5402 requires each head of a Federal agency to share security clearance policies and plans with directly affected industry partners, consistent with national security and with National Industrial Security Program (NISP) goals. Section 5402 further requires the DNI, acting as the Security Executive Agent, jointly with the Director of the NISP, to develop policies and procedures for sharing this information.

TITLE LV—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Russia

Section 5501. Annual reports on influence operations and campaigns in the United States by the Russian Federation.

Section 5501 requires the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center to submit an annual report to the congressional intelligence committees concerning the influence operations and campaigns in the United States conducted by the Russian Federation.

Section 5502. Assessment of legitimate and illegitimate financial and other assets of Vladimir Putin.

Section 5502 expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should do more to expose the corruption of Russian President Vladimir Putin and directs the DNI to submit to appropriate congressional committees an assessment on the net worth and financial and other assets of President Putin and his family members.

Section 5503. Assessments of intentions of political leadership of the Russian Federation.

Section 5503 directs the IC to submit assessments to certain congressional committees of the current intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation concerning potential military action against members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), responses to an enlarged

United States or NATO military presence in Eastern Europe, and potential actions taken for the purpose of exploiting perceived divisions among the governments of Russia's Western adversaries.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to China

Section 5511. Annual reports on influence operations and campaigns in the United States by the Communist Party of China.

Section 5511 requires the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center to submit an annual report to the congressional intelligence committees concerning the influence operations and campaigns in the United States conducted by the Communist Party of China.

Section 5512. Report on repression of ethnic Muslim minorities in the Xinjiang region of the People's Republic of China.

Section 5512 requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees concerning activity by the People's Republic of China to repress ethnic Muslim minorities in the Xinjiang region of China.

Section 5513. Report on efforts by People's Republic of China to influence election in Taiwan.

Section 5513 requires the DNI to submit a report within 45 days of the 2020 Taiwan Presidential and Vice Presidential elections concerning any influence operations by China to interfere in or undermine the election and efforts by the United States to disrupt those operations.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Other Countries

Section 5521. Sense of Congress and report on Iranian efforts in Syria and Lebanon.

Section 5521 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, to submit a report that assesses Iran's efforts to establish influence in Syria, Iran's support of proxy forces, and the resulting threats to U.S. interests and allies.

Section 5522. Assessments regarding the Northern Triangle and Mexico.

Section 5522 requires the DNI, in coordination with other IC officials, to submit a comprehensive assessment of drug trafficking, human trafficking, and human smuggling activities in the Northern Triangle and Mexico. Section 5522 further requires the DNI to provide a briefing on the IC's collection priorities and activities in these areas.

TITLE LVI—FEDERAL EFFORTS AGAINST DOMESTIC TERRORISM

Section 5601. Definitions.

Section 5601 provides definitions for terminology used throughout this Title.

Section 5602. Strategic intelligence assessment of and reports on domestic terrorism.

Section 5602 requires the Director of the FBI and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the DNI, to submit a report on standardization of terminology and procedures relating to domestic terrorism, and a report containing strategic intelligence assessment and data on domestic terrorism, together with required documents and materials, with annual updates for 5 years thereafter.

TITLE LVII—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Subtitle A—Reports and Briefings

Section 5701. Modification of requirements for submission to Congress of certain reports.

Section 5701 amends or cancels numerous reporting requirements under current law.

Section 5702. Increased transparency regarding counterterrorism budget of the United States.

Section 5702 makes several findings regarding the transparency of the IC's counterter-

rorism budget and directs a briefing from the executive branch on the feasibility of releasing additional information to the public concerning the IC's efforts on counterterrorism. *Section 5703. Study on role of retired and former personnel of intelligence community with respect to certain foreign intelligence operations.*

Section 5703 requires the DNI to conduct a study on former IC personnel providing intelligence assistance to foreign governments, and to provide a report on the findings and a plan for recommendations.

Section 5704. Collection, analysis, and dissemination of workforce data.

Section 5704 requires the DNI to provide a publicly available annual report on diversity and inclusion efforts of the IC's workforce.

Section 5705. Plan for strengthening the supply chain intelligence function.

Section 5705 requires the Director of the NCSC, in coordination with interagency partners, to submit a plan for strengthening supply chain intelligence function.

Section 5706. Comprehensive economic assessment of investment in key United States technologies by companies or organizations linked to China.

Section 5706 requires the DNI, in coordination with other designated agencies, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a comprehensive economic assessment of investment in key United States technologies, by companies or organizations linked to China, as well as the national security implications of Chinese-backed investments to the United States.

Section 5707. Report by Director of National Intelligence on fifth-generation wireless network technology.

Section 5707 directs the DNI to submit to the appropriate committees a report on the threat to the national security of the United States posed by adoption of fifth-generation wireless network built by foreign companies and possible efforts to mitigate the threat.

Section 5708. Report on use by intelligence community of facial recognition technology.

Section 5708 requires the DNI to submit a report on the IC's use of facial recognition technology.

Section 5709. Report on deepfake technology, foreign weaponization of deepfakes, and related notifications.

Section 5709 requires the DNI to submit a report on the potential national security impacts of machine-manipulated media and the use of machine-manipulated media by foreign governments to spread disinformation or engage in other malign activities.

Section 5710. Annual report by Comptroller General of the United States on cybersecurity and surveillance threats to Congress.

Section 5710 requires the Comptroller General, in consultation with the DNI, Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Sergeant at Arms, to submit a report to the Committees on cybersecurity and surveillance threats to Congress.

Section 5711. Analysis and periodic briefings on major initiatives of intelligence community in artificial intelligence and machine learning.

Section 5711 requires the DNI, in coordination with other appropriate IC elements, to provide briefings to the congressional intelligence committees on the IC's major initiatives in artificial intelligence and machine learning.

Section 5712. Report on best practices to protect privacy and civil liberties of Chinese Americans.

Section 5712 requires the DNI, through the Office of Civil Liberties, Privacy, and Transparency, and in coordination with other IC

civil liberty and privacy officers, to submit a report on how IC policies targeting China affect the privacy and civil liberties of certain Americans of Chinese descent, along with recommendations for necessary protections.

Section 5713. Oversight of foreign influence in academia.

Section 5713 requires the DNI, in consultation with other appropriate IC elements, to submit a report on the risks to sensitive research subjects posed by foreign entities. Section 5713 further requires the report to identify specific national security-related threats to research conducted at institutions of higher education.

Section 5714. Report on death of Jamal Khashoggi.

Section 5714 requires the DNI to submit to Congress an unclassified report on the death of Jamal Khashoggi, consistent with protecting sources and methods. The report shall include identification of those who carried out, participated in, ordered, or were otherwise complicit in, or responsible for, Mr. Khashoggi's death.

Section 5715. Report on terrorist screening database.

Section 5715 requires the DNI and the Secretary of State to jointly submit a report on the FBI's terrorist screening database.

Section 5716. Report containing threat assessment of terrorist use of conventional and advanced conventional weapons.

Section 5716 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for I&A, in coordination with the Director of the FBI, to develop and submit a threat assessment regarding the availability of certain conventional weapons in support of terrorism activities.

Section 5717. Assessment of homeland security vulnerabilities associated with certain retired and former personnel of the intelligence community.

Section 5717 requires the DNI to submit an assessment of the homeland security vulnerabilities associated with retired and former personnel of the IC providing covered intelligence assistance.

Section 5718. Study on feasibility and advisability of establishing Geospatial-Intelligence Museum and learning center.

Section 5718 requires the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) to complete a study and report the findings on the feasibility and advisability of establishing a Geospatial-Intelligence Museum and learning center.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Section 5721. Whistleblower disclosures to Congress and committees of Congress.

Section 5721 enables whistleblowers to provide classified disclosures to appropriate committees of Congress.

Section 5722. Task force on illicit financing of espionage and foreign influence operations.

Section 5722 requires the DNI to establish a task force to study and assess the illicit financing of espionage and foreign influence operations directed at the United States and requires the task force to issue a report on this subject to the appropriate congressional committees.

Section 5723. Establishment of fifth-generation technology prize competition.

Section 5723 establishes a program to award prizes to stimulate research and development relevant to fifth-generation wireless technology.

Section 5724. Establishment of deepfakes prize competition.

Section 5724 establishes a program to award prizes to stimulate the research, de-

velopment, or commercialization of technologies to automatically detect machine-manipulated media.

Section 5725. Identification of and countermeasures against certain International Mobile Subscriber Identity-Catchers.

Section 5725 requires the DNI and the Director of the FBI, in collaboration with the Under Secretary of DHS for I&A, and other appropriate heads of Federal agencies, to undertake an effort to identify and, when appropriate, develop countermeasures against, International Mobile Subscriber Identity-Catchers operated within the United States by criminals and hostile foreign governments.

Section 5726. Securing energy infrastructure.

Section 5726 requires the Secretary of Energy, within 180 days of enactment of the Act, to establish a two-year control systems implementation pilot program within the National Laboratories. This pilot program will partner with covered entities in the energy sector to identify new security vulnerabilities, and for purposes of researching, developing, testing, and implementing technology platforms and standards in partnership with such entities. Section 5726 also requires the Secretary to establish a working group composed of identified private and public sector entities to evaluate the technology platforms and standards for the pilot program, and develop a national cyber-informed engineering strategy to isolate and defend covered entities from security vulnerabilities. Section 5726 requires the Secretary, within 180 days after the date on which funds are first disbursed, to submit to specified committees an interim report that describes the pilot program's results, provides a feasibility analysis, and describes the working group's evaluations. Section 5726 further requires the Secretary, within two years of funding, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a progress report on the pilot program and an analysis of the feasibility of the methods studied, and a description of the working group's evaluation results.

SUBDIVISION 2—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Section 6100. Table of contents.

TITLE LXI—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Section 6101. Authorization of appropriations.

Section 6101 lists the United States Government departments, agencies, and other elements for which the Act deems authorized appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Section 6102. Intelligence Community Management Account.

Section 6102 provides that the amounts that were appropriated for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 are deemed authorized.

TITLE LXII—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Section 6201. Authorization of appropriations.

Section 6201 deems authorized the appropriations for the CIA Retirement and Disability Fund for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Section 6202. Computation of annuities for employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 6202 makes technical changes to the CIA Retirement Act to conform with various statutes governing the Civil Service Retirement System.

TITLE LXIII—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Section 6301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Section 6301 provides that the authorization of appropriations by the Act shall not

be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

Section 6302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Section 6302 provides that funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in compensation or benefits authorized by law.

Section 6303. Modification of special pay authority for science, technology, engineering, or mathematics positions and addition of special pay authority for cyber positions.

Section 6303 provides an increased yearly cap for Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mathematics (STEM) employee positions in the IC that support critical cyber missions. Section 6303 also permits the National Security Agency (NSA) to establish a special rate of pay for positions that perform functions that execute the agency's cyber mission.

Section 6304. Modification of appointment of Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community.

Section 6304 changes the position of IC Chief Information Officer from being subject to presidential appointment to being subject to appointment by the DNI.

Section 6305. Director of National Intelligence review of placement of positions within the intelligence community on the Executive Schedule.

Section 6305 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management, to conduct a review of the positions within the IC that may be appropriate for inclusion on the Executive Schedule, and the appropriate levels for inclusion.

Section 6306. Supply Chain and Counterintelligence Risk Management Task Force.

Section 6306 requires the DNI to establish a task force to standardize information sharing between the IC and the United States Government acquisition community with respect to supply chain, cybersecurity, and counterintelligence risks. Section 6306 further provides requirements for membership, security clearances, and annual reports.

Section 6307. Consideration of adversarial telecommunications and cybersecurity infrastructure when sharing intelligence with foreign governments and entities.

Section 6307 requires the IC, when entering into foreign intelligence sharing agreements, to consider the pervasiveness of telecommunications and cybersecurity infrastructure, equipment, and services provided by United States adversaries or entities thereof.

Section 6308. Cyber protection support for the personnel of the intelligence community in positions highly vulnerable to cyber attack.

Section 6308 permits the DNI to provide cyber protection support for the personal technology devices and personal accounts of IC personnel whom the DNI determines to be highly vulnerable to cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities.

Section 6309. Elimination of sunset authority relating to management of supply-chain risk.

Section 6309 extends certain IC procurement authorities to manage and protect against supply chain risks.

Section 6310. Limitations on determinations regarding certain security classifications.

Section 6310 prohibits an officer of the IC who is nominated to a Senate-confirmed position from making certain classification determinations posing potential conflicts of interest regarding that nominee.

Section 6311. Joint Intelligence Community Council.

Section 6311 amends Section 101A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3022(d)) as to the Joint Intelligence Community Council meetings and to require a report on its activities.

Section 6312. Intelligence community information technology environment.

Section 6312 defines the roles and responsibilities for the performance of the Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment (IC ITE). Section 6312 requires certain reporting and briefing requirements to the congressional intelligence committees regarding the IC's ongoing implementation of IC ITE.

Section 6313. Report on development of secure mobile voice solution for intelligence community.

Section 6313 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Directors of the CIA and NSA, provide the congressional intelligence committees with a classified report on the feasibility, desirability, cost, and required schedule associated with the implementation of a secure mobile voice solution for the IC.

Section 6314. Policy on minimum insider threat standards.

Section 6314 requires the DNI to develop minimum insider threat standards to be followed by each element of the IC, consistent with the National Insider Threat Policy and Minimum Standards for Executive Branch Insider Threat Programs.

Section 6315. Submission of intelligence community policies.

Section 6315 requires the DNI to make all ODNI policies and procedures available to the congressional intelligence committees. Section 6315 also requires ODNI to notify the congressional committees of any new or rescinded policies.

Section 6316. Expansion of intelligence community recruitment efforts.

Section 6316 requires the DNI, in consultation with IC elements, to submit a plan to the congressional intelligence committees as to each element's efforts in recruitment from rural and underrepresented regions.

TITLE LXIV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Section 6401. Authority for protection of current and former employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Section 6401 amends Title 50, section 3506, to provide protection for current and former ODNI personnel and designated immediate family members, if there is a national security threat that warrants such protection.

Section 6402. Designation of the program manager-information sharing environment.

Section 6402 amends the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 so that the Program Manager-Information Sharing Environment (PM-ISE) is subject to appointment by the DNI, not the President.

Section 6403. Technical modification to the executive schedule.

Section 6403 amends the Executive Schedule to make the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center a Level IV position on the Executive Schedule.

Section 6404. Chief Financial Officer of the Intelligence Community.

Section 6404 amends the National Security Act of 1947 by requiring the Chief Financial Officer of the IC to directly report to the DNI.

Section 6405. Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community.

Section 6405 amends the National Security Act of 1947 by requiring the Chief Informa-

tion Officer of the IC to directly report to the DNI.

Subtitle B—Central Intelligence Agency

Section 6411. Central Intelligence Agency subsistence for personnel assigned to austere locations.

Section 6411 authorizes the Director of the CIA to approve, with or without reimbursement, subsistence to personnel assigned to an austere overseas location.

Section 6412. Special rules for certain monthly workers' compensation payments and other payments for Central Intelligence Agency personnel.

Section 6412 authorizes the Director of the CIA to provide enhanced injury benefits to a covered employee or qualifying dependents who suffer an injury overseas due to war, insurgency, hostile act, or terrorist activities.

Section 6413. Expansion of security protective service jurisdiction of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 6413 expands the security perimeter jurisdiction at CIA facilities from 500 feet to 500 yards.

Section 6414. Repeal of foreign language proficiency requirement for certain senior level positions in the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 6414 repeals Title 50, section 3036(g), with conforming amendments to section 611 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-487).

Subtitle C—Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy

Section 6421. Consolidation of Department of Energy Offices of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.

Section 6421 amends the Department of Energy Organization Act to consolidate the offices of intelligence and counterintelligence into the DOE Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.

Section 6422. Repeal of Department of Energy Intelligence Executive Committee and budget reporting requirement.

Section 6422 amends the Department of Energy Organization Act by repealing the Department of Energy Intelligence Executive Committee, as well as certain budgetary reporting requirements.

Subtitle D—Other Elements

Section 6431. Plan for designation of counterintelligence component of the Defense Security Service as an element of intelligence community.

Section 6431 directs the DNI and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, to provide the congressional intelligence and defense committees with an implementation plan to make the Defense Security Service's (DSS's) Counterintelligence component an element of the IC as defined in paragraph(4) of section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), by January 1, 2020. Section 6431 further mandates that the plan shall not address the DSS's personnel security functions.

Section 6432. Notice not required for private entities.

Section 6432 provides a Rule of Construction that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is not required to provide notice to private entities before issuing directives on agency information security policies and practices.

Section 6433. Establishment of advisory board for National Reconnaissance Office.

Section 6433 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the Director of the

NRO to establish an advisory board to study matters related to space, overhead reconnaissance, acquisition, and other matters. Section 6433 provides that the board shall terminate 3 years after the Director declares the board's first meeting.

Section 6434. Collocation of certain Department of Homeland Security personnel at field locations.

Section 6434 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence & Analysis (DHS I&A) to identify opportunities for collocation of I&A field officers and to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a plan for deployment.

TITLE LXV—ELECTION MATTERS

Section 6501. Report on cyber attacks by foreign governments against United States election infrastructure.

Section 6501 directs the DHS Under Secretary for I&A to submit a report on cyber attacks and attempted cyber attacks by foreign governments on United States election infrastructure, in connection with the 2016 presidential election. Section 6501 further requires this report to include identification of the States and localities affected and include efforts to attack voter registration databases, voting machines, voting-related computer networks, and the networks of Secretaries of State and other election officials.

Section 6502. Review of intelligence community's posture to collect against and analyze Russian efforts to influence the Presidential election.

Section 6502 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees, within one year of enactment of the Act, a report on the Director's review of the IC's posture to collect against and analyze Russian efforts to interfere with the 2016 United States presidential election. Section 6502 further requires the review to include assessments of IC resources, information sharing, and legal authorities.

Section 6503. Assessment of foreign intelligence threats to Federal elections.

Section 6503 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Director of the CIA, Director of the NSA, Director of the FBI, Secretary of DHS, and heads of other relevant IC elements, to commence assessments of security vulnerabilities of State election systems one year before regularly scheduled Federal elections. Section 6503 further requires the DNI to submit a report on such assessments 180 days before regularly scheduled Federal elections, and an updated assessment 90 days before regularly scheduled Federal elections.

Section 6504. Strategy for countering Russian cyber threats to United States elections.

Section 6504 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Secretary of DHS, Director of the FBI, Director of the CIA, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of the Treasury, to develop a whole-of-government strategy for countering Russian cyber threats against United States electoral systems and processes. Section 6504 further requires this strategy to include input from solicited Secretaries of State and chief election officials.

Section 6505. Assessment of significant Russian influence campaigns directed at foreign elections and referenda.

Section 6505 requires the DNI to provide a report assessing past and ongoing Russian influence campaigns against foreign elections and referenda, to include a summary of the means by which such influence campaigns have been or are likely to be conducted, a summary of defenses against or responses to such Russian influence campaigns, a summary of IC activities to assist

foreign governments against such campaigns, and an assessment of the effectiveness of such foreign defenses and responses.

Section 6506. Information sharing with State election officials.

Section 6506 requires the DNI, within 30 days of enactment of the Act, to support security clearances for each eligible chief election official of a State, territory, or the District of Columbia (and additional eligible designees), up to the Top Secret level. Section 6506 also requires the DNI to assist with sharing appropriate classified information about threats to election systems.

Section 6507. Notification of significant foreign cyber intrusions and active measure campaigns directed at elections for Federal offices.

Section 6507 requires the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to brief the congressional intelligence committees, congressional leadership, the armed services committees, the appropriations committees, and the homeland security committees (consistent with sources and methods) not later than 14 days after a determination has been made with moderate or high confidence that a significant foreign cyber intrusion or active measures campaign intended to influence an upcoming election for any Federal office has taken place by a foreign state or foreign non-state person, group, or other entity. The briefing shall provide a description of the significant foreign cyber intrusion or active measures campaign, including an identification of the foreign state or foreign non-state person or group.

Section 6508. Designation of counterintelligence officer to lead election security matters.

Section 6508 requires the DNI to designate a national counterintelligence officer within the National Counterintelligence and Security Center to lead, manage, and coordinate election security-related counterintelligence matters, including certain risks from foreign power interference.

TITLE LXVI—SECURITY CLEARANCES

Section 6601. Definitions.

Section 6601 provides definitions for terminology used throughout this Title.

Section 6602. Reports and plans relating to security clearances and background investigations.

Section 6602 requires the interagency Performance Accountability Council (Council) to provide plans to reduce the background investigation inventory and best align the investigation function between DoD and the National Background Investigation Bureau. Section 6602 further requires the Council to report on the future of the clearance process and requires the DNI to notify the appropriate committees of responding to official requests to change clearance standards, and the status of those requests' disposition. As with other reports in this title, these reports can be met in a consolidated format and potentially through the regularly scheduled quarterly Council briefings.

Section 6603. Improving the process for security clearances.

Section 6603 requires the DNI to review the Questionnaire for National Security positions (SF-86 or any current instantiation thereof) and the Federal Investigative Standards to determine potential unnecessary information required and assess whether revisions are necessary to account for insider threats. Section 6603 further requires the DNI, in coordination with the Council, to establish policies on interim clearances and consistency between the clearance process for contract and government personnel.

Section 6604. Goals for promptness of determinations regarding security clearances.

Section 6604 requires the Council to implement a plan to be able to process 90 percent of clearance requests at the Secret level in 30 days, and at the Top Secret-level in 90 days. The provision provides the Council with latitude to issue equivalent metrics that similarly improve the timeliness of the clearance process. The plan shall also address how to recognize reciprocity in accepting clearances among agencies within two weeks, and to require that ninety percent of clearance holders not be subject to a time-based periodic investigation.

Section 6605. Security Executive Agent.

Section 6605 establishes the DNI as the government's Security Executive Agent, consistent with Executive Order 13467, and sets forth relevant authorities.

Section 6606. Report on unified, simplified, Governmentwide standards for positions of trust and security clearances.

Section 6606 directs the DNI and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to report on the advisability and implications of consolidating the tiers for positions of trust and security clearances from 5 to 3 tiers.

Section 6607. Report on clearance in person concept.

Section 6607 requires the DNI to submit a report on a concept whereby an individual can maintain eligibility for access to classified information for up to 3 years after access may lapse.

Section 6608. Reports on reciprocity for security clearances inside of departments and agencies.

Section 6608 requires each federal agency to submit a report to the DNI that identifies the number of clearances that take more than two weeks to reciprocally recognize and set forth the reason for any delays. Section 6608 further requires the DNI to submit an annual report summarizing reciprocity.

Section 6609. Intelligence community reports on security clearances.

Section 6609 requires the DNI to submit a report on each IC element's security clearance metrics, segregated by Federal employees and contractor employees.

Section 6610. Periodic report on positions in the intelligence community that can be conducted without access to classified information, networks, or facilities.

Section 6610 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on positions that can be conducted without access to classified information, networks, or facilities, or may require only a Secret-level clearance.

Section 6611. Information-sharing program for positions of trust and security clearances.

Section 6611 requires the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability and Credentialing Executive Agents to establish a program to share information between and among government agencies and industry partners to inform decisions about positions of trust and security clearances.

Section 6612. Report on protections for confidentiality of whistleblower-related communications.

Section 6612 requires the Security Executive Agent, in coordination with the IC IG, to submit a report detailing the IC's controls used to ensure continuous evaluation programs protect the confidentiality of whistleblower-related communications.

Section 6613. Reports on costs of security clearance background investigations.

Section 6613 requires the DNI to provide an annual report for three years after enact-

ment on the resources expended by each government agency for processing security clearance background investigations and continuous evaluation programs, disaggregated by tier and employment status.

TITLE LXVII—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS
Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Russia and Other Foreign Powers

Section 6701. Limitation relating to establishment or support of cybersecurity unit with the Russian Federation.

Section 6701 prohibits the Federal government from expending any funds to establish or support a cybersecurity unit or other cyber agreement that is jointly established or otherwise implemented by the United States Government and the Russian Federation, unless the DNI submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees at least 30 days prior to any such agreement. The report shall include the agreement's purpose, intended shared intelligence, value to national security, counterintelligence concerns, and any measures taken to mitigate such concerns.

Section 6702. Assessment of threat finance relating to Russia.

Section 6702 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees, within 60 days of enactment of the Act, an assessment of Russian threat finance, based on all-source intelligence from both the IC and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence of the Treasury Department. Section 6702 further requires the assessment to include global nodes and entry points for Russian money laundering; United States vulnerabilities; connections between Russian individuals involved in money laundering and the Russian Government; counterintelligence threats to the United States posed by Russian money laundering and other forms of threat finance; and challenges to United States Government efforts to enforce sanctions and combat organized crime.

Section 6703. Notification of an active measures campaign.

Section 6703 requires the DNI to notify congressional leadership, and the Chairman and Vice Chairman or Ranking Member of the appropriate congressional committees, each time the DNI has determined there is credible information that a foreign power has attempted, is attempting, or will attempt to employ a covert influence or active measures campaign with regard to the modernization, employment, doctrine, or force posture of the United States' nuclear deterrent or missile defense. Section 6703 further requires that such notification must include information on any actions that the United States has taken to expose or halt such attempts.

Section 6704. Notification of travel by accredited diplomatic and consular personnel of the Russian Federation in the United States.

Section 6704 requires the Secretary of State to ensure that the Russian Federation provides notification at least two business days in advance of all travel that is subject to such requirements by accredited diplomatic and consular personnel of the Russian Federation in the United States, and take necessary action to secure full compliance by Russian personnel and address any non-compliance.

Section 6705. Report and annual briefing on Iranian expenditures supporting foreign military and terrorist activities.

Section 6705 requires the DNI to submit a report to Congress describing Iranian expenditures on military and terrorist activities outside the country.

Section 6706. Expansion of scope of committee to counter active measures.

Section 6706 amends a provision in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 to expand the scope of the interagency committee to counter active measures by the Russian Federation to add China, Iran, North Korea, and other nation states.

Subtitle B—Reports

Section 6711. Technical correction to Inspector General study.

Section 6711 amends Title 50, section 11001(d), by replacing the IC IG's "audit" requirement for Inspectors General with employees having classified material access, with a "review" requirement.

Section 6712. Reports on authorities of the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

Section 6712 requires the Secretary of DHS, in consultation with the Under Secretary for I&A, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the adequacy of the Under Secretary's authorities required as the Chief Intelligence Officer to organize the Homeland Security Intelligence Enterprise, and the legal and policy changes necessary to coordinate, organize, and lead DHS intelligence activities.

Section 6713. Review of intelligence community whistleblower matters.

Section 6713 directs the IC IG, in consultations with the IGs of other IC agencies, to conduct a review of practices and procedures relating to IC whistleblower matters.

Section 6714. Report on role of Director of National Intelligence with respect to certain foreign investments.

Section 6714 directs the DNI to submit a report on ODNI's role in preparing analytic materials in connection with the United States Government's evaluation of national security risks associated with potential foreign investments.

Section 6715. Report on surveillance by foreign governments against United States telecommunications networks.

Section 6715 requires the DNI, in coordination with the Director of the CIA, Director of the NSA, Director of the FBI, and Secretary of DHS, to submit to the congressional intelligence, judiciary, and homeland security committees, within 180 days of enactment of the Act, a report on known attempts by foreign governments to exploit cybersecurity vulnerabilities in United States telecommunications networks to surveil United States persons, and any actions that the IC has taken to protect United States Government agencies and personnel from such surveillance.

Section 6716. Biennial report on foreign investment risks.

Section 6716 requires the DNI to establish an IC working group on foreign investment risks and prepare a biennial report that includes an identification, analysis, and explanation of national security vulnerabilities, foreign investment trends, foreign countries' strategies to exploit vulnerabilities through the acquisition of either critical technologies (including components or items essential to national defense), critical materials (including physical materials essential to national security), or critical infrastructure (including physical or virtual systems and assets whose destruction or incapacity would have a debilitating impact on national security), and market distortions caused by foreign countries. Technologies, materials, and infrastructure are deemed to be "critical" under this provision if their exploitation by a foreign government could cause severe harm to the national security of the United States.

Section 6717. Modification of certain reporting requirement on travel of foreign diplomats.

Section 6717 amends a provision in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, to require reporting of "a best estimate" of known or suspected violations of certain travel requirements by accredited diplomatic and consular personnel of the Russian Federation.

Section 6718. Semiannual reports on investigations of unauthorized disclosures of classified information.

Section 6718 requires the Assistant Attorney General for National Security at the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Director of the FBI, to submit to the congressional intelligence and judiciary committees a semiannual report on the status of IC referrals to the Department of Justice regarding unauthorized disclosures of classified information. Section 6718 also directs IC elements to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a semiannual report on the number of investigations opened and completed by each agency regarding an unauthorized public disclosure of classified information to the media, and the number of completed investigations referred to the Attorney General.

Section 6719. Congressional notification of designation of covered intelligence officer as persona non grata.

Section 6719 requires, not later than 72 hours after a covered intelligence officer is designated as persona non grata, that the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the designated committees a notification of that designation, to include the basis for the designation and justification for the expulsion.

Section 6720. Reports on intelligence community participation in vulnerabilities equities process of Federal Government.

Section 6720 requires the DNI to submit, within 90 days of enactment of the Act, to the congressional intelligence committees a report describing the Vulnerabilities Equities Process (VEP) roles and responsibilities for each IC element. Section 6720 further requires each IC element to report to the congressional intelligence committees within 30 days of a significant change to that respective IC element's VEP process and criteria. Section 6720 also requires the DNI to submit an annual report to the congressional intelligence committees with specified information on certain VEP metrics.

Section 6721. Inspectors General reports on classification.

Section 6721 requires each designated IG to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the accuracy in the application of classification and handling markings on a representative sample of finished products, to include those with compartments. Section 6721 also directs analyses of compliance with declassification procedures and a review of the effectiveness of processes for identifying topics of public or historical importance that merit prioritization for declassification review.

Section 6722. Reports on global water insecurity and national security implications and briefing on emerging infectious disease and pandemics.

Section 6722 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the implications of global water insecurity on the United States' national security interests. Section 6722 further requires the DNI to provide a briefing to appropriate congressional committees on the geopolitical effects of emerging infectious disease and pandemics, and their implications on the United States' national security.

Section 6723. Annual report on memoranda of understanding between elements of intelligence community and other entities of the United States Government regarding significant operational activities or policy.

Section 6723 amends a provision in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, instead requiring each IC element to submit an annual report to the Committees that lists each significant memorandum of understanding or other agreement entered into during the preceding fiscal year. Section 6723 further requires each IC element to provide such documents if an intelligence committee so requests.

Section 6724. Study on the feasibility of encrypting unclassified wireline and wireless telephone calls.

Section 6724 requires the DNI to complete a study on the feasibility of encrypting unclassified wireline and wireless telephone calls between personnel in the IC.

Section 6725. Reports on intelligence community loan repayment and related programs.

Section 6725 requires the DNI, in cooperation with the heads of the elements of the IC, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on potentially establishing an IC-wide program for student loan repayment and forgiveness.

Section 6726. Repeal of certain reporting requirements.

Section 6726 repeals certain IC reporting requirements.

Section 6727. Inspector General of the Intelligence Community report on senior executives of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Section 6727 directs the IC IG to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees regarding senior executive service staffing at the ODNI.

Section 6728. Briefing on Federal Bureau of Investigation offering permanent residence to sources and cooperators.

Section 6728 directs the FBI within 30 days of enactment of this Act to provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence committees regarding the FBI's ability to provide permanent U.S. residence to foreign individuals who serve as cooperators in national security-related investigations.

Section 6729. Intelligence assessment of North Korea revenue sources.

Section 6729 requires the DNI, in coordination with other relevant IC elements, to produce to the congressional intelligence committees an intelligence assessment of the North Korean regime's revenue sources.

Section 6730. Report on possible exploitations of virtual currencies by terrorist actors.

Section 6730 requires the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to submit to Congress a report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Section 6741. Public Interest Declassification Board.

Section 6741 permanently reauthorizes the Public Interest Declassification Board administered by the National Archives and Records Administration.

Section 6742. Technical and clerical amendments to the National Security Act of 1947.

Section 6742 makes certain edits to the National Security Act of 1947 as amended for technical or clerical purposes.

Section 6743. Bug bounty programs.

Section 6743 directs the Secretary of DHS, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to submit a strategic plan to implement bug bounty programs at appropriate

agencies and departments of the United States Government. Section 6743 further requires the plan to include an assessment of the “Hack the Pentagon” pilot program and subsequent bug bounty programs. Section 6743 also requires the plan to provide recommendations on the feasibility of initiating bug bounty programs across the United States Government.

Section 6744. Technical amendments related to the Department of Energy.

Section 6744 provides technical corrections to certain provisions regarding the Department of Energy’s Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.

Section 6745. Sense of Congress on notification of certain disclosures of classified information.

Section 6745 expresses the sense of Congress that, pursuant to the requirement for the IC to keep the congressional intelligence committees “fully and currently informed”

in Section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947, IC agencies must submit prompt written notification after becoming aware that an individual in the executive branch has disclosed certain classified information outside established intelligence channels to foreign adversaries—North Korea, Iran, China, Russia, or Cuba.

Section 6746. Sense of Congress on consideration of espionage activities when considering whether or not to provide visas to foreign individuals to be accredited to a United Nations mission in the United States.

Section 6746 provides a Sense of Congress that, as to foreign individuals to be accredited to a United Nations mission, the Secretary of State should consider known and suspected intelligence and espionage activities, including activities constituting precursors to espionage, carried out by such individuals against the United States, or against foreign allies or partners of the United States. Section 6746 further provides

that the Secretary of State should consider an individual’s status as a known or suspected intelligence officer for a foreign adversary.

Section 6747. Sense of Congress on WikiLeaks.

Section 6747 provides a Sense of Congress that WikiLeaks and its senior leadership resemble a non-state hostile intelligence service, often abetted by state actors, and should be treated as such.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o’clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 13, 2019, at noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 3 AND NOV. 5, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Takano	11/3	11/5	Japan	922.98	642.27	308.16	1,873.41
Yuri Beckelman	11/3	11/5	Japan	922.98	15,295.72	308.16	16,526.86
Committee total					1,845.96		15,937.99		616.32		18,400.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARK TAKANO, Dec. 5, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to Iceland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Finland—July 26–August 2, 2019											
Hon. Ruben Gallego	7/27	7/28	Iceland	559.48	559.48
	7/28	7/29	Scotland	234.82	234.82
	7/29	7/31	Norway	569.68	569.68
	7/31	8/1	Finland	355.37	355.37
Commercial airfare							9,231.29				9,231.29
Sapna Sharma	7/27	7/28	Iceland	559.48	559.48
	7/28	7/29	Scotland	234.82	234.82
	7/29	7/31	Norway	569.68	569.68
	7/31	8/1	Finland	355.37	355.37
Commercial airfare							8,431.79				8,431.79
Travel to France, Italy, Morocco—July 26–August 5, 2019 with CODEL Pallone											
Hon. John Garamendi	7/27	7/28	France	350.00	350.00
	7/29	8/2	Italy	705.00	705.00
	8/3	8/5	Morocco	111.00	111.00
Travel to Pakistan, Tajikistan—July 27–August 3, 2019											
William T. Johnson	7/29	7/31	Pakistan	350.00	350.00
	8/1	8/3	Tajikistan	799.14	799.14
Commercial airfare							10,324.93				10,324.93
Mark Morehouse	7/29	7/31	Pakistan	150.00	150.00
Commercial airfare							8,605.71				8,605.71
Travel to Australia—August 4–14, 2019											
Hon. Joe Courtney	8/6	8/14	Australia	1,525.30	1,525.30
Hon. Mike Gallagher	8/6	8/14	Australia	1,525.30	1,525.30
Phil MacNaughton	8/6	8/14	Australia	1,525.30	1,525.30
David Sienicki	8/6	8/14	Australia	1,525.30	1,525.30
Halimah Locke	8/6	8/14	Australia	1,586.65	1,586.65
Travel to Australia, Japan—August 9–16, 2019											
Craig Greene	8/11	8/13	Australia	917.15	917.15
	8/14	8/16	Japan	358.00	358.00
Commercial airfare									21,114.00		21,114.00
Dave Giacchetti	8/11	8/13	Australia	917.15	917.15
	8/14	8/16	Japan	358.00	358.00
Commercial airfare							21,114.00				21,114.00
Brian Garrett	8/11	8/13	Australia	917.15	917.15
	8/14	8/16	Japan	358.00	358.00
Commercial airfare							21,114.00				21,114.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dan Sennott	8/11	8/13	Australia		917.15						917.15
	8/14	8/16	Japan		358.00						358.00
Commercial airfare							21,114.00				21,114.00
Laura Rauch	8/11	8/13	Australia		917.15						917.15
	8/14	8/16	Japan		358.00						358.00
Commercial airfare							19,037.03				19,037.03
Travel to Thailand, Philippines—August 10–18, 2019											
Matt Rhoades	8/11	8/13	Philippines		449.55						449.55
	8/13	8/16	Thailand		507.29						507.29
Commercial airfare							21,087.73				21,087.73
Mark Morehouse	8/11	8/13	Philippines		615.65						615.65
	8/13	8/16	Thailand		628.00						628.00
Commercial airfare							13,856.67				13,856.67
Michael Hermann	8/11	8/13	Philippines		140.00						140.00
	8/13	8/16	Thailand		140.00						140.00
Commercial airfare							17,541.73				17,541.73
Katherine Quinn	8/13	8/16	Thailand		727.00						727.00
Commercial airfare							14,967.03				14,967.03
Shannon Green	8/11	8/13	Philippines		620.65						620.65
	8/13	8/16	Thailand		829.18						829.18
Commercial airfare							13,766.67				13,766.67
Travel to Germany, Niger, Nigeria, Mali, France—August 22–30, 2019 with CODEL Panetta											
Hon. Austin Scott	8/23	8/24	Germany		510.55						510.55
	8/24	8/26	Niger		539.67						539.67
	8/26	8/27	Nigeria		347.21						347.21
	8/27	8/28	Mali		235.28						235.28
	8/28	8/29	France		1,120.88						1,120.88
Commercial airfare							2,082.13				2,082.13
Hon. Anthony Brown	8/23	8/24	Germany		510.55						510.55
	8/24	8/26	Niger		539.67						539.67
	8/26	8/27	Nigeria		347.21						347.21
	8/27	8/28	Mali		235.28						235.28
	8/28	8/29	France		1,120.88						1,120.88
Commercial airfare							1,387.03				1,387.03
Laura Rauch	8/23	8/24	Germany		616.00						616.00
	8/24	8/26	Niger		537.00						537.00
	8/26	8/27	Nigeria		348.00						348.00
	8/27	8/28	Mali		243.00						243.00
	8/28	8/29	France		1,082.00						1,082.00
Commercial airfare							2,142.00				2,142.00
Committee total					32,957.94		226,917.74				259,875.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ADAM SMITH, Nov. 1, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. William Timmons IV	9/3	9/5	Montenegro		643.24						643.24
	9/5	9/6	Croatia		401.46						401.46
	9/6	9/8	Italy		1,066.14						1,066.14
Committee total											2,110.84

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH, Dec. 5, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert B. Aderholt	6/28	7/2	United Kingdom	Pound Sterling	2,390.00						2,390.00
	7/2	7/3	Poland	Zloty	443.29						443.29
			Luxembourg	Euros	2,494.13						2,494.13
Hon. Richard Hudson	6/28	7/2	United Kingdom	Pound Sterling	2,875.00						2,875.00
	7/3	7/8	Luxembourg	Euros	2,784.13						2,784.13
Hon. Steve Cohen	6/28	6/30	Denmark	Kroner	978.76						978.76
	6/30	7/1	Ukraine	Hryvnia	239.69						239.69
	7/1	7/3	Hungary	Forint	848.00						848.00
	7/3	7/5	Luxembourg	Euros	1,010.00						1,010.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/30	7/3	Hungary	Forint	463.00		8,073.20				8,536.20
	6/30	7/1	Luxembourg	Euros	1,010.00						1,010.00
Alex T. Johnson	6/27	7/1	Belgium	Euros	408.00		3,306.53				3,714.53
	7/1	7/3	Hungary	Forint	696.00						696.00
	7/3	7/9	Luxembourg	Euros	750.00						750.00
Mischa Thompson	6/22	6/29	Belgium	Euros	1,088.00		11,498.33				12,586.33
	6/29	7/2	Netherlands	Euros	426.00						426.00
	7/2	7/7	Luxembourg	Euros	625.00						625.00
Janice Helwig	7/3	7/10	Luxembourg	Euros			1,026.20				1,026.20
Francois Hernandez	7/3	7/7	Luxembourg	Euros	2,274.38		1,924.63				4,199.01
Erika Schlager	7/1	7/3	Hungary	Forint	1,392.00		1,025.33				2,417.33
Alex Tiersky	7/18	7/23	Ukraine	Hryvnia	1,493.34		10,658.43				12,151.77
Alex T. Johnson	8/28	8/30	Mongolia	Togrog	570.00		6,440.53				7,010.53
	8/30	9/4	Japan	Yen	1,907.57						1,907.57

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Paul Massaro	8/28	8/30	Mongolia	Tögrög	570.00	6,450.53	7,020.53
Janice Helwig	8/30	9/4	Japan	Yen	1,907.57	1,907.57
Alex T. Johnson	8/30	9/4	Japan	Yen	1,907.57	5,517.90	7,425.47
Janice Helwig	9/13	9/21	Poland	Zloty	1,784.25	2,925.13	4,709.38
Shannon Simrell	9/15	9/27	Poland	Zloty	2,132.99	1,249.50	3,382.49
Mark Toner	9/14	9/24	Poland	Zloty	2,587.49	3,362.43	5,949.92
Francois Hernandez	9/14	9/20	Poland	Zloty	1,338.75	3,771.43	5,110.18
Mischa Thompson	9/19	9/25	Poland	Zloty	1,338.75	2,090.13	3,428.88
.....	9/17	9/22	France	Euros	2,797.00	9,001.83	11,798.83
.....	9/22	9/24	Belgium	Euros	513.00	513.00
.....	9/24	9/27	Poland	Zloty	803.25	803.25
Nathaniel Hurd	9/18	9/25	Poland	Zloty	1,874.25	2,682.93	4,557.18
.....	9/25	9/27	Switzerland	Swiss Franc	947.13	947.13
Paul Massaro	9/10	9/14	Czechia	Czech Koruna	1,653.37	1,097.93	2,751.30
.....
Janice Helwig	6/1	8/7	Austria	Euros	25,039.00	13,657.33	38,696.33
Committee total	74,360.66	95,760.25	170,120.91

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Dec. 9, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3279. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 1st quarter FY 2020 Quarterly Briefing on Progress of the Chemical Demilitarization Program, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3280. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs, Fiscal Year 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3281. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the fifteenth annual Federal Trade Commission Report on Ethanol Market Concentration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(10)(B); July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title II, Sec. 211 (amended by Public Law 109-58, Sec. 1501(a)(2)); (119 Stat. 1074); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3282. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3283. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 01-20, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3284. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-175, "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3285. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-177, "Federal Worker Housing Relief Extension Temporary Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3286. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

D.C. Act 23-176, "Community Harassment Prevention Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3287. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to the Congress for the reporting period April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3288. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019 and the Management Report on Final Actions for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3289. A letter from the Office of Public and Congressional Affairs, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 2019 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3290. A letter from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting the Gallery's Inspector General Act of 1978 report for Fiscal Year 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3291. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XY018) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3292. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2019 Commercial Closure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia [Docket No.: 181009921-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-XS011) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3293. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the Cen-

tral Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG996) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3294. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2018 and Projected 2019 Scup Specifications and Announcement of Final 2018 Summer Flounder and Black Sea Bass Specifications; Correction [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF669) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3295. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Authorize Recreational Quota Entity To Participate in the Halibut IFQ Program [Docket No.: 161222999-8773-02] (RIN: 0648-BG57) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3296. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule- Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Modifications to Individual Fishing Quota Programs [Docket No.: 170413393-8487-02] (RIN: 0648-BG83) received December 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1620. A bill to

amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program (Rept. 116-338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2548. A bill to modify eligibility requirements for certain hazard mitigation assistance programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-339, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4719. A bill to amend the Federal share of the fishing safety standards grants; with an amendment (Rept. 116-340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON (MS): Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3256. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize and improve the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-341, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. JOHNSON (TX): Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4704. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability; with an amendment (Rept. 116-342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5065. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide re-entry entrepreneurship counseling and training services for formerly incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5078. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide re-entry entrepreneurship counseling and training services for incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2548 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 5406. A bill to provide grants to owners of grandfamily housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5407. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer certain property of the Department of Defense to State and Federal agencies for purposes of disaster-related emergency preparedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 5408. A bill to oppose violations of religious freedom in Ukraine by Russia and armed groups commanded by Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CURTIS:

H.R. 5409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax credits for energy storage technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROY, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 5410. A bill to prohibit Federal interference with the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 5411. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Task Force on Local Mental Health Needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5412. A bill to direct the National Council on Disability to conduct a review of the implementation of standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in the travel, tourism, and hospitality industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CARBAJAL (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 5413. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe additional regulations to secure the safety of individuals and property on board certain small passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5414. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to implement a policy on allergy bullying in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 5415. A bill to provide the Food and Drug Administration with authority to conduct microbial sampling on concentrated animal feeding operations as necessary to facilitate a foodborne illness outbreak investigation, determine the root cause of an outbreak of foodborne illness, or address other public health needs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 5416. A bill to establish a National Climate Bank; to the Committee on Energy and

Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 5417. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add membership in a significant transnational criminal organization to the list of grounds of inadmissibility and to prohibit the provision of material support or resources to such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Rules, and Financial Services, 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 Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5418. A bill to require executive agencies to reduce cost-sharing requirements for certain grants with certain nonprofit organizations 25 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 5419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require payroll tax withholding on independent contractors of certain large businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5420. A bill to establish the Pullman National Historical Park in the State of Illinois as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 5421. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; 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 Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 5422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain rules applicable to qualified small issue manufacturing bonds, to expand certain exceptions to the private activity bond rules for first-time farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 5423. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize owners or operators of general aviation airports to impose certain restrictions relating to noise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5424. A bill to protect funding for Universal Service Fund programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 5425. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include court-ordered receivership in the list of actions resulting in a change of ownership of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 5426. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study on the unsafe use of electric scooters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 5427. A bill to modernize training programs at aviation maintenance technician schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that assisted suicide (sometimes referred to using other terms) puts everyone, including those most vulnerable, at risk of deadly harm; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. YOUNG):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Reform, 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. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H. Res. 762. A resolution recognizing the 4th anniversary of the adoption of the inter-

national Paris Agreement on climate change; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 763. A resolution expressing support for the development of a national strategic plan to end deep poverty; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

151. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 97, urging the President and Congress of US to enact H.R. 500 which prevents IRS from collecting taxes on amount student loan forgiven for deceased veterans; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 5406.

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. OLSON:

H.R. 5407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 5411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 1

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 5413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8; U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5416.

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. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations as well as other financial powers which Congress has used to create the Department of the Treasury. For immigration and travel restrictions, Congress has had recognized plenary power over immigration since the Supreme Court 1889 Chae Chan Ping v. United States case.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 5418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"All legislative Power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 5419.

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 defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution by 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. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the

common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." And Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 5425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 5426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 5427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, and 18.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 218: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 587: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 588: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 779: Mr. WRIGHT, Ms. FOXF of North Carolina, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 921: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 961: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1042: Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1043: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1049: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1154: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1173: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1223: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1367: Ms. SCHRIER and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1380: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 1450: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1550: Mr. STEILL.

H.R. 1652: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1661: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1709: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1748: Mr. KIM and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1754: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1763: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1766: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 1973: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1975: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 1978: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 2013: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2096: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 2117: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. STELL.

H.R. 2214: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 2219: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2416: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2478: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2573: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GUEST, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 2599: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2616: Ms. BARRAGAN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2711: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2748: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2777: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2825: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2850: Ms. MENG and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2881: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2986: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2990: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 3040: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3077: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. STEILL.

H.R. 3114: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 3121: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3157: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3192: Ms. BASS and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3212: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 3235: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 3266: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3297: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3316: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 3373: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 3524: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3598: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3623: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3637: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 3689: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 3778: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3789: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 4046: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4078: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4211: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 4248: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 4269: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4307: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4347: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4368: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4426: Mr. BEYER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4438: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 4448: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4508: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 4516: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 4540: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4681: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4766: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 4832: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4899: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 4926: Ms. WILD and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 4980: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 4995: Ms. NORTON and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 5004: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 5044: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 5053: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 5068: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 5104: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 5116: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 5127: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 5136: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5166: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 5170: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 5172: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5176: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 5216: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5231: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5243: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 5267: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 5268: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 5272: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 5306: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 5338: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. CROW and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIRE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 672: Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 727: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H. Res. 729: Mr. STAUBER.

H. Res. 742: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HARDER of California.

H. Res. 744: Mr. SCALISE.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2019

No. 199

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, on Your people, shower Your blessings. Be for us a shield and sure defense. Lord, as we live in this tangled world, give us the wisdom to keep our eyes on You.

Bless our Senators. Crown their deliberations with Your wisdom so that Your purposes will prevail. Lord, quicken in our lawmakers noble impulses as You sanctify their efforts with Your mercy and might.

Be merciful to us. Forgive our faults, and remember that we are but dust, like a wind that blows by and is gone. Lord, keep us from stumbling or slipping.

We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I have spoken at length about the serious impact the Democrats' impeachment obsession has had on months' worth of important legislative priorities. For months, the Republicans have been calling for bipartisan solutions to the NDAA, to the appropriations process, and more, but only in the last couple of days, here in mid-De-

ember, have our Democratic colleagues gotten sufficiently serious about these must-pass bills.

In the meantime, while we have waited on the House Democrats to act, the Senate has made good use of our floor time to complete the American people's business with respect to nominations. Last week alone, the Senate confirmed two executive branch nominations and put eight impressive jurists in seats on Federal district courts.

This week, we have considered yet another slate of the President's well-qualified nominees. The Senate will consider today John Sullivan, of Maryland, to serve as Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to serve as Commissioner at the Food and Drug Administration, and Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Already this week, we have confirmed two more outstanding jurists to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit—Patrick Bumatay, of California, and Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada. Mr. Bumatay is a graduate of Yale and Harvard Law School. He clerked for the Eastern District of New York and the Tenth Circuit, practiced in the private sector, and served in a variety of roles with the Department of Justice. Mr. VanDyke graduated from Montana State University and Harvard Law School. His career has included a clerkship with the DC Circuit, time as a State solicitor general, and service as Deputy Assistant Attorney General at the Department of Justice. Both of these jurists are well qualified, and both have widespread respect from legal peers. Now they are the 49th and 50th circuit judges to have been nominated by President Trump and confirmed by the Senate in the last 3 years.

As I have said before, these kinds of milestones are emphatically not partisan achievements. It is not one party or the other that benefits when our

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6999

Federal courts consist of men and women who understand that a judge's job is to follow the law, not to make the law. The entire country benefits from that. Our constitutional system benefits from that as well. If a judge's applying our laws and our Constitution as they are written strikes anybody as a threat to one's particular agenda, it is the agenda that needs to change, not the judiciary the Framers intended.

On another matter, as I said, the Democrats' fixation with impeachment has pushed critical governing priorities right into the eleventh hour. Just yesterday, after months of delays and hostage-taking, the House Democrats finally approved an NDAA conference report. Next week, the Senate will pass it and send this overdue legislation to President Trump. Yet, of course, we need to follow up Defense authorization with Defense appropriations so that we actually supply the funding our servicemembers need to carry out their missions and our commanders need to plan for the future.

It is not just defense funding that has been hampered by the Democrats' impeachment obsession and reluctance to do anything bipartisan. All Federal funding has been jeopardized by the House's procrastination. That includes critical domestic programs with implications for every one of our colleagues and all of our constituents. Even today, at this late date, the Democratic leadership is continuing to delay a bipartisan agreement on appropriations. Even now, at the eleventh hour, the Democratic leadership is still threatening to potentially tank the whole process and force another continuing resolution.

Look, the story is the same as it has been for months—partisan policy demands, poison pills. It is exactly the playbook the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader had explicitly promised months ago, in writing, they would not use in order to sabotage appropriations.

Let me say that again. Last summer, the Speaker of the House and the Senate Democratic leader explicitly promised in writing that they would not use poison pills or changes to Presidential transfer authorities to sabotage the appropriations process. Yet, even in mid-December, they are still using those tactics to jeopardize all of our progress.

It doesn't have to end this way. I know earnest discussions are still underway as our colleagues in both Chambers work to fix this. I urge the Democratic leadership to let the committees do their work, to let the Congress do its work, and to let us pass legislation on a bipartisan basis next week.

On a related matter, while we hold out hope for a breakthrough in appropriations, we also know there has been one major casualty of Speaker PELOSI's impeachment obsession—Congress's ability to pass the President's USMCA this year.

It was more than a year ago that President Trump first signed the draft agreement with the leaders of Canada and Mexico—more than 12 months ago. That is how long the House Democrats have dragged their heels on the USMCA and have kept 176,000 new American jobs on ice. Now, at the eleventh hour, Speaker PELOSI has finally realized it would be too cynical and too nakedly partisan to allow her conference's impeachment obsession to kill the USMCA entirely.

So after a year of obstruction, she finally gave in to Republican pressure and struck a notional deal with the White House. But actions have consequences. That entire calendar year that House Democrats wasted has consequences. The Speaker's action was so belated that the administration is still—still—in the process of writing the actual bill. We don't have a bill yet. Once a bill is produced, the House has to take it up first, and then, under trade promotion authority that exists to protect the deals Presidents negotiate, after House passage, the bill spends up to 15 session days in the Senate Finance Committee. After that, there are up to 15 session days for the Senate to vote on the floor.

So, unfortunately, the Speaker's 12 months of delay have made it literally impossible for the Senate to take up the agreement this year. And if House Democrats send us impeachment articles, those have to come first in January, so the USMCA will get pushed back yet again.

Like I said, actions have consequences. There is just no way the Senate can make up for 12 months of House Democratic delays in just a couple of days. Governing is a question of priorities. Speaker PELOSI failed to make this trade deal a priority for the entire year, and we are now bound by the time requirements of TPA to protect the agreement here in the Senate.

On one final matter, speaking of priorities, listen to what the House Democrats are prioritizing. Listen to what they are doing today while all of this crucial legislation goes unfinished: more Judiciary Committee hearings on impeaching the President and on the floor, a vote on yet another far-left messaging bill with literally no chance of becoming law.

They are spending floor time on their socialist scheme to micromanage Americans' prescription drugs and put the Federal Government in charge of the medicines so many people rely on. The Speaker wants to take us down the road of nationalizing an entire industry and imposing Washington's stifling influence on the life sciences sector that produces lifesaving cures—never mind the fact that this far-left messaging bill has zero chance of passing the Senate and that President Trump has already threatened to veto it.

We know by now that political performance art takes precedence over bipartisan legislation where this Democratic House has been concerned. I

hope these stunts—stunts—come to an end soon. I hope the House finds time to finish negotiating the things we actually have to pass—the funding of the government. I hope we can do that in good faith. I hope our Democratic colleagues join Republicans at the table, and let's get the American people's business that must be done accomplished.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, this past Sunday, hundreds of thousands of protesters filled the streets of Hong Kong to remind Beijing that totalitarianism will no longer go unchallenged.

I was reading a New York Times article about this protest when I came across a particularly striking quote. When asked why she had taken to the streets, a 24-year-old biology researcher named Alice said:

We want Hong Kong to continue being Hong Kong. We don't want to become like China.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article on the Hong Kong human rights protest, that appeared in the December 9 edition of the New York Times and that depicts a beautiful picture of what people will do for the cause of freedom.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 2019]

HONG KONG PROTEST, LARGEST IN WEEKS, STRETCHES SEVERAL MILES

(By Javier C. Hernández and Elaine Yu)

HONG KONG.—Hundreds of thousands of protesters, basking in a recent election victory by Hong Kong's pro-democracy camp, poured onto the city's streets on Sunday in one of the largest marches in weeks to pressure the government to meet demands for greater civil liberties.

The huge turnout was a reminder to China's leader, Xi Jinping, that the monthslong campaign against his authoritarian policies still had broad support in Hong Kong despite a weakening economy and increasingly violent clashes between protesters and the police.

Tensions in Hong Kong, a semiautonomous territory, had eased somewhat in recent days, after pro-democracy advocates won a stunning victory in local elections two weeks ago, giving new hope to the movement.

On Sunday, demonstrators returned in force, packing city streets to denounce Mr. Xi's government, rail against police brutality and reiterate demands for greater civil liberties, including universal suffrage. They beat drums, sang protest anthems and chanted, "Fight for freedom." Though the march was largely peaceful, some demonstrators vandalized shops and restaurants and lit a fire outside the high court.

"We want Hong Kong to continue being Hong Kong," said Alice Wong, 24, a biology researcher who stood among protesters gathered at Victoria Park. "We don't want to become like China."

As many as 800,000 people attended the march, according to Civil Human Rights Front, an advocacy group that organized the gathering.

The mood at the march was relaxed, with people taking selfies against a backdrop of the vast crowds. Children, some dressed in black, marched with their parents, holding hands as they shouted, "Stand with Hong Kong!"

A sea of protesters, spread across several miles, filled major thoroughfares as they moved between towering skyscrapers. In some areas, there were so many people that the crowds moved at a snail's pace and spilled into adjacent alleys. Some small businesses encouraged the turnout by promising giveaways if more than one million people joined the march.

The protesters said they intended to remain peaceful on Sunday, but some vowed to use more aggressive tactics if the police cracked down. In the evening, the police readied canisters of tear gas as they stood opposite crowds of protesters who had barricaded a street downtown in a briefly tense moment.

The large turnout could further embolden the movement's confrontational front-line protesters, who said they planned to disrupt the city's roads and public transportation system on Monday. The call for further action seemed to resonate among some protesters on Sunday.

"If the government still refuses to acknowledge our demands after today, we should and will escalate our protests," said Tamara Wong, 33, an office worker who wore a black mask as she stood among the crowd gathered at Victoria Park.

The protesters have demanded amnesty for activists who were arrested and accused of rioting, as well as an independent investigation of police conduct during the demonstrations.

Despite the show of strength on Sunday, it is unlikely that the protesters will win further concessions from Beijing, which has worked to portray demonstrators as rioters colluding with foreign governments to topple the governing Communist Party.

Jean-Pierre Cabestan, a professor of political science at Hong Kong Baptist University, said that even though Sunday's march showed the protest movement remained strong and unified, Beijing was unlikely to listen to its demands.

"Hong Kong is condemned to live in a permanent political crisis as long as China is ruled by the Communist Party," Professor Cabestan said.

Mr. Xi, who has cultivated an image as a hard-line leader, has demanded "unswerving efforts to stop and punish violent activities" in Hong Kong. He has publicly endorsed the city's beleaguered leader, Carrie Lam, and her efforts to bring an end to the unrest.

Chinese officials have suggested that the United States is responsible for helping fuel unrest in Hong Kong, pointing to statements by American officials in support of the protests. Last month, President Trump signed tough legislation that authorizes sanctions on Chinese and Hong Kong officials responsible for rights abuses in Hong Kong. The move was welcomed by many protesters but also seen as exacerbating tensions between the two countries.

In a possible sign of increased scrutiny of American citizens working in Hong Kong, two leaders of the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong said on Saturday that they had been denied entry to Macau, a

semiautonomous Chinese city. Mr. Xi is expected to visit Macau this month to mark the 20th anniversary of the former Portuguese colony's return to China.

Tara Joseph and Robert Grieves, the president and the chairman of the American business group, said they had planned to attend an annual ball put on by the chamber's Macau branch.

"We hope that this is just an overreaction to current events and that international business can constructively forge ahead," Ms. Joseph said.

The protests, which began in June in opposition to a bill that would have allowed extraditions to mainland China, have hurt the tourism and retail sectors, pushing the city's economy into recession.

In recent weeks, the violence has escalated, with protesters intensifying their efforts to vandalize businesses they associate with hostility to the movement. The police shot an antigovernment protester last month, inflaming tensions. Then, in some of the worst violence, universities became battlefields, with black-clad students hurling gasoline bombs, throwing bricks and aiming arrows at the riot police, who shot rubber bullets and fired tear gas in return.

Many demonstrators acknowledge that a compromise with the government is unlikely, despite recent victories. Mrs. Lam, the city's leader, who is under pressure from Beijing to restore order without weakening the government's position, has brushed aside their demands and has warned that the mayhem could "take Hong Kong to the road of ruin."

Government officials have cast the demonstrations as primarily centered on economic issues, arguing that vast inequality in Hong Kong has exacerbated anger among the city's youth. They rolled out emergency measures recently to counter the effects of the turmoil on the economy, including providing electricity subsidies to businesses and expanding job training for young people.

The authorities have justified their efforts to crack down on the movement by saying that protesters are endangering public safety. On Sunday, the police said they had found a 9-millimeter semiautomatic pistol, five magazines, 105 bullets and two ballistic vests, as well as fireworks, among other items, during a series of early morning raids.

Senior Superintendent Steve Li of the Hong Kong Police said early in the day that officers had received information that the firearm and fireworks would have been used on Sunday to create chaos.

The police have in recent months banned many protests and rallies in Hong Kong, citing safety concerns. But the government granted a rare approval for the march on Sunday, which was held to mark the United Nations' Human Rights Day.

Demonstrators said they believed that the turnout sent a strong message: The protest movement would not back down.

"If the government thinks that we will give up," said Adam Wong, 23, a university student who was waving a black flag, "today's turnout will prove them delusional."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, Alice's statement is loaded with historical context and correctly implies that what we are seeing now is the culmination of a slow but sure violation of the laws and norms that once defined Hong Kong's semiautonomous relationship with mainland China. These protests erupted after what Beijing argued was a simple proposed change to existing extradition laws, but the people saw it for what it was—a thinly veiled threat to Hong Kong's

relative autonomy. It wasn't a take-over. It was just that foot in the door, and China is nearly unparalleled in its ability to turn a foot in the door into a permanent existing condition.

Sometimes their power plays are very obvious, and sometimes they are not. On my recent trip to Djibouti, I saw firsthand the influence of China's debt-trap diplomacy.

Here is what debt-trap diplomacy is. It is a fancy way of saying that China has increased its influence around the world by offering to struggling nations that they are going to hold their debt in exchange for preferential treatment on trade or maybe a physical presence such as a port or other sweetheart deals.

In Djibouti City, I saw this tactic run wild. Now China would say that what they have done is to help the Djiboutians create a "smart city" in the Horn of Africa, but in reality they have negotiated their way into creating a full-blown surveillance state.

Cameras are everywhere—on every corner and every street, with 24/7 footage—and guess where that footage lands. Beijing. They have even tried to point one of those cameras at our military base, right at the entrance to Camp Lemonnier.

Debt-trap diplomacy is bold. It is obvious. If that is all you see of China, it is easy to assume that all of their tactics are that bold and obvious. As I said, they will go after you in obvious areas and also in areas that are not as obvious.

Even domestically, China's surveillance state is notoriously the opposite of covert. Their domestic "smart city" program has outpaced that of every other country on the face of the Earth and the majority of their \$70-plus billion budget for that project has been spent not on intelligent power grids or traffic management systems or on clean air or clean water, but it is being spent on surveilling their own citizens.

The greatest danger China has created by engaging in brash and at times absurd surveillance and suppression is that it has created a false sense of security here in the West when we don't see the evidence of what they are doing. In the United States we are not particularly vulnerable to their debt trap, but we are vulnerable to less obvious attempts to get that foot in the door.

In some form or another, most Americans have allowed Big Tech to take hold of a portion of their lives. Smartphones and cloud storage once were very novel, but now we assume that even simple transactions come predicated by an additional condition. Everything is free as long as the app or the service has access to—guess what—your data. They want to own your virtual you.

Popular apps like TikTok, whose parent company is based in China, have left me with more questions than answers about the platform's business practices, privacy protections, and ideological loyalty to the Communist

Party. Consider that the U.S. Army has barred soldiers from using TikTok. Everybody needs to understand this. The U.S. Army has said: You cannot use TikTok. This very body has expressed our concerns on a bipartisan basis with the platform's censorship and data handling practices.

It is no wonder that TikTok's chief executive officer canceled this week's scheduled meetings here in DC with Members of this body. The fact that millions of Americans, especially our American children, continue to offer their personal data to TikTok is beyond disturbing, but we will not be able to roll back the creeping surveillance state without setting our own standards for what is acceptable from both foreign and domestic companies.

When I introduced the BROWSER Act earlier this year, I did so not only to give Big Tech solid guidelines regarding data privacy and content but to set a new standard for what consumers expect from Big Tech. Our problem here in this country is pretty much one of awareness and of understanding that the exact same philosophy drives China's surveillance programs and their less obvious but much more personal individual monitoring schemes—their surveillance state scheme.

China's Communist Party is after more than just ad revenue and more complete data sets. Their goal, as those Hong Kong protesters put it, is to trick other countries in becoming more like China, which is not tilting toward freedom but tilting away from freedom.

My goal with the BROWSER Act and with my focus on what has become the surveillance state is to do the exact opposite—to enable freedom, to encourage freedom, not only here but around the globe—and to make certain that consumers here decide how much of their data they want to be able to share. We must make certain that we continue to support the cause of freedom wherever human beings show up to protect the freedoms they have.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

JERSEY CITY SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I learned yesterday that two of the innocent victims in the shooting in Jersey City earlier this week are from my hometown, my home borough, the great borough of Brooklyn—Moshe Deutsch and Mindy Ferencz—and that the kosher deli where they were all killed in all likelihood was targeted as part of a hate crime.

This morning, I stand in solidarity with the Jewish communities of New Jersey and New York as they confront the anti-Semitic poison that motivated that horrible attack, and I stand in sorrow at the loss of innocent lives from my community. May their memory be a blessing.

I also salute the great police officer, as well, who fell in the line of duty trying to apprehend these brutal thugs.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on impeachment, the House Judiciary Committee will continue today its markup of Articles of Impeachment against Donald Trump.

The articles charge that President Trump abused the Office of the Presidency by soliciting the interference of a foreign power in our elections to benefit himself personally. The articles also charge him with obstruction of justice in the investigation into those matters.

Those articles were drafted after a months-long investigation into the President's dealings with Ukraine, which included scores of fact witnesses and expert testimony. Throughout that time, and still today, the White House refuses to participate in the House process. It has blocked key witnesses. It has withheld relevant documents. It has instructed members of the administration to defy congressional subpoenas and not to testify. Those that did testify did so bravely against the wishes of the White House.

What is the President hiding? What do these witnesses know? What do these documents show?

Those are fair questions that every American could ask and, because neither the President nor Republican Congress Members have presented any refutation of the facts in the impeachment charges or any exculpatory evidence other than grand conspiracy theories, the American people have a right to say the President must be hiding something.

If there are documents or witnesses the President believes could provide exculpatory evidence, nothing is stopping the witnesses from testifying and the documents from being sent over, except the President of the United States, who in all likelihood is afraid of what they show because they confirm and corroborate the lengthy factual basis that the House compiled to come up with the Articles of Impeachment. The fact that President Trump is blocking witnesses from testifying and blocking documents from release means that, more likely than not, those witnesses and documents do not and cannot refute the charges against the President.

When someone who might be guilty of a crime says he doesn't want witnesses of the crime to come forward, what do you think that means?

Why haven't the President and his allies presented exculpatory evidence—evidence that says this is not true? Why, instead, have they created these bobbles, these objects far away, saying: There is a conspiracy here. There is a conspiracy there.

It is the old lawyer saying: When you have the facts, argue the facts. When you have the law, argue the law. When you have neither, pound the table.

In this case, pounding the table means coming up with diversionary conspiratorial theories.

House Republicans, rather than mount a vigorous defense of the President on the merits, have attacked the process. If House Republicans could focus on the merits, could find evidence that said: No, this is not true; that is not true; he did not try to influence Ukraine to help his campaign, they would have presented it.

Why has no evidence been presented directly refuting the core of the charge against the President? Because there probably isn't any.

In the Senate we have several Members who are swimming in the murky waters of conspiracy to divert attention from the fact that they don't have the facts and the law on their side. The only way they can defend the President's comments is to come up with crazy, out-of-line conspiracy theories that are not based on any evidence.

Some Senate Republicans find it so difficult to argue the President's defense on the facts that they resort to fiction. For instance, in the past few weeks, certain Republicans have actually helped spread disinformation invented by Putin's intelligence services. He said that Ukraine, not Russia, interfered in the election. No one believes it. There is no factual basis of it. Of course, Putin would say he wants to divert attention from Russia, but it is amazing that Senators would traffic in those theories, totally made up, not one bit of fact. It is a low moment for the Senate when their blind obeisance to President Trump overshadows any need to find truth and to defend rule of law. That is not what a democracy is about. That is the edges of dictatorship.

Chairman GRAHAM conducted an entire hearing yesterday to give public viewing to the now completely debunked conspiracy theory that the FBI investigation into the Trump campaign began with political motives. Inspector General Horowitz, to his credit, stuck to the findings in the report. He found no evidence of bias. So Senator GRAHAM, as he tends to do these days, put on a big show, a lot of ranting, a lot of raving—no refutation of the fact of what the IG found.

So it is just like Ukraine where certain Members are so unable to defend what the President did with Ukraine, they latch on to Russian propaganda, or they come up with these histrionics, again, to try to divert attention, a shiny object to take the American people's attention away from the wrongdoing that the House is accusing him of. In fact, the deputy counsel of the FBI actually said that the department "would be derelict in its responsibility" if it did not open an investigation into Trump. She is not a political person. She is a law enforcement officer.

If you think President Trump is above the law, go right ahead, but that is not what George Washington or Benjamin Franklin or Thompson Jefferson

or Alexander Hamilton thought this Nation was about; that is not what generations of Americans who fought and died for our country thought it was about. We have reached a low moment in American history and a very low moment for the Republican Party now that it has been taken over by Donald Trump. This is not the Republican Party of the last 150 years.

All of this is a backdrop to the impending trial of President Trump, where two lines of argument may be presented in a court of impeachment. One line of argument—accusations against the President—has relied on facts, public record, and the sworn testimony of dozens of officials with knowledge of the events. The other line of argument—the defense of the President—has so far relied on conspiracy, innuendo, hyperventilation about the process, with no refutation of the specific facts that the House has found.

The American people will be savvy enough over the next several months to tell the difference.

TAX REFORM

Madam President, now, on taxes, this month marks 2 years since President Trump and the congressional Republicans passed a trillion-dollar tax cut for large corporations and the richest Americans. Republicans make many promises to sell this legislation as a boom for jobs and middle class. They were outlandish at the time, and now, recent history has proven them even crazier. Two years later, these phony promises have not come close to living up to their billing.

President Trump promised the tax bill would benefit middle-class America, creating a \$4,000 raise for every American family. No way. Ask the average American family. The rich Americans will say yes. The top 1 percent will say yes, but, of course, they received a tax cut 64 times the size of the one given to the middle class. President Trump and Republicans promised the bill would prompt businesses to increase investments into their companies, leading to job growth and higher wages. This, too, has proved a fantasy. Less than 5 percent of all workers in America were ultimately promised pay increases or bonuses as a result of the tax cut.

Out of 5.9 million employers, only 413 announced bonuses to workers or wage hikes. Do you want to know where the lion's share of that Republican tax cut went? Shareholders, not workers. In the 2 years since the tax bill, the annual total of corporate stock buybacks have shattered records over \$1 trillion in 2018.

It is impossible to look at the last 2 years with a straight face and say that the Republican tax cut was designed or is helping middle-class families. If anything, the Republican tax bill exacerbated the already staggering inequalities of work and wealth in our country. We need to start moving the needle in a completely opposite direction. Next year, voters will have a chance to

make that happen by voting for a change in the Senate leadership.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE VANDYKE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Republican majority leader was on the floor a little earlier, and he talked about the business of the Senate and how busy we are in the Senate. I would like to state for the record, so far in the calendar year 2019, on the floor of this U.S. Senate, where the greatest deliberative body meets and considers the lofty issues of our time, in the year 2019—currently this year—we have considered 22 amendments in the entire year—22 amendments.

Madam President, six of them were offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky. One Senator had six amendments: Senator RAND PAUL. They were all defeated. Then some 16 other amendments were offered.

To put that into perspective, on a good day in the Senate, when the Senate was the Senate, there would be 10 amendments; bills would come to the floor; we would debate; amendments would be adopted. Some would lose. People would give speeches. We would pass legislation, send it over to the House, go to a conference. We don't do that anymore.

Under Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader of the Senate, we do not do that anymore. There were 22 amendments in the course of the entire year. If we were paid for the actual piecemeal that we do, we would not get a paycheck this year because we haven't done anything.

I will take that back. What we have done is to fill as many Federal court vacancies as possible with some of the most unqualified people ever offered by a President of the United States. This week, a man named VanDyke is being named to the court in Nevada. He has such a limited connection with Nevada that both Nevada Senators refuse to approve him for this court appointment. He has no connection to their State, but he was chosen by the White House.

He went through a background check by the American Bar Association, and they concluded unanimously that he was unqualified to be a Federal judge—unqualified. He is not the first. Under this President, we have had nine different court nominees found unqualified by the American Bar Association. You say, Well, that is going to happen, lawyers disagree.

Do you know how many were found unqualified under the Obama administration in 8 years? None, not one.

There are nine unqualified men and women now with lifetime appointments on the Federal bench because, for Senator MCCONNELL, that is his priority: Fill the bench with people of his political stripe at any cost.

Take up legislation? No. The Democratically-controlled House of Representatives has sent us over 200 different measures to consider on the floor of the Senate. Senator MCCONNELL has refused. He will not take up any legislation. He is very proud of it. To his credit, he is not ashamed or embarrassed. He says to call himself the Grim Reaper when it comes to measures coming over from the House. He is here to kill them, and he has done a pretty good job of that, if that is his goal in what he wants to achieve. When I hear him come to the floor and say we are not doing enough in the Senate—22 amendments in 1 year. I say to Senator MCCONNELL, you have been in the Senate for a long time. You know that that number tells the whole story.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Madam President, it is the holiday season, and many families are gathering at special meals, giving gifts, with a lot of fond memories, but instead of celebrating, hundreds of thousands of people across America who have been defrauded by for-profit colleges and universities are just trying to get by. There will not be many presents that they will be able to give or probably receive. They have been waiting day in and day out for one person to make a decision. Her name is Betsy DeVos. She is the Secretary of Education. She can provide them relief from their federal student loans that they desperately need, but she refuses to do it.

After being lured with false promises, these people I am talking about ended up in programs at for-profit colleges and universities. Who were the for-profits? See if these names ring a bell: Corinthian, ITT Tech, Westwood, DeVry, University of Phoenix, Dream Center. These are for-profit colleges and universities, and these student borrowers were left with mountains of debt, worthless credits, and diplomas that employers laugh at when it was all said and done. Now, Secretary DeVos refuses to provide these students with relief from their student loan debt to which they are entitled under the borrower defense provision of the Higher Education Act.

Take Rachel from Missouri who attended Corinthian's Everest College. She says, "I am not able to buy my children clothes or shoes."

Pamela from South Carolina owes \$140,000 after attending the corrupt ITT Tech for-profit school. Here is what she says: "I have an autistic daughter that depends on me, and I can't afford to get a decent place to live or buy the things she needs." Is that any surprise with \$140,000 in debt from one of these corrupt for-profit colleges?

Jennifer, who attended the Illinois Institute of Art—not to be mixed up

with the Illinois Art Institute, a reputable institution—but the Illinois Institute of Art where she attended, she owes \$67,800 in Federal student loans, and she says, “The stress and anxiety of working 3 jobs to make a living to pay off these loans, feed my kids, and keep a roof over my head, is exhausting.”

For borrowers like Rachel, Pamela, and Jennifer, Secretary DeVos might as well be Secretary Scrooge this holiday season. She continues to deny them a fresh start. She continues to refuse to apply the borrowed defense provision which would allow the discharge of their federal student debt. More than 200,000 borrowers find themselves in similar positions, while Secretary DeVos lets claims back up at the Department. She has failed to approve a single claim in more than a year, not one for all these hundreds of thousands of students facing this fraudulent debt.

Why we should give them a break? Why should they have any forgiveness for student debt? Let me tell you why. It is because it starts with the U.S. Federal Government Department of Education recognizing the accreditation of these institutions—these worthless institutions. That accreditation says to students applying there: This is a real college.

Well, it turns out that they weren't real colleges and universities. But they were real when it came to costs. Some of the most expensive places to attend higher education in America are these for-profit colleges and universities.

What kind of record do they have? Well, consider this: just nine percent of all postsecondary students in America go to these for-profit colleges and universities—nine percent. This will be on the final, for the students who are listening. Nine percent go to for-profit colleges and universities. Thirty-three percent of all the federal student loan defaults are from students at for-profit colleges and universities. What does that tell you? Well, if I go to one of these schools, I am going to rack up a lot of debt. Maybe I will not be able to find a job; maybe I will not even be able to finish school; and then I learn my credits aren't even transferable from a for-profit school to a real college or university.

It all started with the U.S. Federal Government recognizing the accreditation of these schools, saying “These are real schools,” with the students depending on that accreditation. Then they backed it up, saying: Oh, incidentally, you can borrow money from the Federal Government to go to these real schools. Then, when these schools went bankrupt, when they defrauded everyone in sight, when they were sued by the State attorneys general and other federal agencies, when it turned out they were big frauds and the students saw the schools crumble in front of them, the students ended up with the debt.

We say, under the law, that the Federal Government has some responsi-

bility. We should have done a better job of overseeing these schools.

That isn't the way Secretary DeVos sees it. As far as she is concerned, these kids are on their own. They are not kids anymore. They have been hanging on to their student debt for so long, they don't know which way to turn.

Despite Secretary DeVos's excuses, the reality is that nothing is legally preventing her from providing borrower defense discharges to these students for the loans they took out at these for-profit colleges and universities. She could do it tomorrow. She could clear the backlog quickly, if she wanted to.

We know using her legal authority to provide relief to defrauded borrowers gives her “extreme displeasure”. We know that because she wrote that in an order she issued for the Department. She was extremely displeased to discharge the student loans of these students who had been defrauded by for-profit schools.

Well, I am not surprised. She surrounded herself at the Department of Education with people from that industry who believe that the industry has done no wrong. We know better.

We also know from her previous statements that Secretary DeVos thinks many borrowers got some value from their experience, even though they were defrauded into massive debt. She thinks these borrowers are just after “free money,” and they don't deserve a full discharge.

Yesterday, National Public Radio released a series of internal Department memos showing that the facts don't back up Secretary DeVos's claims.

Back in 2017, the Department staff concluded that “the value of an ITT [Tech] education—like Corinthian—is likely either negligible or non-existent.”

This was a school whose accreditation was recognized by our Federal Government, Secretary DeVos, and it has turned out to be worthless. The memo went on to conclude, “Accordingly, it is appropriate, for the Department to award eligible borrowers full relief.” I agree. It is reasonable for the Department of Education to try to make amends for this miserable failure of oversight of these schools and to give these student borrowers a chance.

Nonetheless, this week, Secretary DeVos announced a new scheme to use something called gainful employment earnings data to deny defrauded student borrowers full discharges. Remember, that the gainful employment rule was meant to ensure that programs were actually preparing students for jobs after graduation. But Secretary DeVos delayed and then eliminated the rule. Now, instead of using gainful employment data to hold poor-performing programs accountable, she wants to use it to punish defrauded student borrowers. She has already tried it once, only to be told by a Federal judge that what she did was illegal.

While it is unclear if this slightly tweaked version of the scheme will pass legal muster, the result for the borrowers would be the same: ultimate denial in terms of full relief from their student loans from miserable for-profit schools.

Not only is Secretary DeVos delaying and denying relief for previously defrauded borrowers, she is rewriting the rules to make it almost impossible for future defrauded borrowers to get relief. She continues to recognize the accreditation of these unworthy institutions. She continues to say to the United States and the world: These are perfectly good schools. Then, when it turns out they are perfectly awful, she wants to accept no responsibility.

She released a new version of the borrower defense rule just a few months ago that places unreasonable burdens on borrowers, way beyond their capacity to detect the fraud being perpetrated at the time. The net result is this: According to The Institute for College Access and Success, the new DeVos rule will cancel just 3 percent of all loans associated with misconduct. She is going to cancel 3 percent.

In September, I introduced a resolution in the Senate to overturn the DeVos borrower defense rule. Forty-two of my colleagues have joined me. I plan to bring it to a vote on the Senate floor, where it needs a simple majority to pass.

Just this week, 57 student, veteran, and consumer organizations released a letter supporting the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 2019.

SENATOR DICK DURBIN,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE SUSIE LEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN AND REPRESENTATIVE LEE: As 57 organizations representing and advocating for students, families, taxpayers, veterans and service members, faculty and staff, civil rights and consumers, we write in support of your efforts to disapprove the 2019 Borrower Defense to Repayment rule pursuant to the Congressional Review Act.

The purpose of the borrower defense rule as defined by the Higher Education Act is to protect students and taxpayers from fraud, deception, and other illegal misconduct by unscrupulous colleges. A well-designed rule will both provide relief to students who have been lied to and cheated, and deter illegal conduct by colleges.

However, the final rule issued by the Department of Education on September 23, 2019, would accomplish neither of these goals. An analysis of the Department's own calculations estimates that only 3 percent of the loans that result from school misconduct would be cancelled under the new rule. Schools would be held accountable for reimbursing taxpayers for just 1 percent of these loans.

The DeVos Borrower Defense rule issued in September imposes unreasonable time limits on student borrowers who have been deceived and misled by their schools. It requires applicants to meet thresholds that make it almost impossible for wronged borrowers to obtain loan cancellation.

The rule eliminates the ability of groups of borrowers to be granted relief, even in cases where there is substantial compelling evidence of widespread wrongdoing. It prohibits the filing of claims after three years even when evidence of wrongdoing emerges at a later date. It requires borrowers to prove schools intended to deceive them or acted recklessly, although students have no ability to access evidence that might show this intent. And the rule stipulates that student loans taken by students under false pretenses are insufficient evidence of financial harm to allow the loans to be cancelled.

Additionally, the 2019 rule eliminates the promise of automatic loan relief to eligible students whose school closed before they could graduate. Instead, the Department would force each eligible student impacted by a school closure to individually find out about their statutory right to relief, apply, and navigate the government's bureaucracy to have their loans cancelled.

Many of us wrote to the Department in August 2018 in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking and offered carefully considered recommendations. However, the Department rejected our recommendations that would have provided a fair process that protects students and taxpayer dollars. Instead, the new rule would do little to provide relief to students who have been lied to, and even less to dissuade colleges from systematically engaging in deceptive and illegal recruitment tactics. Moreover, a borrower defense rule that fails to adequately protect students harms the most vulnerable students, including first-generation college students, Black and Latino students, and military-connected students, who are targeted by and disproportionately enroll in predatory for-profit colleges.

Meanwhile, the Department refuses to take action on a massive backlog of over 200,000 pending borrower defense claims, having failed to approve or deny a single claim in over a year. We fully support your effort to repeal the 2019 borrower defense rule, and look forward to restoration of the 2016 rule, which took major steps to provide a path to loan forgiveness for the hundreds of thousands of students who attended schools where misconduct has already been well documented.

Signed,

AFL-CIO, AFSCME, Allied Progress, American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, Americans for Financial Reform, Association of Young Americans (AYA), Campaign for America's Future, Center for Public Interest Law, Center for Responsible Lending, Children's Advocacy Institute, CLASP, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Consumer Action, Consumer Advocacy and Protection Society (CAPS) at Berkeley Law.

Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Federation of California, Demos, Duke Consumer Rights Project, East Bay Community Law Center, Economic Mobility Pathways (EMPath), The Education Trust, Empire Justice Center, Feminist Majority Foundation, Government Accountability Project, Higher Education Loan Coalition (HELIC), Hildreth Institute, Housing and Economic Rights Advocates, The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS), Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition.

NAACP, National Association for College Admission Counseling, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys (NACBA), National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients), National Education Association, National Urban League, New America Higher Education Program, New Jersey Citizen Action, One Wisconsin Now, PHENOM (Public Higher

Education Network of Massachusetts), Project on Predatory Student Lending, Public Citizen, Public Counsel, Public Good Law Center.

Public Law Center, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC), Student Debt Crisis, Student Defense, Student Veterans of America, Third Way, U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG), UnidosUS, Veterans Education Success, Veterans for Common Sense, Young Invincibles.

Mr. DURBIN. Among the organizations supporting the resolution are the American Federation of Teachers, the Center for Responsible Lending, the Consumer Federation of America, the Education Trust, the National Association of College Admission Counseling, the NAACP, the National Education Association, the Student Veterans of America, and the American Legion on behalf of American veterans who have been victims of this fraud as well.

When our resolution comes to the floor, I hope a handful of my Republican colleagues will take a look at it and realize that we have to give these students a second chance at their lives. We misled them into attending for-profit schools that were worthless. The schools defrauded them. They ended up with a debt to our government, and under the provisions of the Higher Education Act, that debt can be forgiven. Let's give these defrauded student borrowers a second chance. Ultimately, they deserve an opportunity from our government to have a better holiday coming before them and a better life ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Ohio.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have come to the Senate floor several times over the past year to talk about the importance of passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. This is the successor agreement to the 25-year-old NAFTA accord.

Yes, it has been a year; in fact, it has been over a year since that agreement was negotiated between Canada and Mexico, and then Congress was meant to take it up. It has been too long.

However, I am happy to report today that now we are at the end of that long process. I am told that the legislation is actually going to be voted on in the House of Representatives probably next week and then here in the U.S. Senate right after the holidays.

We will have a chance, finally, to pass this agreement that is so good for the farmers, for the workers, for the manufacturers, and for the small businesses that I represent.

I am really pleased that the President of the United States and his chief trade negotiator, Bob Lighthizer, had the persistence to get this done. I am not sure I would have had the same patience.

I also want to congratulate House Speaker NANCY PELOSI for making the

decision to move forward with it. This is one of these situations in which, under our law, the agreement has to be voted on first by the House. So the Speaker of the House had an unusual role here, where it couldn't go forward without her approval. Again, finally, we are there.

The agreement, which was negotiated over a year ago and languished—specific language was sent up here in May of last year—is pretty much the same. About 99 percent of it is the same agreement. It is a good agreement because it opens up more markets for us. What has changed is there are new provisions, different provisions, as it relates to enforcing the labor standards that are already in the agreement.

In the agreement, what Mexico and Canada were asked to do, in addition to the United States, in terms of higher labor standards, was negotiated over a year ago, but what has happened over, really, the past several months is now there is a mechanism to enforce it that is a little different.

I think it will make it easier to enforce potential violations of the agreement we have reached, particularly with regard to Mexico. It doesn't really come back against the United States at all. We can explain this in more detail as we see the exact language that is coming up in the next couple of days.

The bottom line is, for a U.S. company, the labor standards that are established are the ones we already have in our law. For Mexico or Canada to file an objection to us potentially not following that agreement is simply after there has been a U.S. law processed, which would involve the National Labor Relations Board and our existing law, so it really shouldn't affect us at all.

By the way, Secretary Scalia, who is the Secretary of Labor, was very involved in ensuring that it wouldn't come back on U.S. companies, on U.S. workers, and on our economy.

At the end of the day, although it took way too long to get there, we have ended up with a very good result—an agreement that does expand trade, and that is the whole idea.

We have talked a lot on the floor as to why this is so important. I will tell you, in my home State of Ohio, we send more than half of our exports to two countries, Canada and Mexico. By far, the No. 1 trading partner is Mexico, and No. 2 is Canada.

This is really important because these jobs are really important. It is about \$28 billion a year. These are jobs that pay higher wages and better benefits—export jobs. For our farmers, this is really important. For manufacturers and workers, it is really important because this lets them be able to do what we do best, which is efficiently and productively make things and produce things that could be sold to other markets.

Remember, in America, we are only about 5 percent of the global economy—five percent of the people—so our

population is only about 5 percent, but we are about 25 percent of the GDP of the world. We are a relatively small country by population, but we have this big economy. To access that 95 percent of consumers outside of America to sell our products is absolutely essential to our prosperity here, to our jobs here.

As I mentioned earlier, those export jobs tend to be better jobs and higher paying jobs with better benefits.

What does this agreement do? First of all, it creates a bunch of new jobs. This chart has 176,000-plus new jobs. That is because the International Trade Commission—which is the independent body that analyzes these things—gave us a range. The GDP increased. It increased our economy. The number of jobs is huge, by the way—greater than any other trade agreement we have entered into, greater on the economic growth side than the Trans-Pacific Partnership that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thought was something we should have entered into and was so important. This is even bigger.

Obviously, it is so big because Canada and Mexico are such big trading partners with us. So even relatively small changes to open up new markets have a big impact. These are going to be welcome jobs and, again, higher paying jobs.

Second, it really helps us with regard to online sales. One of our advantages as a country is we do a lot of commerce over the internet. When the original NAFTA agreement was written and was currently enforced—the status quo—there really were not any significant online sales—virtually none. So there were no provisions in there. Every modern trade agreement has provisions for online sales or for sales over the internet. Now we have them with regard to Mexico and Canada, which we would not have had under the old NAFTA. So that is a big improvement. For Ohio, that is a lot of small companies because entrepreneurs—some of these new startups are online companies—really like these provisions.

By the way, it says a number of things. It says you can't require localization of data. In other words, Canada and Mexico can't say: Hey, you have to have your servers in our country if you are going to do business with us. That is really important to our American online industry.

Second, it says that you can't put tariffs on data online. Again, it is very important to establish that, not just for Canada and Mexico but as a precedent for other trade agreements going forward.

Third, it actually raises the de minimis level. In other words, to apply customs duties on stuff going to Canada and Mexico, they have a very low level. We have a relatively high level here. That level has increased for Canada and Mexico. That is an administrative burden that is lifted off of a lot of these

small businesses but also a costsaver because they don't have to pay customs duty on a relatively small product that goes to another country.

These are all good things for American jobs. Again, we have a comparative advantage here because we do a lot of online sales.

Third is more U.S.-made steel and auto parts. This is really important to Ohio but also to our country. Manufacturing is now finally on the upswing. Manufacturing jobs are actually increasing in this country for the first time in years, and we are getting back on our feet in terms of what has always made America great, which is that we produce things; we make things. So this agreement helps.

It says, as an example, that 70 percent of the steel that goes into automobiles—and the automobile industry is a big deal for Canada and Mexico and the United States—has to be from North America. That helps U.S. steel mills and steel mills in Ohio, as opposed to steel coming in from China, for example, from Brazil, and from other countries.

Second, it changes the rules of origin—how much stuff can go into an automobile that comes from other countries. It is 62½ percent now, and it would take it up to 75 percent in this agreement. That is the highest level of any agreement we have with anybody.

Why is that important? Well, think about it. We have agreed with Canada and Mexico that we are going to have this agreement that lowers the tariffs in all these countries and lowers the trade barriers generally. In other words, it gives them an advantage in our market. We get an advantage in their market. That is the idea. If you don't have a rule of origin where you say stuff can't come in from other countries and take advantage of that, then you have basically free riders.

As an example, China can send a bunch of their auto parts to Mexico and produce a car that is a Mexican car that therefore gets the benefit of the NAFTA agreement. China has not opened its market at all; it has only provided this product to Mexico. But then the product gets the advantage of the lower tariffs and lower trade barriers generally. That is not fair. Raising it from 62½ percent to 75 percent is really significant. Again, it is the highest number of any trade agreement we have, and it avoids this problem.

Some of us say: Gee, that sounds protectionist. I don't think it is. I think what it says to China, Japan, Brazil, or other countries is that if you want to get the advantage of the U.S. market that Canada and Mexico are getting and that we get reciprocally from them, then enter into a trade agreement with us.

Let's have more trade agreements. Let's lower the barriers for everybody. That actually will expand trade. But we ought not to allow them to do it without that. This is a big deal.

It also is true that in this agreement, there is something unprecedented with

regard to leveling the playing field. Remember, a basic concept of our trade laws is that you want to have a balanced trade law where you have imports and exports because that makes sense—keeps consumer prices down and allows us to have good jobs here—but you want it to be reciprocal and balanced. You don't want to have a situation where a country, because of its low wage rates and lack of labor standards or lack of environmental standards, where it is polluting a lot, can take advantage by having lower cost goods coming into America.

In this agreement, we do say that there is a minimum wage for between 40 and 45 percent of the auto production. It is \$16 an hour. That will end up benefiting us because wages are relatively higher in America and Canada than they are in Mexico. That will be good for auto jobs here and help to level the playing field. This is why you might have seen that some of the labor unions are supporting this agreement and some of the U.S. manufacturers are supporting this agreement. They have a lot of facilities here in America, and they like that part of it as well.

There are new markets for farmers. I mean, this is kind of a no-brainer that has made it, for me, frustrating over the last year because we haven't been able to move forward on this agreement while farmers have really been suffering because of a few different things.

One is weather. We have had some lousy weather, particularly in my State and across the Midwest, where it is too wet to plant and too dry for the crops to grow properly for a harvest, and that has hit us hard. We couldn't plant in Ohio in a number of cases this last year because of the weather being too wet, and so farmers have been hit by that.

The second is that prices have been relatively low—not just recently but really over the last several years for different commodities such as corn, soybeans, and wheat. Part of that is because of the global markets.

Part of it is because of the third issue, which is China. Because of our ongoing negotiation with China and disputes with China over what they are doing on intellectual property, stealing our technology, and other issues, they have bought less of our farm products. For Ohio, as an example, our No. 1 market overseas for soybeans is China, and one out of every three acres planted in Ohio is planted for export. Think about how that affects your prices if you lose that big market share and that big customer.

I am pleased to say that we seem to be making some progress with China right now, incidentally, as an aside. It is great to have this agreement done. The next agreement I hope we get done is with China and get them to play by the rules and open those markets more. This week, they started to buy more soybeans, and that is good.

In the meantime, our farmers are desperate for more markets, and in this

agreement, that is exactly what they get. So if you are an Ohio farmer—and we are No. 2 in the country on eggs—you can now have access to these markets in Canada and Mexico, on eggs, that you never had before.

On dairy, Canada in particular has some very protectionist provisions in place with regard to dairy products—think milk and cheese.

If you are an Ohio dairy farmer, you can sell stuff into Canada you couldn't sell before—also pork, beef, wheat, and other products. This is good for our farmers. This is why over 1,000 farm groups around the country have supported this agreement. I mean, I don't know a farm group in Ohio that doesn't support it strongly. Again, part of it is that this is a great agreement for them, and part of it is that they are hurting, and this gives them some light at the end of the tunnel, an opportunity to see new markets and therefore see some prices increase in our ag community.

This is a good agreement that is good for jobs, good for small business, as we talked about, good for farmers, good for workers, and good for our economy. It is important that we get it done. I am glad the House is going to go ahead and vote on it in the next week. I wish we could vote here in the Senate right away, too, but under the process called trade promotion authority, we do have some processes we need to go through. It is probably best to have it happen after the holidays. Right after the holidays, my hope is that here on the floor of the Senate, Members will look at this for what it is. This is not a Democratic or a Republican victory; this is an American victory.

Again, I appreciate the efforts of President Donald Trump because he was persistent and tough on the negotiations, and then he was persistent and patient in working with the U.S. Congress. There were a lot of people saying: Go ahead and send the agreement up and try to jam the Democrats into doing the right thing. He didn't do that. He waited to figure out a way to come up with an agreement, particularly on the labor enforcement provisions we talked about, and as a result, we now have the ability on a bipartisan basis to get this done. I hope the vote in the House will reflect that; likewise, here in the Senate.

I know there are some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who think this agreement is not perfect. No agreement is perfect; I will just say that. I am a former U.S. Trade Representative. I am a former trade lawyer. I am a former member of the Ways and Means Committee, which is the trade committee over there. I am now on the trade committee here, the Finance Committee. No agreement is ever perfect. It is not the agreement exactly that you would write or I would write, but, boy, this is a good agreement.

To make perfect the enemy of the good would hurt the farmers and the

workers and the small businesses that we represent that want this agreement badly because they know it is going to help them.

The other thing I would say is that it also helps our relationships with our two biggest trading partners in Ohio, Canada and Mexico, and also our neighbors.

For North America's future, this is a good idea—to have the certainty and predictability that comes with an agreement we have all been able to coalesce around and improve the status quo. NAFTA was negotiated 25 years ago. A lot has happened in the last 25 years. We talked about how the digital economy has transformed our economy, and we have a competitive and comparative advantage in that. That is one small example. So many things have changed.

We have better protections for intellectual property in this agreement, as an example. We have these new trade-opening opportunities in agriculture. We have these opportunities in manufacturing to do more here in North America and specifically in the United States.

A vote against this new agreement is a vote for NAFTA, which is this 25-year-old agreement that has these flaws because that is the status quo. My hope is that the next time I come to this floor to talk about this, it will be to ask my colleagues in short order to support a vote, that it will have come out of the Finance Committee with a strong bipartisan vote, that it will have come to the floor with a strong vote from the House, and that we can get this done. Then President Trump can sign it, and the people we represent will be better off, our community of nations here in North America will be better off, and the United States of America will have another victory.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I came to the floor this morning to address what has been an alarming and inaccurate information campaign that is being spread about the international family planning amendment included in this year's State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

I would note that while this amendment is referred to as the "Shaheen amendment" in alarmist and inaccurate blog posts, it is actually bipartisan language that was agreed to by both the subcommittee and full committee chairs of the Appropriations Committee and ultimately approved unanimously by Republicans and

Democrats in the committee. Yet articles and op-eds online have condemned the amendment as pro-abortion. I was surprised to hear this given that, despite my objections, the amendment does not address the Mexico City policy—or the global gag rule, as it is known—abortion services, or information. In fact, this is the first time in 18 years—I am going to say that again. It is the first time in 18 years that members of the Appropriations Committee were prevented from offering a bipartisan amendment that would strip the bill of the Mexico City provision.

Instead of allowing the established committee process to amend the SFOPs bill with this provision, the entire bill was pulled from consideration. In response to that, in an effort to ensure the bill wasn't endangered, I worked with my colleagues Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska and with Republican leadership to limit the scope of the amendment so we could allow the appropriations bill to go forward.

It is false—absolutely, positively false—to say this amendment funds abortions abroad. In fact, it is wrong to say, and inaccurate to say, that any U.S. assistance goes to funding abortions at home or abroad. In compliance with U.S. law, family planning funding does not and never has gone to abortion services. I hope everyone is clear about that. Under our law, family planning funding does not go to support abortion services.

Now that I have outlined what this amendment does not do, let me discuss what it does do. It provides an increase of \$57.5 million for a total of \$632.5 million for existing international family planning accounts. This money funds programs and services that provide modern contraceptives, which 214 million women around the world who want to avoid pregnancy are not able to access.

Again, I don't know when the debate around abortion came to include contraceptives and family planning. It also would allow for the healthy timing and spacing of births, which is very important to the health of infants and it is important to the health of women to be able to space the births of their children to recover between births. It provides education information and counseling about family planning issues. It ensures access to antenatal and postnatal care for a healthy mother and baby. It provides for HPV vaccination and prevention, something very important to the health of children.

These are a few of the critical services the assistance provides. The impact of these services is very real.

According to the Guttmacher Institute, with each additional \$10 million the U.S. dedicates to family planning and reproductive health programs, 400,000 more women and couples receive contraceptive services and supplies. With the \$57.5 million increase provided for in this amendment, more than 2.2 million women and couples

will have that access. That will result in 654,500 fewer unintended pregnancies, 291,500 fewer unplanned births, 280,500 fewer induced abortions. If you care about abortion and you don't believe that is the right alternative, then you should support family planning because that gives families and couples an option to ensure they can have the children they want, and it would provide for 1,320 fewer deaths of women.

While these numbers are stark, the transformative effect of simply having access to family planning information and services on the lives of women and their families should not be underestimated.

The most vulnerable women who are reached by family planning programs report that learning about family planning options, receiving services to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and ensuring that wanted pregnancies are healthy and happy so the babies they want to have are healthy and happy gives them some control over their lives. Many women are making healthcare choices for themselves and their families for the very first time with help from these programs.

These critical programs change lives, and our partners who implement these programs are indispensable. In October, USAID Administrator Mark Green said he could not "imagine an effective development Agency that doesn't partner with the community of faith." Luckily, he doesn't have to. For those people who were worried that family planning programs are not going to be implemented by our faith community, that is just wrong.

The family planning account goes to a range of program implementers, including healthcare providers, international NGOs, and faith-based organizations alike. All of these organizations have the goal of saving women's lives and saving the lives of their children. They need more resources, not fewer, to do this work.

What else does the international family planning amendment do? It includes an additional \$33 million to USAID's family planning account for money that is rerouted away from the U.N. Population Fund.

Again, unlike what the blogs are mistakenly saying, this is not money that currently goes to UNFPA's lifesaving operations. Instead, it will be redirected back into the family planning account and contribute to the programs I just outlined.

Third, the amendment requires the Government Accountability Office to produce a report that evaluates the efficacy of family planning programs and their structure. Again, this was another bipartisan effort with my Republican colleagues to ensure that our U.S. dollars are most effective and they contribute to programs and services that are most effective. Again, if you have a concern about how family planning dollars are being spent, then you should support this amendment because it is going to give us data and in-

formation to show what is effective and what isn't.

Finally, the amendment includes language to reaffirm an existing non-discrimination policy within USAID. This is an existing nondiscrimination policy. This is not a new policy. That policy within USAID ensures the services funded by these accounts reach all segments of the population.

As I said, this is not a new policy. The anti-discrimination policy has existed for several years, and it is not targeted toward faith-based organizations, despite what some of the blogs mistakenly are putting out there. In fact, the complaints I have heard in my office about single women being rejected for services didn't touch on work that faith-based organizations are doing.

I hope all of our colleagues in the Senate will not allow misinformation about the family planning dollars that are in the State and Foreign Operations bill to dismantle what has been a very important bipartisan achievement. Its impact is too great and its programs are too important to let them be killed by a campaign to try and mislead people about what is in the amendment.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF AURELIA SKIPWITH

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to share with the Senate my reasons for opposing the nomination of Aurelia Skipwith to serve as the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Let me begin by saying that I am disappointed to find myself in this position. When I had the privilege of serving as Governor of Delaware, I was able to assemble my own leadership team, so I appreciate how important it is that people in executive positions, including Presidents, have that same ability.

However, in article II of the Constitution, our Founders set up a system in which the President would nominate individuals to the top posts in our government and Senators would provide "advice and consent" on those nominees.

In order for the Senate to fulfill that constitutional role, those nominated individuals must cooperate with the confirmation process. And, unfortunately, Ms. Skipwith has not provided information requested by the Democrats during the nomination process.

Despite my repeated requests for the nominee to be more forthcoming—requests made twice in writing and twice in person, during her nomination process—Ms. Skipwith has refused. Instead, she has given me the impression that she does not take this confirmation process seriously.

Her lack of candor has elevated questions that already existed about her qualifications, her commitment to environmental conservation and whether she can ethically lead the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Therefore, I cannot support this nomination.

Ms. Skipwith first joined the Trump administration in April 2017, when she was appointed as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife and Parks, a non-Senate-confirmed political appointment at the Department of the Interior.

During her tenure there, the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed and finalized controversial regulations that drastically altered implementation of the Endangered Species Act.

The Service has also issued a legal opinion that changes the way the Department of the Interior enforces the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Former senior Interior officials from every administration since the early 1970s, both Republican and Democrat, have strongly opposed this Migratory Bird Treaty Act legal opinion. At her confirmation hearing, Ms. Skipwith vehemently defended it.

Prior to her controversial tenure at the Interior Department, Ms. Skipwith had no previous work experience related to conservation or wildlife management—none.

By contrast, the 16 individuals who previously served as Fish and Wildlife Service Directors for both Republican and Democratic Presidents had an estimated average of 12 years of experience at the Fish and Wildlife Service before taking on the Director role. They also have an estimated average of more than 22 years of professional experience in fields related to wildlife or fisheries management.

Ms. Skipwith has also not seemed to make up for her lack of previous experience while on the job. At her confirmation hearing, when asked to name the conservation scientist who had most influenced her career and her approach to wildlife and fisheries management, Ms. Skipwith struggled to name any conservation scientist. Ultimately, she named a former Monsanto vice president with whom she used to work, but she misremembered his name.

This was not an insignificant misstep. To me, it was revealing. Ms. Skipwith's response to my simple question represented a clear lack of familiarity with the basics of wildlife management, a troubling quality for a Fish and Wildlife Director nominee.

By contrast, Ms. Skipwith does have significant experience in the agribusiness industry. Before joining the Trump administration, she worked for Monsanto, one of the world's largest agrochemical firms. Monsanto regularly has business interests before the Interior Department. She also worked for Alltech, a Kentucky-based agricultural products company.

She also co-founded AVC Global, an agribusiness-technology start up, and was employed by Gage International, a Washington, DC, based lobbying firm founded by her fiancé.

That is why even before her confirmation hearing, I asked Ms. Skipwith some basic questions about how these companies operate and

whether Ms. Skipwith has recused herself from working on those issues. Unfortunately, Ms. Skipwith has refused to answer those questions.

She has repeatedly refused to provide her calendars with the appointments she has had as a Department of the Interior official. This information could be made available to any member of the public under the Freedom of Information Act, but she has refused to provide it to me for months within the confirmation process.

This information is important because Ms. Skipwith's former employer, Gage International, has represented water utilities that have lobbied Congress to weaken Western water policy and the Endangered Species Act.

Unanswered questions also remain about Ms. Skipwith's role in the development of a controversial repeal of an existing ban on using pesticides that have been shown to harm birds and bees in national wildlife refuges. And one of the largest producers of these pesticides is Monsanto, another one of Ms. Skipwith's former employers.

Yet when Senator GILLIBRAND asked Ms. Skipwith about her role in the ban's repeal, Ms. Skipwith defended the reversal but denied any role in the decision. This answer does not appear to be consistent with some of the email records that have been obtained under Freedom of Information Act, which show that she expressed interest in the matter and received materials on the issue from career staff.

If Ms. Skipwith was indeed involved with the decision to reverse the pesticides ban, it would constitute a violation of the ethics pledge she signed when she joined the Department. An examination of Ms. Skipwith's calendar entries could clear up these outstanding questions, but her lack of cooperation makes that impossible.

This lack of being forthcoming is troubling, not only because it undermines the Senate's advice and consent role for Presidential nominees, but it also because it demonstrates the nominee's may not be cooperative when it comes to congressional oversight.

I have found that, when a nominee is unwilling to provide information as part of their confirmation process, they almost always prove to be even more defiant to congressional oversight requests after they are confirmed.

I urge my colleagues, especially my Republican colleagues, to take this matter seriously. In fact, I would urge my Republican colleagues to remember these words spoken by my friend, former Congressman Trey Gowdy of South Carolina.

In June 2012, during the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee contempt proceedings against Attorney General Holder, then Congressman Gowdy said: "The notion that you can withhold information and documents from Congress no matter whether you are the party in power or not in power is wrong. Respect for the

rule of law must mean something, irrespective of the vicissitudes of political cycles."

Eventually, whether it is in 1 year or in 4 years or in 8, we will eventually have another Democratic administration. And when that time comes, Republicans in Congress will want officials in that Democratic administration to answer questions and respond to congressional oversight requests.

I fear that my Senate colleagues will find the process completely broken by then if we continue undermining our duty as Senators to both provide advice and consent on Presidential nomination and to conduct congressional oversight.

This clear defiance of our sworn constitutional duty and congressional oversight role diminishes the Senate, weakens our intricate system of checks and balances, and undermines the trust of the American people.

Beyond her lack of qualifications and her questionable role in some of this administration's major conservation policies, there are too many troubling concerns and questions about this nominee that remain unaddressed or unanswered.

Therefore, I will be opposing this nomination, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote that was going to start at 11:45 a.m. start now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Skipwith nomination?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.
The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 395 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Braun	Cotton
Barrasso	Capito	Cramer
Blackburn	Cassidy	Crapo
Blunt	Collins	Cruz
Boozman	Cornyn	Daines

Enzi	Lankford	Rubio
Ernst	Lee	Sasse
Fischer	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Graham	McSally	Sinema
Grassley	Moran	Sullivan
Hawley	Murkowski	Thune
Hoeven	Perdue	Tillis
Hyde-Smith	Portman	Toomey
Inhofe	Risch	Wicker
Johnson	Roberts	Young
Jones	Romney	
Kennedy	Rounds	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Klobuchar	Shelby
Duckworth	Paul	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Sullivan nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 396 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Barrasso	Boozman	Cardin
Blackburn	Braun	Carper

Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Collins	Inhofe	Rosen
Coons	Johnson	Rounds
Cornyn	Jones	Rubio
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Sasse
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	King	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lankford	Shaheen
Cruz	Leahy	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Sinema
Durbin	Manchin	Sullivan
Enzi	McConnell	Tester
Ernst	McSally	Thune
Feinstein	Merkley	Tillis
Fischer	Moran	Toomey
Gardner	Murkowski	Udall
Graham	Murphy	Van Hollen
Grassley	Perdue	Wicker
Hassan	Portman	Young
Hawley	Risch	
Hoeven	Roberts	

NAYS—22

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schumer
Bennet	Hirono	Smith
Blumenthal	Markey	Stabenow
Brown	Menendez	Warner
Cantwell	Murray	Whitehouse
Casey	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Duckworth	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Hahn nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO COMMEMORATE THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 150 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 150) expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian Genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I further ask that the resolution be

agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 9, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, we have just passed the Armenian genocide resolution recognition. It is fitting and appropriate that the Senate stands on the right side of history in doing so. It commemorates the truth of the Armenian genocide.

On Monday, we commemorated the International Day of Commemoration and Dignity of the victims of the crime of genocide and of the prevention of this crime. The UN General Assembly established this day of remembrance to commemorate and honor the victims of genocide and highlight efforts to combat and prevent genocide. Passing this resolution is a fitting tribute to this day of remembrance.

I have come to the floor on various occasions to talk about the history of the Armenian genocide. An Armenian priest, Krikoris Balakian, recorded some of the massacres against the Armenians. He said:

In Ankara and its surroundings, only a couple hundred miles east of Constantinople, the killing was done with "axes, cleavers, shovels, and pitchforks." It was like a slaughterhouse; Armenians were hacked to pieces . . . infants were dashed on rocks before the eyes of their mothers.

It was indescribable horror. Even when Armenians were supposedly deported, the conditions they were forced to live in made clear that Turkey's ultimate goal was to eliminate the Armenian people.

A visitor to one Turkish city in October of 1915 wrote: "The 16,000 deported Armenians who were living in the tents have been sent to Konia in cattle trucks. At night, while thousands of these unfortunate people, without food or shelter, shiver with cold, those brutes who are supposed to be their guardians attack them with clubs. And push them towards the station. Women, children, and old men are packed together in the trucks. The men have to climb on to the top of the trucks, in spite of the dreadful cold. Their cries are heart-breaking, but all is in vain. Hunger, cold, and fatigue, together with the Government's deeds of violence, will soon achieve the extermination of the last remnant of the Armenian people."

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador for Turkey, from 1913 to 1916, understood full well what was transpiring. He left his post in early 1916 because, as he later recalled, "My failure to stop the destruction of the Armenians had made Turkey for me a place of horror."

American diplomats like Henry Morgenthau were on the ground in Turkey, and they made heroic efforts to help the Armenian people, but here in Washington at the time, no one did anything in the face of this heinous crime.

As former UN Ambassador Samantha Power wrote in her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, "A Problem from Hell," "America's nonresponse to the Turkish horrors established patterns that would be repeated."

As my colleague from Texas, my co-sponsor who has been such a stalwart advocate with me, has very often noted, this is the first genocide to be recorded in this century. We know all too well the horrors in the 20th century with the Holocaust and other genocides around the world. So here in the Senate today, we break those patterns. We join the House and voted to do so by passing a resolution affirming the facts of the genocide, 405 to 11. Today, the Senate shows the same resolve.

I am deeply grateful to Senator CRUZ for his stalwart leadership on this issue and to the 27 other Senators from both parties who have cosponsored the resolution and demonstrated their commitment to the truth, and the truth finally will set us free.

I am thankful that this resolution has passed in a time in which there are still survivors of the genocide. We will be able to see that the Senate acknowledges what they left.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I thank my colleague and friend, the Senator from New Jersey, for his powerful remarks, and I rise today and celebrate a bipartisan achievement—an achievement of the Senate; an achievement for truth; an achievement for speaking the truth to darkness, for speaking the truth to evil, for speaking the truth to murder, for speaking the truth to genocide.

This journey has been a long journey. Senator MENENDEZ has been fighting this fight a long time. I have been proud to stand by his side. This is the third week in a row we have come to the Senate floor seeking to pass this resolution. I am grateful that today we have succeeded.

The Menendez-Cruz resolution affirms U.S. recognition of the Armenian genocide. It has been far too long in coming. From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire carried out a forced deportation of nearly 2 million Armenians, of whom 1.5 million were killed. It was an atrocious genocide. That it happened is a fact and undeniable reality.

In fact, the very word "genocide" literally means the killing of an entire people, and it was coined by Raphael Lemkin to describe the horrific nature of the Ottoman Empire's calculated extermination of the Armenians. It is why we have the horrid word "genocide" in our English language.

Over 100 years ago, the world remained silent as the Armenian people

suffered and were murdered. Even today, many people are unaware of what happened. But we must never be silent in response to atrocity. We have a responsibility to stand up and speak the truth. With this resolution, the United States is now saying it is the policy of the United States of America to commemorate the Armenian genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

We have a moral duty to acknowledge what happened to the 1.5 million innocent souls who were murdered. It is the right thing to do. I am grateful that, today, we have seen every Republican and every Democrat come together in support of the bipartisan Menendez-Cruz resolution. This is a moment of truth that was far too long coming.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate yet another major bipartisan victory that is included as part of the National Defense Authorization Act that the House has passed and the Senate is preparing to pass.

As it so happens, today is the 1-year anniversary—1 year to the very day that the European Parliament voted overwhelmingly to condemn the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline between Russia and Germany. By a vote of 433 to 105, the Members of the European Parliament called for the project to be cancelled because “It is a political project that poses a threat to European energy security and the efforts to diversify energy supply.”

In the coming days, the U.S. Congress will answer the call to stop this profoundly dangerous project. The House has acted, and the Senate will act very soon.

As part of the National Defense Authorization Act, sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline are included. The Cruz-Shaheen legislation—legislation I introduced, bipartisan legislation—Senator SHAHEEN and I and the Foreign Relations Committee brought our legislation to a vote. We won an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote—a vote of 20 to 2—out of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In the past weeks and months, there have been extended negotiations to include this legislation, these sanctions, in the National Defense Authorization Act. We have negotiated with Republicans and Democrats—Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Armed Forces, on the Foreign Relations Committee, on the Banking Committee, in leadership, and also Republicans and Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee, Foreign Relations Committee, Banking Committee, and leadership—and we have achieved a remarkable consensus.

Part of the reason we were able to achieve this bipartisan victory is that the sanctions are narrowly targeted, precisely targeted. The Nord Stream 2 pipeline is a pipeline from Russia to Germany to carry natural gas that, if completed, would generate billions of

dollars for Putin and billions of dollars that would fund Russian military aggression.

Not only that, if completed, this pipeline would make Europe even more dependent on Russian energy and even more vulnerable to Russian blackmail. Putin has demonstrated that he is more than willing to cut off the gas in the dead of winter as economic blackmail against his neighbors.

This pipeline is being built this very moment. It is near completion. The legislation we are passing is designed to operate like a scalpel, specifically directed to the ships that lay in the deep sea pipeline needed to complete Nord Stream 2.

There are only five companies on the face of the Earth with the technological capability to delay the deep sea pipeline. Russia does not have one of those companies.

The Russian Government lacks the expertise to lay this pipeline. As a result, Russia has contracted with the Swiss company, Allseas. Right now, as we speak, Allseas has a ship called the Pioneering Spirit that is laying this pipeline.

The legislation that has passed the House and that is about to pass the Senate imposes crippling sanctions on any company laying this pipeline. It is designed to operate like a scalpel so it doesn't impact anyone else, but if this legislation operates as Congress intends, as both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and House intend, then it will halt construction of this pipeline overnight.

The best estimates we have are that, if uninterrupted, the Nord Stream 2 pipeline would be completed by the end of January. That means the window to stop the pipeline is vanishingly small.

When the Senate passes the National Defense Authorization Act, which will be any day now, and the President signs it, which will be shortly thereafter, two things need to happen immediately.

No. 1, the Treasury Department and the administration need to immediately begin working on implementing these sanctions. I am confident the administration will follow the directives of President Trump. He has said that Nord Stream 2 is harmful to the national security interests of the United States of America, and it is harmful to Europe.

No. 2, there will be a decision made by the CEO and corporate leadership of Allseas. The instant this bill is signed into law—and we are only days away from that—if Allseas continues with construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, even for a single day after this law is signed, then Allseas risks crippling sanctions that could devastate the company.

The purpose of this legislation is not to see those sanctions implemented on Allseas; the purpose of this legislation is to stop construction. The only responsible and rational decision for the corporate leadership of Allseas to make is to stop construction.

My understanding is their contract with the Russians has an explicit escape path in case sanctions were passed. So the day this is signed, Allseas shareholders are at profound risk if Allseas corporate leadership does anything other than cease construction and stop the pipeline.

If and when that happens, that will be an incredible victory. It will be an incredible victory for Europe, an incredible victory for Ukraine, an incredible victory for energy security, and an incredible victory for jobs in the United States of America.

It is far better for Europe to be relying on energy from the United States than to be fueling Putin and Russia and dependent on Russia and subject to economic blackmail. That is why, as I noted, the European Parliament voted by a vote of 433 to 105 to condemn Nord Stream 2.

Passing these Nord Stream 2 sanctions are an incredible victory for the United States and national security, but it is also an incredible loss for Vladimir Putin and Russia.

I commend my Democratic cosponsor Senator SHAHEEN. I commend the cosponsors that this legislation has had, both Republicans and Democrats in a bipartisan way, and I commend the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House for coming together. At a time when so many other issues divide us, we have united in defense of America, in defense of Europe, and in opposition to Russia's military aggression. Passing Nord Stream 2 sanctions is a big, big deal, and I commend the U.S. Congress for acting swiftly in the rapidly closing window we have to stop this project.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Rhode Island.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak about the success of the Affordable Care Act in Rhode Island. It has been very well managed in Rhode Island, and it has made a very big difference in many, many lives.

The marketplace plan that the Affordable Care Act set up in Rhode Island is called Health Source Rhode Island. It has been well run, and it has been successful. For 2019, it has 34,533 people getting health insurance through the plan.

We also expanded Medicaid, as the Affordable Care Act allowed. Under the Medicaid expansion, 72,000 Rhode Islanders got coverage that they didn't have before. So if you put those two together, that is 106,000-plus Rhode Islanders who got the benefit, the comfort, and the confidence of coverage for healthcare as a result of this bill. It is 10 percent of our population, and it has driven our uninsured numbers way, way down, into low single digits, which has been a very big win for us.

I will also say that we have taken very good advantage of the accountable care organization provisions of the Affordable Care Act, with two of the best

performing ACOs in the country as two of our lead primary care provider groups: Coastal Medical and Primary Care Partners. They are showing just terrific results, as they are changing the way they deliver care. They can do so because we have changed the way they can be reimbursed for care.

That Rhode Island snapshot is part of a larger story of success.

Eleven and a half million Americans around the country have enrolled in ACA marketplace insurance in 2019. There are 11.8 million Medicare beneficiaries who have saved a total of \$26.8 billion on prescription drug costs. That is over \$2,200 per senior. That is something to celebrate. Unfortunately, it is still at risk in the courts.

President Trump and this Republican administration are still trying to knock it down. If they succeed, 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions will be at risk of losing healthcare coverage protections.

One hundred and fifty-six million Americans with private or employer-sponsored insurance will lose the consumer protections in the ACA for preventive care, disallowing lifetime or annual limits and closing waiting periods to enroll—things that have really made a difference in people's lives.

These are big numbers, and they add to a tremendous story of success, but behind the numbers are faces. Every one of those 34,533 Rhode Islanders who signed up and got health coverage through Health Source Rhode Island has their own story.

Today it is my privilege to come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to tell the story of Bridget from Tiverton, RI. I can't tell it better than she does, so I will simply read her story. She says:

For the majority of my life, I have suffered from chronic pain. Though I am only in my 20's, I have suffered from acute arthritis in my left hip due to multiple surgeries to correct complications from a hip dysplasia surgery for almost 15+ years. I was told for years that I was not a candidate for hip replacement as I was still growing, so when I was finally developed enough and found a surgeon willing to perform the hip replacement surgery, my life felt like it was actually mine again. Last year, I finally was approved for a hip replacement. It has been a year since that day, and I thank God every day that I was able to receive the help I need. Without the hip replacement, I would still be living in bed and confined to a wheelchair or crutches.

Without my coverage, the preventive care that ensured my health would not backpedal would have been gone. I cannot stress enough how terrifying the thought of losing the opportunity of living my life was. I would not wish this endeavor on anyone, especially a child without coverage, as I have been in their situation.

Since my surgery, I have been able to hold my first full time job. I have been able to consider going back to college. I have lived pain free for the first time in practically my whole life.

No one should have to struggle with chronic issues or be discriminated against because of pre-existing conditions. Every day I grow stronger, and my voice, for those who are not as strong as I am now, grows louder. I will fight for my right to health care and for oth-

ers who deserve the treatment they need for the rest of my life.

Bridget, congratulations. Thank you. God bless you.

Let us make sure we do not let this administration tear down the millions of stories like Bridget's that they seek to undo with this reckless litigation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reflect on the accomplishments that Chairman MURKOWSKI, my colleague and friend on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and I have been able to make this year. Today, I will focus on my remarks on the energy agenda we have put in place to address climate change, as well as a path forward for a bipartisan energy bill.

The year began with my appointment to ranking member of the committee. There were some expressions of uncertainty about where Chairman MURKOWSKI and I might lead that committee, and there was a great deal of skepticism about my ability and interest in addressing climate change, but I can assure you it is strong.

On March 5, 2019, we held the first hearing on climate in the committee in 7 years. Just this morning, we passed an additional five Energy bills, making the total count for this year 52 Energy bills reported out of committee.

We have endlessly examined our Nation's work on innovation in the energy and manufacturing sectors, and we have been reminded that the United States must lead in this space in order to ensure we can address climate change effectively.

As discussions about large climate bills move forward, it is important that Congress is doing the work to ensure we have the technology necessary to meet the challenge of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in a comprehensive and timely way.

In the midst of all the political noise, our committee has been quietly leading this effort over the last year. The strong bipartisan nature of our committee has enabled us to move dozens of pieces of legislation that will push the Department of Energy and the private sector into their next phase of research and development as we seek technological emissions-reducing solutions.

In reflecting on this year's progress, I want to highlight that bipartisanship because I believe it is absolutely the reason we are delivering solutions worthy of the people of West Virginia, Alaska, and the entire country. It is

simple—the chairman and I talk to each other, we talk to one another's colleagues on either side of the aisle, and sometimes we disagree, but we never disrespectfully disagree because we are friends.

We must come together in this Chamber to solve this crisis and also ensure that no community is left behind.

From even before the founding of our country, my home State of West Virginia has poured its natural resources and its human resources into every one of our Nation's ambitions. It is well known that West Virginia has produced the coal that has powered our grid and built our steel skyscrapers for decades. We have literally done the heavy lifting. What you may not know is that our salt deposits were used to make gun powder in the French and Indian and Revolutionary Wars. Our deeply ingrained culture of hard work and entrepreneurship led to James Rumsey's steamboat innovation in 1787, just as it is leading to the National Energy Technology Laboratory's inventions today.

West Virginians have applied all of our resources—coal, hydropower, natural gas, geothermal, wind, solar, and human ingenuity—to achieve our common goals. But these natural and human resources have been tested significantly in the past decade. The decline in coal production and use has gone beyond rising unemployment to unravel the tax revenues needed for our schools and communities. These economic and workforce downturns have occurred alongside the opioid crisis, the doubling of energy costs in our State, and historic flooding due to climate change in West Virginia—flooding that resulted in the tragic death of 23 of our friends, families, and neighbors.

None of these obstacles have or will get the best of West Virginia. Nothing ever has. Just as the innovators of my home State have sought to use all the resources at their disposal to seize opportunities and overcome challenges, we must reflect that resolve here in the Halls of Congress.

We cannot turn the American energy system on its head because the costs will fall too heavily on people in rural areas and energy-producing regions like West Virginia. At the same time, we cannot disregard what the science tells us about the reality and severity of climate change.

Across the country, we can clearly see that the costs of climate change are mounting, but we need to refocus our attention on the incredible opportunities presented by the solutions to it. Whether that is the upstart solar company hiring former coal miners in Jefferson and Cabell Counties; the collaboration between oil, gas, and geothermal on new ways to access hot rocks in Monongalia County; or the insulation installer who retrofits our homes, the opportunities and the needs exist in each and every community, not just on the coasts.

I have said time and again that the miners who built our country are the best workers we can employ to build our future economy. It is our responsibility as their representatives to include them and their communities in the economy of the future by passing the laws and making the investments needed to shape that future, creating those jobs and guiding the private sector and others toward new, ambitious climate solutions. That is why I have pursued bills that will build new energy and natural resource jobs in rural communities.

The Advanced Geothermal Innovation Leadership Act would significantly invest in new geothermal projects to unlock new and potentially vast resources in the Eastern United States—bringing proven renewable technologies to fossil fuel-producing regions.

The Enhancing Fossil Fuel Energy Carbon Technology Act would make the first Federal investments in direct air capture and firm up our commitment to carbon capture, utilization, and storage—necessary climate solutions and ones that can be built in the valleys of West Virginia.

The Clean Industrial Technology Act would incentivize new technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in industrial and heavy transport fuel sectors—solutions that reenergize the manufacturing heartland of the United States.

These bills and the many others we have reported out will lay the foundation for meeting our climate goals while creating the innovation jobs needed in our rural communities, all while leading the world.

That brings me back to the bipartisan nature of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The legislation we have passed in our committee reflects the diversity of our Members and our constituents who have sent us here on their behalf. These bills invest in the programs necessary to bring climate solutions to bear, and they will create jobs and opportunities.

Our bipartisan work on energy innovation is evidence of the good work that can be done in Congress and stands in contrast to the skeptical and cynical narrative that dominates our politics today. Our work is far from done. We will continue to work in a bipartisan fashion with our colleagues in this Chamber and in the House to take those 52 bills and turn them into an impactful energy package, one that can easily and readily move the needle on reducing emissions and one that can be signed into law.

I congratulate my dear friend and colleague Chairman MURKOWSKI and the members of the committee for their work, and I look forward to this Chamber taking up our energy innovation package in the new year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the ranking mem-

ber on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. He is really a friend on not only energy matters but on so many of the other initiatives we have worked on.

As he mentioned, every now and again, our two States might see things differently, but we have come to understand where we come from, what we bring to the table, and figure out how we can work together collaboratively and then set that collaborative tone for the full committee as a whole. I appreciate the opportunity to highlight a few of the accomplishments we as a committee have achieved over this past year.

We had a holiday lunch at the first of this week with both of our staffs assembled—had some good food—and I was able to share with all of the staffs that I felt like we were the committee that was kind of like “The Little Engine that Could”—the children’s storybook wherein the tiny little engine is kind of plugging along. We are not typically the headline-grabbing committee in this Senate, but just like the little engine, we kind of put our heads down and get to work, and we achieve a lot.

In our case, even in a divided time, we are seeing good, strong bipartisan legislation that is helping just about every Member of our Senate in all areas of the country.

Think about where we started off this year. You will recall that it was unfortunately in the midst of a government shutdown. But what we were able to do even at that time was to move through a significant victory, and that was the passage of our sweeping lands package containing more than 120 individual measures that reflected the priorities of dozens of Members in the Senate and the House. We passed that out of the Senate 92 to 8, the House passed it out 363 to 62, and the President signed it shortly thereafter. It was sweeping. We recognized that it provided for economic development for so many small communities, protected treasured landscapes, addressed a range of sportsmen’s priorities, and permanently reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

It took a long time. There were many initiatives we had been working through for a considerable period of time. But our ability to be able to pass it shortly after this government shutdown underscored that even at a time when we are known for our divisions, we can still achieve bipartisan success.

The committee really took the momentum, and we ran with it—as Senator MANCHIN has pointed out, some 51 bills, 52 bills here. Today, we just moved 19 bills out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee markup. We have moved out measures that are focused on energy efficiency, renewables, energy storage, advanced nuclear energy, carbon capture, utilization, and storage. We focused on mineral security, cyber security, and a range of additional technologies that really

work to ensure that energy becomes more affordable as it becomes cleaner.

We have been working very hard on the public lands side of our jurisdiction as well. One bill you are sure to hear more about in the first of the year is the Restore Our Parks Act, which will address the multibillion-dollar deferred maintenance backlog at our national parks—the crown jewels of our Nation. That bill provides \$6.5 billion over the next 5 years to fix dilapidated trails, buildings, roads, bridges, monuments, and historic markers.

Working on the parks and the land side, we reported 13 nominees for key leadership positions at the Department of Energy, Department of the Interior, and the FERC. Nearly all of them were confirmed, ensuring the President has a good team to carry out our Nation’s energy and resource policies.

We have also held hearings—about two a week while we have been in session—to highlight the opportunities and the challenges we face within our jurisdiction. These range from everything from the need for new and innovative technologies—as Senator MANCHIN pointed out—to the future of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. As he mentioned, we have held hearings—many hearings now—on climate change, making that a priority among priorities.

I think it is fair to say we have been very productive as a committee. We know the work isn’t done. It is one thing to report the measures out of committee; it is another thing to get them enacted into law. Our eyes are directed right now on these next steps.

Early next year, we hope to bring much of the work we have processed through the committee, bring it to the Senate floor. We are counting on our colleagues to join us and to help move these bills to the House and to the President for his signature. Whether you are interested in energy innovation, resource security, or access to public lands, this work should appeal to just about every Member and provide a great opportunity to advance the security, prosperity, and competitiveness of our Nation.

I want to share the deep appreciation I have for my ranking member, Senator MANCHIN, and his partnership. We have navigated some complicated stretches, but we have done so by working together to ensure a good outcome for the committee, for the Senate, and for the American people. I think you have seen some of that.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY ISAKSON

Mr. President, we saw some of the good work reflected of a gentleman we have lauded on the floor now throughout this week and will continue to laud because he is a most laudable and wonderful human being, and that is our friend, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. ISAKSON, who will soon be stepping down after a very good and honorable career in the U.S. Senate and before that.

It was a pleasure to know we were able to move out of the Energy Committee this morning. One of the priorities he has been working on is the Preserving America's Battlefields Act. He is a great historian and has put a great deal of himself into advancing that important legislation.

Another markup I was part of this morning was in Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, where we moved out two significant bills that had JOHNNY ISAKSON's fingerprints all over it. His care, his compassion for the most vulnerable children who have been abused—he has been a leader in the CAPTA legislation that moved out of that committee by voice vote this morning.

He was also instrumental in another measure that moved through the committee, the Adoption Opportunities Act. It gives you a glimpse of the range and the breadth of this extraordinary legislator, whether it is his great effort working for our veterans and his leadership on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, his leadership on those matters that he cares so personally and passionately about in the HELP Committee, or what we see in the other committees as we have seen in Energy with his focus on America's history.

JOHNNY ISAKSON is not only a great legislator, a laudable man, but he is also a true friend. He is one who has reminded us all that relationships matter; that how we speak to one another matters; that how we treat one another as human beings and friends matters.

I know that as we say our goodbyes to Senator ISAKSON from this Chamber, we will long remember not only the contributions he has provided from a legislative perspective and a policy perspective but as a person and as a lovely and decent human being.

With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise for a few moments to compliment my colleague, the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources committee, along with her ranking member, JOE MANCHIN, who spoke a few minutes ago, the Senator from West Virginia.

I have done a lot of thinking about leadership. One of the observations I have made is that the character and personality and thoughtfulness of the leader infect the entire organization. In this case, the chair and the ranking member of our committee have produced one of the most remarkable records of achievement in a committee that I have seen since I have been here over the past year. It has been because of their willingness to listen, their willingness to work with all of the members of the committee—and it is quite a diverse committee in terms of geography and in terms of ideology and in terms of representation of various interests at the table of the important questions of energy that face us.

This has been an amazingly productive year. I attribute that to the skill and leadership and character of Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska and of Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia.

It has been a wonderful experience for me to see what can be done in this institution. The next step, of course, is to get to the floor of the U.S. Senate and move these bills forward, as I think they can and should, through the House of Representatives and to the President.

Again, I rise not only to congratulate but also to thank the leadership of this committee for the great work they have done this year. I look forward to even better and greater things in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor briefly today to remind my colleagues to remind their constituents that December 15 is the open enrollment deadline for healthcare at healthcare.gov. This is incredibly important because if you are uninsured or you are currently on an Affordable Care Act plan, if you don't renew or sign up by the 15th, you will be frozen out of the marketplace unless you have what is called a qualifying event.

As we head back for the weekend, I want to ensure we do everything we can to make sure there are aren't more people who go into the New Year without insurance than absolutely necessary. This is especially important because we have seen a big decline in the number of people who have insurance in this country since President Trump took office.

Obviously, we made enormous progress after the passage of the Affordable Care Act. We were able to get the percentage of Americans without insurance down to around 5 percent. That is really extraordinary. Yet we have seen that progress reverse. We have seen more and more people go without insurance since this administration started to wage what is a pretty consistent, remarkable war on the Affordable Care Act.

As we speak today, the Trump administration is in court trying to get the court system—the Federal court system—to strike down the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. If they are successful in that endeavor, then next year's deadline will not matter because the Affordable Care Act will be gone; 20 million people will lose their health insurance; insurers will once again be able to charge you more because you have a preexisting condition or your kid has cancer or you are a woman.

As we fight that court case, we need to remember that the Affordable Care Act is still out there and is still very affordable for millions and millions of Americans. Seventy percent of enrollees who go on to healthcare.gov find they qualify for financial help, meaning the sticker price is not actually

what you pay. The tax credits in ObamaCare will help you get that premium lower.

In fact, on average, folks are getting pretty sizable premiums—in the neighborhood of \$500. That could make healthcare incredibly affordable, even if the sticker price looks out of your range.

A woman in Hartford, named Deborah, visited a local enrollment fair after receiving a letter saying her premiums actually might be going up. She said this:

That scared me a little bit so I wanted to come in and have someone explain it to me whether it was going to go up, decrease, you know, what were my options. What ended up happening is that actually my premium went down for the same plan but I also learned that just because they renew you that I had the opportunity to go in and say no, I don't want that plan, I want to choose this plan. I am ecstatic with my new plan. . . . I got educated on the insurance process and I like that.

You can still get that help. You can still get somebody on the phone to walk you through your choices. I really encourage people to do that by this Sunday.

For folks who do find an affordable plan, I hope you will also step up and try to help us maintain the protections and the coverages we have. We have been fighting a battle with the Trump administration. It doesn't like the Affordable Care Act simply because the President's name is on it, despite the fact that Americans don't want the Affordable Care Act repealed. But the administration has been doing everything within its power to try to make it harder for people to sign up. The administration has rolled back the advertising for the Affordable Care Act.

This is what qualifies for advertising today—charts on the floor of the U.S. Senate. The administration has rolled back the money for the navigators—the people who help you pick which plan is right for you. The administration, for a period of time, threatened to stop paying insurance companies, which chilled the interest of insurers to actually offer plans on these exchanges. As I mentioned, the administration is going to court to try to unroll and unwind the entirety of the act through a court case.

Lastly, though, what you will find, if you go and enroll in some States, are plans that look like an Affordable Care Act plan on these websites but actually aren't. They are what we call junk plans, short-term plans—plans that don't really cover anything. They might not cover maternity care or addiction care or mental health or prescription drugs. Some of these junk plans don't cover you if you get admitted into the hospital on a Friday or Saturday.

Be careful of those plans because the sticker price is going to look really low, but that is for a reason. It is because they don't cover anything.

The President has allowed for those junk plans to be shown right next to

the Affordable Care Act plan. Make sure you are signing up for a regulated, Affordable Care Act plan. That is a plan that is bronze or silver or gold, not one of these junk short-term plans that is not going to be right for the vast majority of Americans.

It is not too late. Sunday is the deadline. If you are in Connecticut, make sure to go to Access Health CT or your State exchange, if your State runs an exchange. If not, you can get healthcare through www.healthcare.gov.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled at 1:45 p.m. begin right now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON HAHN NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hahn nomination?

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 397 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Brown	Cornyn
Baldwin	Capito	Cortez Masto
Barrasso	Cardin	Cotton
Bennet	Carper	Cramer
Blackburn	Casey	Crapo
Blunt	Cassidy	Cruz
Boozman	Collins	Daines
Braun	Coons	Durbin

Enzi	Lee	Sasse
Ernst	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Feinstein	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Fischer	McSally	Shaheen
Gardner	Menendez	Shelby
Graham	Murkowski	Sinema
Grassley	Murphy	Sullivan
Hawley	Perdue	Tester
Hooven	Peters	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Portman	Tillis
Inhofe	Risch	Toomey
Johnson	Roberts	Van Hollen
Jones	Romney	Warner
Kaine	Rosen	Whitehouse
Kennedy	Rounds	Wicker
Lankford	Rubio	Young

NAYS—18

Blumenthal	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Gillibrand	Markey	Smith
Hassan	Merkley	Stabenow
Heinrich	Murray	Udall
Hirono	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Duckworth	Moran	
Harris	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from South Dakota.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PALLONE-THUNE TRACED ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, every American has had to deal with annoying and illegal robocalls. All of us have been interrupted at one time or another by a robocall's announcing "You have won a prize" or claiming to need important banking information so that our accounts will not be closed. These calls are a major nuisance. Of course, they are not just a nuisance. Too many Americans fall victim to sophisticated robocall scammers and have their money or identities stolen. These individuals spend months or years struggling to get their lives back after falling prey to these scammers.

There are currently laws and fines in place to prevent scam artists from preying on people through the telephone. Unfortunately, these measures have not been sufficient. In many cases, robocall scammers simply build the current fines into the cost of doing business, and the Federal Communications Commission's enforcement efforts are hampered by a tight time window for pursuing violators.

I have been working on this issue since my time as chairman of the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and at the end of last year, I introduced the Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act, or the TRACED Act, with my colleague Senator MARKEY.

The Senate passed our bill in May, and last week our bill was passed by the House of Representatives. The TRACED Act provides tools to discourage illegal robocalls, protect consumers, crack down on offenders.

Criminal prosecution of illegal robocallers can be difficult. Scammers are frequently based abroad and quickly shut down shop before authorities can get to them, but I believe we need to make sure there is a credible threat of criminal prosecution and prison for those who use robocalls to prey upon the elderly and other vulnerable Americans.

The TRACED Act convenes a working group with representatives from the Department of Justice, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, State attorneys general, and others to identify ways to criminally prosecute illegal robocalling.

In the meantime, it expands the window in which the FCC can pursue scammers and levy fines from 1 year to 4 years.

The bill also makes it easier for your cell phone carrier to lawfully block calls that aren't properly authenticated, which will ultimately help stop scammers from getting through to your phone in the first place.

The TRACED Act also tackles the issue of spoof calls, where scammers make the call appear as if it is coming from some known number.

I remember an article from my home State a couple of years ago that reported that scammers had successfully spoofed the number of the Watertown Police Department. To anyone who received a call, it looked as if it really was the Watertown Police Department calling.

The TRACED Act also addresses the issue of so-called one-ring scams, where international scammers try to get individuals to return their calls so they can charge them exorbitant fees, and it directs the Federal Communications Commission to convene a working group to address the problem of illegal robocalls being made to hospitals.

There are numerous stories of hospital telephone lines being flooded with robocalls, disrupting critical lines of communication, literally, for hours. This can't be allowed to go on.

I want to thank Senator MARKEY for partnering with me on the TRACED Act, and my House colleagues for advancing this legislation. I am proud of the bipartisan support our bill has received in both Houses of Congress.

One last step remains before we can get this bill to the President's desk, and that is Senate passage of the final

bill. I am hoping we can get that done in the coming days so we can get this bill to the President before Christmas.

While the TRACED Act may not eliminate all of the robocalls Americans receive, it will go a long way toward making it safe to answer your phone again.

I look forward to seeing this legislation signed into law in the very near future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT MICHAEL CLEARY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of 1LT Michael Cleary from Dallas, PA. It has been 14 years since his death. Michael is one of some 288 Pennsylvanians killed in action in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

First Lieutenant Cleary served as platoon leader of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Team in E Company, 1st of the 15th Regiment, 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division of the U.S. Army.

On December 20, 2005, First Lieutenant Cleary was killed in action while working in a bomb factory near Samarra, Iraq. His platoon was ambushed outside the facility. He was just 24 years old.

Even prior to joining the Army, Michael Cleary was an active member of his community. He graduated from Dallas Senior High School in Dallas, PA, and was a 4-year varsity athlete in both soccer and tennis. He was captain of both teams in his senior year. He received the Dr. Pepper Soccer MVP Scholarship and a history scholarship at high school graduation and was offered academic scholarships at Ursinus College, Gettysburg, as well as Dickinson and Lafayette—all very strong academic institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania.

He followed his father's footsteps and chose Hamilton College in New York. While at Hamilton, First Lieutenant Cleary participated in varsity soccer and lettered in varsity tennis. After the September 11, 2001, attacks on our Nation, he wanted to enlist in the Special Forces but chose to follow the advice of his mother and stayed in school until completing his studies.

In May 2003, he graduated from Hamilton with honors. During his senior year, he applied to and was accepted into the Marine flight officer program.

He was notified that his class would be deferred until January. Not wanting to wait any longer to serve his country, Michael Cleary decided to enlist in the U.S. Army. Three weeks after college graduation, he went to basic training and earned his airborne wings and sapper tab and graduated from the Special Air Service Antiterrorist Course.

The news of First Lieutenant Cleary's death came just before he was scheduled to return home during the Christmas season. He was also planning to get married 2 months after he returned home to his high school sweetheart. First Lieutenant Cleary earned the following awards and decorations: the Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, and Overseas Service Ribbon. His family also received First Lieutenant Cleary's U.S. Army Bronze Star and Purple Heart.

Following his death, First Lieutenant Cleary's father, Jack, described his last conversation with his son the day before he died. Jack Cleary is someone I have gotten to know since his son's passing, but here is what Jack said at that time. I am quoting him directly. "He"—meaning Michael—"was very upset that they were sending home some of his men without their awards . . . for things like promotions, and he was fighting for his men. That is the kind of officer he was. Michael was a fine man. He cared about all people, great and small."

Jack Cleary knows of what he speaks because he, himself, served in Vietnam and, as I mentioned earlier, was also a graduate of the same college. 1LT Michael Cleary's legacy lives on with his family. His mother, Marianne, is a member of Gold Star Mothers where she works to support veterans, military families, and her community every day.

Jon Bellona, Michael's college roommate, is a director and founder of the 1LT Michael Joseph Cleary: Run for the Fallen, a run across America to raise awareness about the lives of those who fought to activate their memories and to keep their spirits alive. Run for the Fallen supports organizations that help wounded veterans, as well as the families of those killed, and helps aid the healing process for those Americans whose lives have been affected by war.

All Americans are grateful for the friends and family of fallen servicemembers who not only continue the legacy of service to the Nation, but who take their tragedy and turn it into a force for good.

1LT Michael Cleary is one of so many bright, talented, and dedicated young men and women who have died in service to our country. While I speak specifically of Michael today, his story is the story of thousands of men and women across our country, hundreds of them in Pennsylvania who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan and

also have given their lives in service of American values, values like democracy and liberty and rule of law.

As we remember Michael Cleary, we should also remember the words of Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln reminded us that people like Michael Cleary gave, as Lincoln said, "The last full measure of devotion to our country." It is at times like this when we should remember not only those words, but also other words from the Gettysburg Address, where he said, "It is us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

So that was our charge from President Lincoln all those generations ago. We must strive every day, whether we are citizens or public officials, whatever our station in life, we must strive every day to complete that unfinished work that Lincoln talked about, so that, as we discuss major security issues like U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan or combating the resurgence of ISIS in the Middle East or exercising oversight over U.S. military engagements overseas and look increasingly to try to resolve complicated global crises, we must not forget that those who have given the ultimate sacrifice and service to our country, particularly in the most recent wars, are those we should remember.

Just consider these numbers of Americans who have lost their lives in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, with an additional seven killed in African Command operations since 2001. That number is 6,989 Americans just in those conflicts, just in that timeframe. These 6,989 Americans includes some 300 servicemembers from Pennsylvania, the fifth highest total of any State. No. 2, over 49,000 in that time period have been wounded, including more than roughly 2,000 from Pennsylvania. So 6,989 killed since 2001 nationwide and over 49,000 wounded in that time period.

Third, although the administration refuses to be transparent in its deployment tracking, press reports indicate that approximately 19,000 Americans are currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, with an additional 65,000 serving the Persian Gulf and Saudi Arabia.

This year, Pennsylvania lost MSG Benjamin Hines of York County, PA, assigned to the 25th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division, Marine Forces Reserve. He was killed by a roadside bomb on April 8 in Parwan Province, Afghanistan, along with two other marines: SSG Christopher Slutman and SGT Robert Hendricks. Staff Sergeant Slutman also had family ties to my home State of Pennsylvania.

While we are so grateful that Pennsylvania did not suffer more losses this year, any loss of life is not only devastating, but should also cause us to reconsider the nature of our military commitments overseas. These fighting men and women are born into families,

not into divisions and brigades. They are sons and daughters, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers. Their love for their families are matched only by their devotion to our country, but many more bear the scars of war.

Some families have a loved one who served in Iraq or Afghanistan and were returned home, but who were one of the more than 49,000 who were wounded. We must not overlook the unusually high percentage of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who have died since returning home, whether from a drug overdose or suicide or the effects of combat. Thousands of American families continue to pay a terrible price for the courage and dedication of their family members who gave life and limb for this country.

We have much to think about, not only on this day, but, of course, in this season—this season of hope, this season of gratitude, this season of our time together with our families back home, but we should especially remember those families who have loved and lost, those who have lost someone in combat, those who have lost someone who served so nobly, served on behalf of the rest of us.

At this time, Mr. President, I know you have personal experience with this, having served yourself, and I know that you understand this. It is an important time to remember those who have given so much for our country, with the spirit of gratitude for their service, hope that we don't have more losses in the coming year, and with confidence that they have set a great example for us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the chaos in Washington, DC, precipitated by impeachment mania or our inability to get what should be relatively straightforward work done, like the appropriations process and all the gymnastics over the USMCA, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement—in fact, we are coming down to a deadline on Friday, the 20th of December, when the current continuing resolution runs out.

Because of everything that is going on, many people may not have been able to pay that much attention—and I think attention is deserved—to the testimony of Department of Justice Inspector General Michael Horowitz, who testified in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday. I know there was some news coverage of it, but I

wanted to give some reflections on the testimony Mr. Horowitz gave.

First of all, the Office of Inspector General is a very important one. They are a watchdog to make sure the laws Congress passes and the rules of the various agencies—in this case, the Department of Justice—are complied with. It is really very, very important.

With everything else going on, it is important to have an impartial inspector general to conduct that kind of investigation and to hold people accountable—something that doesn't happen enough here in Washington, DC.

Inspector General Horowitz, along with his team, was widely praised for producing an outstanding report this time on the counterintelligence investigation of the Trump administration by the Obama-era Justice Department and the FBI.

This is a 480-page report. I have a copy of it right here. It is redacted for public release. If you look at it online—you can look at it through the Department of Justice website—you can see that some of it is redacted or black marks are drawn through parts of it to protect certain classified information.

But there is more than enough information contained in this report to know that the Crossfire Hurricane investigation into the Trump administration by the Obama Justice Department, including Comey and the FBI, was an unmitigated disaster.

Mr. Horowitz highlighted some of the truly disturbing and alarming facts about how this Russia investigation was conducted—how it was initiated and how it was conducted. There were mistakes made, including some intentional misconduct, which has now been referred to the Justice Department for potential investigation and even charging and prosecution. This was a troubling report, identifying at least 17 different areas of concern.

The report is full of legal jargon, government acronyms, and a long list of names most Americans probably don't recognize. The bottom line is, beneath all of this is a pattern of concerning behavior that ought to concern everyone who cares about civil liberties.

At the core of these issues is, under Director Comey, the FBI's abuse of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA. I know people have heard the reference to FISA, and that is short for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. In other words, when our intelligence services, including the FBI, gather information, they can't do that on American citizens absent a showing of probable cause in front of a court. That is a protection of our civil liberties. When it comes to foreign intelligence, there is a different court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—that has to assess and judge whether they have met the appropriate legal standards.

The inspector general found that the Comey FBI failed to file accurate applications to surveil an American citizen by the name of Carter Page.

There are very exacting requirements, very technical but very important requirements that the FBI has to put together, in consultation with the National Security Division at the Department of Justice, in order to go to court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—and justify issuance of the authority to gather intelligence on an individual.

In this case, they claimed that Carter Page, who was for a time associated with the Trump campaign—they claim that they suspected him to be an agent of a foreign power—in other words, Russia.

The way these documents were prepared and the way in which this matter was pursued was hardly a stellar performance by the Comey FBI, and I will mention that here in a moment. Once that FISA warrant is issued, as it was on an American citizen—Carter Page—that individual's private communications then come into the hands of the FBI as part of their investigation of a potential agent of a foreign power.

As I said yesterday and reiterated to Inspector General Horowitz this morning—or yesterday morning—spying on an American citizen is not something to be taken lightly. None of us should view this as a trivial matter. That is why there are such strong protections in place to prevent an abuse of power.

One of those backstops is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—a specialized court appointed by Chief Justice Roberts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, that sits in rotation for a time to look at the government's applications for these warrants under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. You can imagine that when that court makes important decisions involving the national security of the United States or the civil liberties of an American citizen, they need to have a full picture. They need to have the utmost candor exercised by the FBI of all the details and information surrounding the issue at hand. Again, this is no trivial matter. The court is determining whether the government has a compelling case to secretly spy on an American's communications.

Unfortunately, as we heard from Mr. Horowitz, the FBI, under Director Comey, fell dramatically short of that goal. The application for something as serious as a foreign intelligence surveillance warrant should be free from error, let alone intentional lies. Unfortunately, Inspector Horowitz found 17 different instances where the FBI agents involved in securing this FISA warrant failed that standard.

First of all, the inspector general identified 7 mistakes in the original application and an additional 10 in 3 renewals, for a total of 4 separate warrants under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. These applications weren't put together and examined by rank-and-file agents; these errors came from three handpicked teams that didn't raise any red flags for high-level

senior officials—something that Mr. Horowitz said made him deeply concerned, which is a feeling I share.

One of the most glaring errors was the applications' reliance on a deeply flawed private intelligence report—opposition research paid for by the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee—on Donald Trump. This is called the Steele dossier, as people have heard that reference. Mr. Steele is a former intelligence officer who worked for the British Government, the British intelligence services, but he had long since retired from his government service, and now he was out for hire to dig up information—in this case, on a political candidate in the Presidential election in 2016.

One of the biggest concerns we have all had since the 2016 election is Russian interference in our elections. Sometimes this is called active measures, where they merely try to sow discord and dissent by social media use, by propaganda, and by intelligence services leaking information.

I asked Attorney General Barr, before the Judiciary Committee earlier this year, whether he could state with confidence that the Steele Dossier, which we know was paid for by the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton administration, was not a part of this Russian disinformation campaign, whether he could say it was not. The Attorney General said no, he could not.

FBI attorneys assisting in the Crossfire Hurricane investigation called it a “close call” on whether they had sufficient justification to ask the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to issue a warrant so they could collect intelligence on an American citizen, Carter Page. What made that a close call? What turned a close call into the granting of that authority? Well, it was the Steele dossier. It was a hit piece, really—called that by one of our intelligence agencies—based on internet rumor, not based on verified information. That was used by the Crossfire Hurricane team to apply to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to get a warrant issued to surveil and spy on an American citizen.

Although I know that taking a look at the real source of the Steele dossier was outside the realm of the inspector general's duties, it is worth investigating because it played a central and essential role in the FBI's FISA applications. That is what Mr. Horowitz found.

Mr. Horowitz found on one occasion serious and intentional misconduct on the part of an FBI lawyer, and he now has referred that lawyer for criminal prosecution. But the explanations they offered for the other errors were completely unsatisfactory, and they should not be overlooked or excused. Attorney General Barr echoed that in a TV interview earlier this week. I trust him and Mr. Durham to get to the bottom of it. They have more authority than the inspector general to compel the

production of evidence in testimony—much like a grand jury, as opposed to what the inspector general had, which was basically a voluntary willingness of witnesses to come forward and to look at the FBI's internal files.

To make matters worse, even as new and exculpatory information—information that tended to show innocence—came to light on Carter Page, this information was not reflected in what the FBI filed when they requested a foreign intelligence surveillance warrant from the court.

You have to wonder—if this level of mishandling is occurring in a high-profile investigation of a Presidential candidate, someone who would later become the leader of the free world, what kind of protections are in place for average American citizens?

We place an enormous amount of trust in the U.S. Government to keep us safe and also to respect and uphold our constitutional rights. So seeing these types of errors, intentional and unintentional, slipping through the cracks in such a sensitive investigation doesn't give me much confidence that it is not happening in other cases.

Another question I asked the inspector general was on something called defensive counterintelligence briefings. This is a little bit arcane, but let me explain.

There are two different types of investigations by the FBI. One is of a potential criminal prosecution. We are all familiar with that. But the second role that the FBI plays is conducting counterintelligence investigations—in other words, protecting the American people and our national security from the attempts by foreign actors, malign foreign actors to gain intelligence on the U.S. Government and the American people, to our detriment and to the detriment of our national security.

One of the things Loretta Lynch, who was Attorney General under Barack Obama, said is that in a counterintelligence investigation, defensive briefings are routine. In other words, if the Presiding Officer were a target of a Russian intelligence operation—somebody had bumped into you at the grocery store or shown up at your kid's soccer game or perhaps shown up at your work, and you began to wonder, who this person and why have they taken such interest in me?—well, if the FBI discovers information that indicates this is part of an effort to recruit an American citizen to become an asset for the Russian intelligence services, what the FBI is obligated to do is to give a defensive briefing where they might tell the Presiding Officer or me or anybody else who might be targeted “This is what is happening to you, so be on your guard. Don't think this is innocent. Protect yourself,” and in so doing, protect the national security of the United States.

These briefings, we learned from Loretta Lynch, are routine. They are given routinely to political candidates, to individuals, and to companies that

hear from the FBI about those potential threats so they can take steps to protect themselves.

We know that both Presidential candidates of 2016—Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton—received some kind of defensive briefing in August of 2016, but the so-called defensive briefing for the Trump campaign was unique in a number of aspects.

At the time the FBI believed the Russians were trying to infiltrate the Trump campaign, you would think that would have been a prime opportunity to share that information with Candidate Trump and his campaign so he could tell the people on his campaign: Be on your guard, and don't engage in any unnecessary contact with people whom you don't know and who might have malign motives.

The FBI could have advised the Trump campaign about these potential threats and given them their professional advice on how to mitigate the concerns, but that didn't happen in the case of the Trump campaign. Instead of warning the Trump campaign about possible Russian efforts, they actually inserted—the FBI inserted a case agent into the briefing and used that as an opportunity to collect information in support of their own criminal investigation of GEN Michael Flynn.

It is not only unfair to insert an FBI agent into an otherwise benign setting in order to collect information on an American citizen in a criminal investigation, obviously General Flynn did not know the FBI was trying to do this under a pretext, so he couldn't say: I would like to talk to a lawyer. I would like to know that what I say can't be used against me in a court of law. In other words, all of the normal protections under the Bill of Rights that would be given to somebody under a criminal investigation were not afforded because of this pretextual defensive briefing where the FBI agent slipped in in order to collect information.

Here is the bottom line: This defensive briefing of the Trump campaign lasted a whopping 13 minutes—hardly enough time to convey the sort of information you would want to a political campaign. I can tell you that if the FBI came to me and told me that some foreign actor was trying to infiltrate my campaign, I would want to know about it, and I would want to tell the people who volunteered in the campaign to knock it off. But President Trump, when he was a candidate, was not given that information or the opportunity to shut it down, which he should have been.

Director Wray, to his credit, after hearing about that, has accepted the recommendations of the inspector general and has moved quickly to try to rectify some of these practices, and he has already issued corrective action on them. This doesn't negate the fact that the American people's trust in their government to protect them has been harmed by the Comey FBI.

We need the American people's confidence in the laws the Congress passes, the constitutional rights they enjoy under our Constitution, and the oversight that Congress performs and that the FBI and the intelligence community are going to be required to play by the rules of the road and not jeopardize the civil liberties of any American, much less a candidate for the U.S. Presidency. This is something I will talk about more at another time.

Chairman GRAHAM of the Judiciary Committee assures me that yesterday's very important hearing, at which Inspector Horowitz testified, will not be the last hearing on this matter but merely the first. There is more to come, as there well should be.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying S. 1790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report, which will be stated by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of December 9, 2019.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Kevin Cramer, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo,

Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, John Thune, James Lankford, James E. Risch, Deb Fischer, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum called be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to discuss Congress's ongoing failure to assert our constitutional war powers. This failure is the root cause of two pressing concerns that we currently face: first, the seemingly endless U.S. involvement in Middle East wars; and, second, the very real possibility that the Trump administration will involve us in more of them.

The Founders were clear in their intent. The Constitution squarely places the authority to "declare war"—that is the phrase in the Constitution—and places it clearly with Congress and Congress alone. The Founders did this for good reason. For centuries, European monarchs had drained royal coffers, levied heavy taxes, and lost countless lives in wars that benefited themselves and not the people.

As Elbridge Gerry from Massachusetts said during the Constitutional Convention, after another delegate suggested giving this war power to the President: "[I] never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war."

The Founders vested this most consequential power in the legislative branch so that any decision to go to war would have broad public support. Since the Republic's beginning, there has been a tension between the Congress and the executive branch regarding the use of this power.

In the modern era, the balance has been upended. Our ability and willingness to effectively check the Executive on war powers is dangerously diminished. Congress has not declared war for any of our major conflicts since World War II. But after the bloody, prolonged, and politically divisive Vietnam War, Congress passed a War Powers Resolution of 1973, overriding the veto of President Nixon. That resolution requires Congress to issue an authorization for use of military force, or an AUMF.

Immediately after 9/11, a nearly unanimous Congress—myself included—authorized force against the perpetrators, al-Qaida and those who harbored them, by which we meant the Taliban government in Afghanistan. The 2001 AUMF authorized the United States' entering conflict in Afghanistan to root out al-Qaida.

The Taliban was then expelled from power. Al-Qaida in Afghanistan has been defeated. Osama Bin Laden is dead. And the now 18-year-old AUMF

has outlived its purpose, as a stunning Washington Post expose on the Afghan war has now made clear.

The war in Afghanistan is the longest in U.S. history, but it no longer has a clear purpose. The Washington Post successfully sued for access to previously undisclosed government documents, dubbed the "Afghanistan Papers." These 2,000 pages of interviews and memos from senior military, diplomatic, and White House officials tell a shocking and tragic story. Three separate administrations have had no well-formed mission for the war but fought on anyway and repeatedly misled the American people.

According to the head of the NATO command in Afghanistan in 2006, "there was no coherent long-term strategy there." The next NATO commander, Army LTG Dan McNeill said:

I tried to get someone to define for me what winning meant, even before I went over, and nobody could. Nobody would give me a good definition of what it meant. . . . There was no NATO campaign plan—a lot of verbiage and talk, but no plan.

A senior diplomat under President Obama said:

If I were to write a book, its [cover] would be: "America goes to war without knowing why it does."

Over and over, senior officials describe the lack of strategic goals. All the while, the government lied to the American people, claiming success when there was none.

This war has cost 157,000 lives, more than 775,000 American troops have been deployed, 2,300 American military personnel have been killed, and more than 20,000 have been wounded. It has cost the American people over \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion. These costs are tragic, inexcusable, and it is time for this war to end.

The executive branch isn't the only branch at fault. Congress has sat back and let the Executives stretch the AUMF to the point of breaking. We have ducked the debates. We have ducked the hard votes. We need to change that, and we can start with Afghanistan.

In March, Senator PAUL and I introduced the American Forces Going Home After Noble Service Act. This act would responsibly pull our troops out of Afghanistan. The act declares victory in Afghanistan, acknowledging that the original objectives have largely been met. It sets guidelines for the safe and orderly withdrawal of troops, and it repeals the 2001 AUMF once and for all. We should have a vote on this.

Afghanistan is just the largest of our ongoing Middle Eastern wars. The 9/11 AUMF has been used to justify military ventures all around the world—41 times to justify military action in 14 countries. I voted for this authorization, and I know full well that Congress did not intend that. More unauthorized conflicts are looming on the horizon.

I was encouraged earlier this year when the House passed—and a majority

of the Senate supported—my amendment to prohibit war with Iran absent congressional authorization.

Tensions with Iran have grown since the President withdrew from the international agreement preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons. It has been a year and a half since the President dropped out of the agreement, claiming he could get a “better deal” and mounting his “maximum pressure” strategy. Since then, we haven’t gotten anywhere close to a better deal, but we have gotten much closer to war.

This June we were 10 minutes away from the President’s calling a strike on Iran, 10 minutes away from military escalation in the Gulf. While the President’s maximum pressure campaign has not succeeded in forcing Iran into a better deal, it has succeeded in pushing Iran to breach the nuclear agreement, and it has led to a cycle of violence in the region and from Iran, attacking commercial ships in the Gulf of Oman, moving short-range ballistic missiles into Iraq, and threatening U.S. troops in Israel.

Since May, the President has increased troop presence by 14,000 in the Middle East, and after initially denying it, the Pentagon is considering sending an additional 14,000 troops. The risk of war with Iran is very real, whether intentionally or by mistake, miscalculation, or misjudgment. And the President claims he can go to war against Iran without congressional approval.

In September, this body held a historic vote, voting 50 to 40 to include the Udall-Kaine-Paul amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to prohibit funding for war with Iran without congressional authorization. We took a giant step forward to assert our constitutional authority.

This amendment was germane and by rule it should have been included in the final Senate NDAA, but the majority leader forced a 60-vote threshold that should not have been applied. Nevertheless, the House version did include the prohibition, and with Senate majority support, it should have been included in the conference.

This week, the Senate and the House conference committee just released their NDAA conference report. I am deeply disappointed that they did not include our amendment. This is a major missed opportunity to take back our authority and a missed opportunity to stop expansion of war and U.S. interventionism in the Middle East. Another terribly missed opportunity is the NDAA’s failure to include a provision to eliminate U.S. support for Saudi Arabia’s disastrous war in Yemen.

Under the authority of the 2001 AUMF, our troops are supporting Saudi Arabia in its war against the insurgent Houthi, but the Houthi are also fighting al-Qaida, the actual target of the AUMF. We are fighting a group fighting against al-Qaida. This is a prime

example of the misuse of this authorization.

The human cost is horrific. Since 2015, more than 100,000 people have been killed in Yemen, including more than 12,000 Yemeni citizens. More than 20 million Yemenis need humanitarian aid. There is no compelling U.S. national security interest in aiding the Saudis in this war. We should not be lending support to a war that the international community recognizes as a humanitarian disaster.

In April, both Houses voted on a bipartisan basis to remove our troops from this conflict unless Congress authorized force. The President vetoed that bipartisan bill. The NDAA conference committee missed an opportunity to step up and direct the President to take us out of the Saudi-Yemen conflict. Again, Congress is ducking its duties. For too long, Congress has hidden from making the hard decisions, from taking the tough votes. We have deferred to the Executive under Republican and Democratic administrations alike. The Founders placed this power in our hands for a good reason. Those reasons are as sound today as they were two centuries ago.

This is not a political issue. It is not a red or blue issue. It is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It is a constitutional issue. It goes to the core of our Constitution and our war powers in the legislative branch in Congress. Everyone here has sworn to uphold the Constitution. We can do so by upholding, not running from, our constitutional responsibilities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY ISAKSON

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, JOHNNY ISAKSON will be a legend in the Senate. His life is marked with such tremendous service. From his time in the Georgia Air National Guard to his service in the Georgia house and senate, and on to the U.S. House and the Senate, Johnny has been making his home State proud every single step of the way.

As a fellow veteran, I can’t tell you how much I especially appreciate Senator ISAKSON’s relentless and dedicated focus on veterans’ issues. As chairman of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, he has worked tirelessly to put our veterans first.

One of the most important pieces of legislation we worked on together was the VA MISSION Act. Veterans in Iowa and in Georgia are oftentimes living in rural areas or are simply homebound. So with the VA MISSION Act, I knew that Johnny would be a great ally and partner to make sure that we prioritized telehealth and ensure that veterans could receive necessary care closer to home, and we did just that.

Folks, the MISSION Act is truly landmark legislation that is making a difference in the lives of countless veterans across our Nation. It would not have been possible without the hard

work and the diligent efforts of our colleague Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON. He understands the importance of building relationships and working across the aisle, putting our veterans ahead of politics, and getting his job done. His determination and commitment to veterans is remarkable, and I will forever be grateful for his leadership in this particular area.

I have been asked many times what I am going to miss about JOHNNY ISAKSON. Well, there is quite a lot that I will miss about Johnny, but if I had to narrow it down to just a few things, I would say, first, his joy. Johnny always—always—has a smile on his face. His joy truly is contagious, and it is genuine. He loves serving the people of Georgia, and you can’t help but smile when you see JOHNNY ISAKSON.

Second is his passion. There is absolutely no doubt in anyone’s mind around here that Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON loves his country. You can see it when he speaks on the floor of the Senate and in the way he works with colleagues to fulfill his duties as a Senator. Georgians really should be very proud of him.

Finally, for me, I would have to say his encouragement. When I see Johnny in the halls or in the cloakroom, always—no matter how quickly I seem to be walking—he smiles. He will stop me, and he will always speak an encouraging and a very kind word. I know he does this not just with his Republican colleagues but also with our Democratic friends. While you will not see that on TV or in the headlines, it is real, and it is JOHNNY ISAKSON.

That leads me to what I will miss most of all. I will miss Johnny, plain and simple. He has never taken his eye off the ball. He has been committed and he has been focused on serving the people of his home State that he loves so dearly. We will miss Johnny. He has been a tremendous colleague and a friend to all of us.

Johnny, you will be missed on this floor and in these halls. From one veteran to another, thank you for all you have done for our great veterans, not just in Georgia, not just in Iowa, but all across our Nation. May God bless you, JOHNNY ISAKSON, and may God bless your family. Thank you for your service.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING STEPHEN CARR

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Stephen Carr has been described by friends as a “gentle giant” and “all-American boy.” He enjoyed hunting and fishing. He played on the offensive line at Southwest Baptist University.

He came from a law enforcement family. He always knew he wanted to be a police officer, so it was little surprise when Stephen joined the Fayetteville Police Department 2½ years ago. He served with professionalism and valor in those 2½ years as a patrol officer in the Dickson Street entertainment district.

Sadly, Officer Carr was in his patrol car Saturday night when he was ambushed by a gunman looking for an officer to kill. Carr's fellow police heard the gunshots and responded to the scene within seconds. With little regard for their own safety, they pursued the gunman down an alley. When confronted, they met force with force and took him down. The whole incident took just minutes from start to finish.

Emergency services were on the scene within an instant, but despite their best efforts, they couldn't save Officer Carr. He succumbed to his wounds on the scene, as did his killer. Officer Carr was only 27 years old.

This tragedy reminds us of the terrible risks officers face every day when they put on the uniform and the badge, not knowing whether they will be alive to take it off that night. Already this year, 118 officers across America have been killed in the line of duty. Some were the victims of random tragedies. Others, like Officer Carr, were targeted by a criminal class that hates what the police represent: law and order.

Since Officer Carr's killing, two more officers have fallen in the line of duty. Detective Joseph Seals, a 15-year veteran of the Jersey City Police Department, was shot to death while approaching two suspected killers. Sergeant Kaila Sullivan, a 16-year veteran of the Nassau Bay Police Department, was struck and killed by a fleeing suspect in a vehicle. All of these fallen officers will be remembered as heroes.

In Arkansas, especially, we will remember Officer Carr, whose watch ended on December 7, 2019. May he rest in peace.

HONORING STOREKEEPER 1ST CLASS JOHN
WILLIAM CRAIG

Mr. President, Navy Storekeeper 1st Class John William Craig of Monroe, AR, perished aboard the USS *Oklahoma* on December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy. On that day, Imperial Japanese bombers shattered the morning calm at Pearl Harbor, killing Petty Officer Craig and more than 2,000 of his brothers in arms.

Nearly eight decades later, however, his remains were listed as unknown and interred at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Honolulu. He was reported as missing in action, but Petty Officer Craig is missing no more. Thanks to the outstanding work of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, his remains were accounted for in 2017, and just last weekend, on the 78th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, he arrived home in Arkansas to his final resting place.

Petty Officer Craig's burial is a long-overdue moment of honor for a brave sailor. It is also a moment of hope for our many military families whose loved ones haven't yet been found—a reminder that our Nation will not rest until every one of our missing heroes is back in our arms or laid to rest with honor.

We have now fulfilled this solemn pledge to Petty Officer Craig. Nearly 80

years after his disappearance, we have affirmed once again that the United States leaves no man behind on the battlefield.

FENTANYL SANCTIONS ACT

Mr. President, synthetic opioids like fentanyl kill tens of thousands of Americans each year. They are a terrible accelerant that has fueled the worst drug crisis in our Nation's history, killing more people every year than died in the entire Vietnam war.

These drugs aren't made here in the United States. No, they are flooding across our borders from overseas, trafficked by cartels, and, even unwittingly, sometimes by the U.S. Postal Service.

Synthetic opioids are often produced in superlabs by the drug cartels that are terrorizing our border communities. But the ingredients for those drugs—and sometimes the drugs themselves—can be traced back to a different source: China, whose vast pharmaceutical and chemical industries frequently have been abused to poison our fellow citizens.

The Chinese Communist Party has been waging an opium war in reverse against the United States for far too long. As tens of thousands of Americans have perished from overdoses, Chinese officials have turned a blind eye to the drug criminals who have profited off of our pain. But now, desperate for a trade deal to save its sputtering economy, Beijing has finally promised to crack down on fentanyl and other synthetic opioids. But we would be naive to trust any promise from Chinese Communists, especially this one.

It is time that we take matters into our own hands. That is exactly what we will do in the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act, which includes my bill introduced with Senator SCHUMER to sanction foreign drug dealers in China, Mexico, and elsewhere. The bill also urges the President to work with our allies to impose even tougher multilateral sanctions against foreign drug dealers. It authorizes new funding for law enforcement and the intelligence community for counternarcotics activities. It establishes a commission to find new ways to stop the flow of drugs from overseas.

This bill will soon be signed by the President and become law. This is welcome news for law enforcement and for families who are battling the crisis of opioid addiction, and it is bad news for the Chinese Communist Party and foreign drug dealers around the world who are responsible for the poisoning of so many Americans.

PROTECTING EUROPE'S ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2019

Mr. President, 70 years after the creation of NATO, the biggest external threats to the alliance are our revisionist adversaries—China and Russia. Unfortunately, however, the alliance faces some internal threats, too, among the allies themselves, who too often fail to take these adversaries seriously. Instead, they strike dangerous

deals with the very powers that threaten to destroy all of us.

Consider the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project between Germany and Russia. Germany touts the pipeline's commercial benefits, but Russia sees it differently—as a strategic tool to divide Europe and thus to strengthen its fictional claim to dominion over parts of Eastern Europe.

The Nord Stream 2 pipeline would effectively double the amount of natural gas Russia could export to Europe along a route that bypasses the alliance's eastern frontier. This would deepen the NATO members' reliance on Russian gas while it would enhance Putin's ability to engage in energy blackmail, just as he has done in the past. For example, in 2009, Russia shut off the flow of natural gas to Europe during a dispute with Ukraine, causing energy shortages across the entire continent in the dead of winter. Putin's opportunities for such blackmail will only increase if Nord Stream 2 is completed because he will be able to ship his gas to Western Europe without its transiting Eastern Europe. Therefore, he will be able to blackmail Eastern Europe while the Germans will sit warm and toasty in their living rooms—indifferent to the plight of their NATO allies to the east.

This pipeline is almost complete, so the timeline for action is short. Thankfully, the National Defense Authorization Act includes our bill to impose mandatory sanctions on companies that are constructing, insuring, or financing Vladimir Putin's pipeline to Europe. These sanctions are a demonstration of our commitment to the strength and security of the whole NATO alliance.

I urge the German Government and all companies involved in this dangerous endeavor to pull back before it is too late and to consider the serious consequences that Nord Stream 2 could have for their security as well as for the security of the NATO alliance as a whole.

JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS HOMESCHOOL

Mr. President, homeschooling parents sacrifice a lot when they make the legitimate and indeed very admirable choice to personally educate their children. In effect, these parents are making the choice to go back to school themselves so that their kids may receive well-rounded and faithful educations.

Their sacrifices pay off in spades. Homeschooled students consistently prove to be outstanding citizens because they are taught the importance of patriotism, faith, hard work, and sacrifice—virtues exemplified by their parents and their teachers.

Homeschooled students, therefore, ought to be prime candidates for our Armed Forces for this very reason, but until now, in some places, it hasn't been clear as to whether homeschooled

students have been eligible to join their local Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Programs. Now that is going to change.

The 2020 National Defense Authorization Act includes my bill—also sponsored by Senator JONES—which clarifies that homeschooled students may indeed enroll in their local JROTC Programs. Our bill will ensure that the Nation's 2.5 million homeschooled students will have the opportunity to sharpen and deploy their skills in service of our country. This will move us closer to being a society that fully accepts and indeed celebrates homeschooling families for the noble paths they have chosen.

PCS ACT

Mr. President, the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act includes many valuable reforms. One such reform is the PCS Act, which is legislation I introduced with Senator SHAHEEN, that helps military spouses keep their occupational licenses even when they are on the move across State lines.

One in three military spouses works in a field that requires one to have an occupational license, and too many spouses are forced to recertify every time they move between States. That can be very often. Most military families move every 2 to 3 years, and when each move requires an expensive, time-consuming recertification process, many military spouses might as well kiss their jobs goodbye. These occupational licenses are a costly burden for military families, who have already sacrificed so much for our country.

Our PCS Act will alleviate this burden by empowering the Department of Defense and the States to negotiate interstate compacts for occupational licenses in fields in which military spouses often work. These compacts, which are made possible by our bill, will ensure that military spouses will be able to pursue their careers uninterrupted even while they are moving their families from State to State and base to base. Most importantly, the PCS Act will allow military families to focus on their mission, which is to protect and serve our country with honor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO HUGH "BUD" FATE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of week in which I get to come down to the floor of the U.S. Senate—a great privilege—and talk about a special person in Alaska, somebody who helps to make my State the greatest State in the country, in my opinion. We call this person our Alaskan of the Week. It is one of the best things I get to do all week. I know that the pages really enjoy it as well because they get to hear about Alaska and all of the things that are happening.

Before I recognize our special Alaskan, let me tell you a little bit about what is going on in Alaska right now.

We have had some strange weather in Southcentral Alaska—warm by our

standards—that being wet and windy, with gusts over 100 miles per hour in some places. In Fairbanks, which is in the interior—I was just up there last week and am going to talk about that, for it is where our special Alaskan of the Week is from—it feels a lot more like winter. It got down to 27 below zero last week, and now it is in the single digits.

When it comes to Alaska's interior weather, there is some debate as to what the lowest recordbreaking temperature was in Fairbanks. Some say it was 66 below zero in 1934, and others say it was in the negative 70 and 70-below-zero territory.

The numbers do matter. Take it from Dr. Hugh "Bud" Fate, who is our Alaskan of the Week—we call him Bud—who, during the time he was working construction on the North Slope in the early 1950s, once had to walk a mile for shelter after a tractor he was operating froze up.

"When I got to the station, they told me the official temperature was 70 degrees below zero," he said. "I was dressed for it"—Bud is a tough guy—"but my fingers and my toes were getting cold. I don't think I could have made another mile," Bud said.

Bud, we know you could have. We know you could have.

That is just one of many stories that Bud tells about his 70 years of living in the great State of Alaska.

So let me talk about Bud Fate—a legend across our State. He just turned 90 years old last week. He has been a rodeo cowboy, a college football player, a roughneck, a soldier, a gold miner, a carpenter, a hunter, a commercial and subsistence fisherman, a dog musher, a bush pilot, a dentist, a businessman, a State representative, an author, an artist, an all-around rabble-rouser, and an Alaskan renaissance man through and through.

But most importantly, he is a dedicated father, grandfather, husband to his wife, Mary Jane, for 65 years, and a man who has lived his life in service to his country, his State, and his community—very worthy of being our Alaskan of the Week.

So Bud Fate was born on December 4, 1929—90 years ago last week—and raised in Eastern Oregon—Cowntown, he called it. He began riding a horse when he was just 6 years old, eventually riding on the rodeo circuit, getting bucked off horses all across the American West.

He went to college at the University of Washington, where he initially played football. After he got hurt, he enrolled in a drama class and had dreams, when he made his way to California, to Hollywood, to work as an actor or as a stuntman in cowboy movies and films.

As it turned out, it wasn't California that called him; it was Alaska that called him—specifically, a good job in the far north of Alaska, a place called Umiat, working on oil rigs not too far away from what would become the big-

gest oil find ever in North America, the mammoth field at Prudhoe Bay. Bud was 20 years old, working 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. Even though it was a barren and cold, cold place—this was in the winter—he fell in love with it. Alaska grabbed him, as it does to certain types of adventuresome, intelligent, and fiercely independent individuals.

It grabbed Bud, and it didn't let go—never let go. He was one of the drillers working on the shift which brought the first oil to the surface that came out of this rig in Umiat. Bud likes to describe it as this almost beautiful orange color, some of the first oil in Alaska in the fifties, early fifties—pretty exciting.

He was working on the slope when, in 1950, a radio message came in where they were working that the United States was at war in Korea.

Bud said:

I remember thinking it wouldn't affect me way up here on the North Slope of Alaska. Nobody is going to find me, a 20-year-old, but 2 weeks later, I got my first draft notice.

That is what Bud said. I guess it goes to show you Uncle Sam can find you anywhere if he wants you.

As a U.S. Army corporal, Bud was attached to the 11th Airborne Division when he got deployed not to Korea but actually back to Alaska. He was charged with riding the lead Jeep to conduct the combat survey on all the twists and turns of the newly constructed, 1,700-mile-long Alcan Highway, advising the mission commanders about the Arctic, cold weather, and Alaska.

A couple of years later, he was out of the Army, back in Alaska, and he was having a drink one night at the famous Rendezvous Club in Fairbanks, a tongue-tied veteran, he was, and in walks a Miss Alaska contestant—or should I say, from Bud's perspective, in walks destiny.

Whom am I talking about? Who was the destiny?

Well, it is Mary Jane Evans, a young, smart—according to Bud—"Hollywood beautiful" Athabaskan woman from the small Yukon River village of Rampart. She took his breath away. As a matter of fact, she took everybody's breath away.

Now, Bud, at this event, was wearing moccasins. Mary Jane was wearing stillettos, and she promptly stepped on his toes, but it was still love at first sight for both of them, and according to Bud, it still is, 65 years later. For 65 years, they forged a life together, Bud and Mary Jane, the theme of which centered around public service.

Always working together, they raised three beautiful, kind and keenly intelligent daughters—keenly intelligent—and they worked to fundamentally change Alaska for the better, both through institutions and volunteering at organizations and through individual actions that profoundly impacted so many Alaskans over the years.

Eventually Bud, using the GI bill, went back to college, and then he went to get his degree in dentistry. He was a beloved dentist not only in Fairbanks but all across the region.

Now, he was a bush pilot, and he had a plane, so he and Mary Jane, who was a trained dental assistant, traveled all around the small villages in the interior.

Trust me, these villages do not and certainly back then did not have any dental care, so they provided dental care throughout the interior to tiny, little communities for free, for anybody who needed it.

As their three daughters were growing up—Janine, Jennifer, and Julie—it was a big time, a momentous time, in Alaska.

The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was being debated. One of the biggest land settlements in American or all history took place right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Bud and Mary Jane were both highly involved in this monumentally important bill for Alaska and in the overarching efforts to attain rights and lands for the Alaska Native people.

One of Bud's best friends was Ralph Perdue, a strong Alaska Native leader, who, along with Mary Jane and Bud, founded the Fairbanks Native Association. Working together, they focused heavily on education for Alaska Natives, particularly high school education, something most Americans take for granted. Until 1970, rural Alaska—a huge swath of America—by and large did not have any high schools. The small communities, small villages, did not have any high schools. To get a high school education, young students and even children had to leave their homes and their villages and travel to boarding schools in very faraway places in Alaska and in the lower 48.

Now, that was an injustice—one, among others, that the Fairbanks Native Association decided to tackle. They produced studies. They gave lectures. They talked to State officials. They talked to Federal officials. They and so many others across the State helped lay the groundwork for the seminal lawsuit brought by a group of Alaskans that resulted in a State-signed consent decree to provide high schools in communities throughout the State—communities with at least 15 students—rather than sending their children all across Alaska, hundreds of miles away, or to the lower 48, thousands of miles away.

At the time, this education settlement was the largest education settlement in American history, but Bud's commitment to education didn't stop there—not even close. He was on the Board of Regents for the University of Alaska, eventually serving as president of the university. It should be noted that later, Mary Jane, his wife, also served on this very important board.

With a combined 24 years of service together, Bud and Mary Jane were on the University of Alaska Board of Re-

gents. Bud helped run the university when the president abruptly resigned.

He and Mary Jane also opened their home to villagers all across the State who came to Fairbanks and just needed a place to stay. They knew that Bud and Mary Jane would take them in. "Our house was always full," their lovely daughter Julie said.

There were always people living with us who were empowering themselves through education. To this day, I still have Alaskans stop to tell me how they were helped and given a second chance by my parents.

As Julie also noted, there was always a huge amount of smoked salmon strips on the table for all to share—the best smoked salmon in Alaska, I might add.

There is so much more to Bud Fate's life. For instance, at the young, tender age of 70, he decided he was going to run for office. He ran for the State legislature, and he won in a landslide. He served two terms. He was immediately elected chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, which is a huge, important committee in Alaska, and was highly respected on both sides of the aisle.

The list of boards and commissions that he sat on is way too long to go into here, as is the list of service organizations he has volunteered for and led.

He has known Presidents of countries and dignitaries from all over the globe. He is as comfortable at his fish camp on the Yukon River as he is in the board room.

As I mentioned, he is a rabble rouser with very strong opinions—I have heard them for many years, but at heart all of his opinions are focused on a commitment to treat everybody with respect and kindness and provide every Alaskan—every American—an opportunity to better themselves.

He is a good man—Bud Fate—one of the best. The measure of Bud and the impact of his life is probably best reflected in his family and his friends, so many of whom gathered in Fairbanks on December 4 for his 90th birthday, where people from all walks of life all across the State came together—well over 100—talked about his generosity, how it impacted them, how it impacted families, and how it impacted people all around him.

People gave speeches about how he and Mary Jane took in people from all walks of life—veterans coming back from Vietnam who needed comfort and respect, people who needed a helping hand, food, warmth, just love. He lifted people up, so did Mary Jane, and they saved lives.

I was actually one of those people giving a speech in Fairbanks at Bud's 90th birthday party, and I talked about the profound impact Bud has had on my own life—after all, Bud Fate is my father-in-law, and I can't imagine a better one.

He has taught me so much. Bud and Mary Jane, along with my own mom and dad, have provided me a model—

actually, for me and Julie, my wife, of what a true partnership looks like. He is a model for how fulfilling a life of service can be, especially a life in the great State of Alaska.

As I mentioned, he is not just a model for me but for the whole State of a life well lived and a life lived in full.

So, Bud, thanks for all you have done for Alaska, for America, for Fairbanks, for our family, for our great State, and all you continue to do. Thanks for being a great father-in-law and a friend, and, Bud, congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO KIAH MORRIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of meeting with my friend, former Vermont State Representative Kiah Morris, who among many distinctions was only the second African-American woman ever elected to the Vermont Legislature. Kiah's talents are far-reaching. She has also been an actress of stage, film, and television, spoken word performance, as a singer, dancer, and arts manager. Whether as a legislator or on a theater stage, Kiah's work has focused on amplification of the voices of oppressed people, on human rights, and on social justice.

It was in keeping that Kiah recently traveled to El Salvador and Honduras under the auspices of Oxfam America to meet with families struggling with the violence, poverty, lack of opportunity, injustice, and hopelessness that is causing thousands of destitute, frightened people to abandon their homes to seek refuge elsewhere. In those countries, Kiah saw where people had been gunned down, victims of gangs or corrupt police. She listened to the stories of threats and extortion, of kidnappings and deadly attacks, of fear and desperation. Inspired by the people she met and outraged by the brutality they described, she wrote a poem.

I ask unanimous consent that Kiah's poem, which captures the essence of what the debate here over Central American refugees should be about, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SAW THE PLACES THEY DIED

(By Kiah Morris 2019)

I saw the places they died
I saw the places they died
I saw the blood on the wall as if it were fresh

I saw the bullet holes pierce their flesh
 I saw the places where they died and their
 spirits left their bodies onto a heavenly
 place
 Far from a war-torn country of our design
 which orchestrated their demise
 On the darkened brick walls splashed with
 stucco
 Metal bars on windows each home a fortress
 from the violence that hovers in wait
 across the thresholds
 Street vendors who compete for our
 Starbucks money to feed their souls
 and nourish their dreams
 I saw the places they died in the tears behind
 the eyes of a priest who saw too much
 Mental memorials to the expressions of
 horror and sadness on the face of a
 mother who died trying to save their
 daughter's life captured in the space
 between his eyes and the weight of
 their loss
 Their state-sanctioned murders designed to
 leave no witnesses behind
 Ordered bullets to fillet her face to ensure no
 viewer could recognize their own moth-
 er's eyes in her frozen gaze
 I saw the places where they died, where the
 children were not spared
 No life too precious to halt corruption and
 gang warfare
 Daily genocides where there are no sacred
 spaces or sanctuaries in which to hide
 I saw the places that they died in the cobble-
 stone streets
 Where people are pawns in a corruptors
 endgame
 The depth of the violence bears no shame
 I saw the places where they died when I
 heard the women speak of the terror
 that they face every day,
 Every week
 The normalcy of rape, the dignity decimated,
 the beatings meant to break and the
 constant earthquakes that shake the
 fragile state
 I saw the places they died in the hopeful
 smiles of the proud feminists who carry
 the burdens of their sisters as a shield
 To protect the dignity of their humanity
 which too often is forced to yield
 I saw the places they died, float off into still
 air
 Laden with promises unfulfilled and hidden
 ambitions laid bare
 I craft petals with poem to form a bouquet
 dropped off in a history of genocide
 With the hope the path these roses display
 will propagate a garden in honor of the
 many places they died.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR BRAD CATON

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to MAJ Brad Caton for his exemplary dedication to duty while serving as a Department of Defense congressional fellow and a congressional budget liaison for the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. This month, he will begin his transition to serve as a budgetary analyst in the Army's Budget Office.

As a native of Libby, MT, Brad was commissioned as an infantry officer upon graduation from the University of Montana, where he earned a bachelor's of science degree in business administration. A dedicated scholar, Brad went on to earn his master of business administration from the University of Montana and later a master's degree in legislative affairs from the George

Washington University. Brad has been very successful in his Army career and has served in a broad range of assignments.

His billets have spanned from serving as an infantry platoon commander with the 4th Infantry Division with a deployment to Iraq to assignments managing the Army's financial resources. Brad exemplifies what it means to be a Montanan with his leadership, perseverance, and versatility. This was evident during his first assignment as a budget analyst for U.S. Army Central Command and while he commanded the Pontiac Recruiting Company in Eastern, MI. Following command, Brad continued to display his Montana Resolve as the support operations officer at Camp Carroll, Republic of Korea. Additionally, he was deployed to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan while serving as the deputy assistant chief of staff, financial management for the 1st Armored Division.

In 2017, Brad served as my Department of Defense congressional fellow. For a year, I had the privilege of working closely with Brad. He was extremely passionate about serving and representing Montanans. He consistently went above and beyond his immediate responsibilities to work in areas outside of the veterans and defense realm. He used his insight as a Montanan to provide critical local feedback on rural Montana priorities, including Tribal and energy issues. He was always thinking of Montana while representing the Department of Defense in my office. Following his fellowship, Brad transitioned to serve as a congressional budget liaison for the U.S. Army. In this capacity Brad arranged and escorted me over to visit the Montana National Guard while they were deployed to Afghanistan over the holidays. He continued to work tirelessly with all Members of Congress and their staffs to accurately articulate the Army's budget positions to the Appropriations Committees. His professionalism, diligence, and commitment to the mission are unmatched, and his work both as a fellow and as a liaison was outstanding and represented the Department of Defense and U.S. Army to the U.S. Congress well.

The foundation of Brad's military success is his family and his Montana roots. In fact, Brad bought a house in Red Lodge during his fellowship which he hopes to retire to 1 day. He is a devoted husband to his wife, Eryn Beckman of Colstrip, MT, and a committed father to his children, Isabel, Evan, Pierce, and Audrey. Brad and Eryn's attitude of service, sacrifice, and care for others permeates every organization and activity they participate in, and they are truly examples of servant leaders in the Army and their communities.

Throughout his career, Brad has exemplified what it truly means to be a Montanan as he positively impacted soldiers, peers, and superiors. Our country has benefited tremendously

from his extraordinary leadership, judgment, and passion. I join my colleagues today in honoring his dedication to our Nation and his invaluable service to the U.S. Congress as an Army congressional liaison.

It has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with MAJ Brad Caton over the past 3 years. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Brad for his service to our country, and we wish him all the best as he continues service in the U.S. Army.

TRIBUTE TO JEREMY WHEELER

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to formally express my appreciation to Mr. Jeremy Wheeler. Jeremy is a congressional relations officer in the Department of Veterans Affairs. However, over the last year, he served as a fellow on my national security and veterans team.

Jeremy has supported my work helping the veterans of Indiana and the Nation using his exceptional knowledge of the Veterans Affairs system and his experience working with many of the veterans service organizations. A dedicated public servant, Jeremy has spent much of the last two decades serving our Nation. He served in the U.S. Army for 6 years, including two combat tours in Iraq in 2003 and 2005. After 5 years working in Hollywood, he returned to government service at the Department of Veterans Affairs and has spent much of this decade working to improve the quality and access to care for our Nation's heroes, establish deeper relationships with veterans service organizations, and strengthen the VA's outreach and communications capabilities.

In my office this year, he has provided valuable insight into how the legislation before this Chamber would be implemented and how it would impact the VA's ability to continue serving our veterans. And perhaps most impressively, I am not sure how many offices on Capitol Hill can boast an Emmy-winning staff member. This is just one of the many unique contributions Jeremy has brought to my office. In the last year, I have continually been impressed with Jeremy's work ethic, professionalism, candor, and knowledge.

Next month, Jeremy will be returning to the VA, where I have no doubt he will continue seeking innovative ways to caring for veterans. I wish him the best in all his endeavors, and I look forward to working with him in the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VETERANS GUEST HOUSE

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I come forward today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Veterans Guest House.

The Veterans Guest House has long been one of Reno's best kept secrets. This "home away from home" is one of the only facilities of its kind in the country serving U.S. military veterans and their families, providing temporary overnight accommodations for veterans receiving treatment at a medical facility in the Reno-Sparks area. In the early 1990s, veterans visiting the Veterans Administration Medical Center of the Sierra, VAMC, in Reno noticed that the family members of veterans were sleeping in their cars because they couldn't afford lodging while their loved one was in the hospital. Even some veterans were sleeping in their cars so they could arrive for appointments and other treatments. It was clear that this was not acceptable, and so our generous Northern Nevada community went to work to do better for our veterans.

In 1994, Reno's Spouse House opened its doors in an old bungalow-style home right near the VAMC in Reno. It had a handful of beds, and in those early years, the House provided lodging to about 800 guests each year. In the 25 years since that time, the Veterans Guest House has evolved and expanded to better meet the needs of our veterans and their families. In 2002, the nonprofit took the name "Veterans Guest House" to reflect its broader mission of assisting both veterans and their families, and in 2004, a new 12-bed home was built. By 2012, the nonprofit had acquired another property and expanded the bed total to 17, allowing them to provide more than 5,000 guest nights that year. Recently, construction concluded on the latest expansion bringing total capacity to 33 beds.

The Veterans Guest House is key to connecting our community to our veterans, providing a variety of ways to show our support for our veterans and their families and the sacrifices made by both. Volunteers are welcome at the Veterans Guest House to help provide the organization ongoing support doing everything from cleaning rooms, to assisting in small repairs, to helping with fundraisers. Community groups, families, and businesses also are encouraged to provide a home-cooked meal for the guests or help fill the needs of the agency's "Wish List." Most guests reside more than 30 miles away from the hospital, and so having that support for them and their families is crucial. Guests are asked to make a donation to support the work of the House, but no one is turned away because they can't pay. The organization relies completely on donations and receives no Federal or State funding.

I am so pleased to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Veterans Guest House and the critical services and support it provides to our veterans and their families.●

TRIBUTE TO ALYSSA LIEDLE-CAISSEY AND KAI BAUER

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing

the first set of graduates from Anaconda Junior/Senior High School's Copper Academy, Alyssa Liedle-Caissey and Kai Bauer.

The Anaconda Junior/Senior High School's Copper Academy allows students to learn at a different pace and in a unique environment which includes the use of online programs that have visual demonstrations and explanations for different educational requirements.

Alyssa and Kai both took a chance participating in this program, and it paid off. They both graduated 6 months early. I am very proud of these two young Montanans for pushing themselves and showing the Anaconda community that this new, individualized program allows students to thrive. Congratulations to Alyssa and Kai on their graduation from the Copper Academy. I wish them the best of luck as they transition into the next steps of their lives.●

TRIBUTE TO MELISSA MATTHEWS AND BELLE RAE ZACHESKY/COPP

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Melissa Matthews and Belle Rae Zachesky/Copp of Raymond as December's Granite Staters of the Month for seeking to turn their own grief into positive change and mental wellness for their community.

In the last few months, both Melissa and Belle have lost someone dear to them. Melissa lost her husband, Graham, to suicide on September 30, 2019; and her niece, 8-year-old Belle, lost her father, Jesse, to an opioid overdose the next day, on October 1.

In response to their shared grief and to distract from their sadness Melissa and Belle are seeking to raise awareness about the importance of mental wellness in their community. Belle and Melissa have started promoting wristbands with the slogan "Lets change the 'I' in mental illness with 'WE' for mental wellness," to help spread this important message to others.

The two have also started a Facebook page to try to create an online community of support and positivity. The group's name, MW Warriors—MW standing for mental wellness—was inspired by the song "Warrior" by singer Demi Lovato, who has struggled with drug addiction and depression.

Their story is another inspiring example of how people across New Hampshire come together during difficult times to support one another. This is particularly true as the opioid crisis continues to ravage our State, and it is crucial that we continue to be there for the loved ones of those whom we have lost.

Melissa and Belle are trying to do the challenging but important work of promoting positive change, all while battling their own loss and channeling their energy to help others.

Thank you, Melissa and Belle, for your strength and courage.●

100 SEASONS OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 100th season of the National Football League.

Ohio has a rich football history. In 1920, 10 teams gathered in Canton, OH, to form the American Professional Football Association. Of those original 10 teams, Cleveland, Canton, Akron, Columbus, and Dayton were all in the lineup. Further, the Dayton Triangles hosted the first-ever NFL game in 1921 against the Columbus Panhandles.

Home to the Cleveland Browns and the Cincinnati Bengals, Ohio has continued to embrace the legacy and tradition of America's game. The birthplace of the NFL, Canton's Pro Football Hall of Fame sees 225,000 visitors annually. Additionally, Ohio natives Don Shula, Chuck Noll, Paul Brown, Roger Staubach, and Cris Carter are among the 326 players who have been inducted into the Hall of Fame. Further, Cleveland looks forward to hosting the 2021 NFL draft, and I was proud to advocate for this selection last year.

Since its first season in 1920, the NFL has grown from humble beginnings to a national pastime known as America's game. Represented in 22 States by 32 teams, the NFL has united communities across the Nation through live games and televised events. In fact, the Super Bowl has become the single most-watched annual television event in the United States.

I commend the NFL for their continued philanthropic and volunteer efforts. Through working to honor veterans, promote cancer awareness, and encourage healthy lifestyles, the league has embraced community through sport. I applaud the commitment of the NFL, its staff, and all who were involved in reaching this milestone and making the first 100 seasons of the NFL a success.●

TRIBUTE TO NANCY WHITWORTH

● Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize Ms. Nancy Whitworth of Greenville, SC, for her over 40 years of service to Greenville County. I extend my congratulations to her on her upcoming retirement and wish to reflect on her successful career.

As the longtime economic developer and deputy city manager for the city of Greenville, Nancy was responsible for commercial and neighborhood revitalization, downtown development, business recruitment and retention, planning and zoning, and building codes. She has also authored articles on Greenville's award-winning downtown and meets frequently with other cities to share Greenville's success story. Last year, she was awarded with the 2018 Local Economic Developer of the Year award.

Ms. Whitworth is to be commended for her role in spurring the dramatic growth and revitalization Greenville

has seen in the past decades. Through her leadership and dedication to her community, she has been an invaluable asset to the Upstate of South Carolina. Ms. Whitworth is a shining example of a dedicated public servant and should inspire us all to give our best to our communities. I would like to personally commend and thank Ms. Whitworth for her decades of service that encouraged Greenville's economic prosperity and success.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 729. An act to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5038. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing agricultural labor or services, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 729. An act to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5038. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing agricultural labor or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 877. A bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-173).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1822. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect

to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-174).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2641. A bill to promote United States national security and prevent the resurgence of ISIS, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Crosby Kemper III, of Missouri, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3029. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make premium and cost-sharing subsidies available to low-income Medicare part D beneficiaries who reside in Puerto Rico or another territory of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3030. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a national evictions database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 3031. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add membership in a significant transnational criminal organization to the list of grounds of inadmissibility and to prohibit the provision of material support or resources to such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for transfers of the renewable electricity production credit, the energy credit, and the credit for carbon oxide sequestration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3033. A bill to establish a K-12 education cybersecurity initiative, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3034. A bill to make trade adjustment assistance available to workers whose jobs are eliminated through automation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3035. A bill to provide that the amount of time that an elderly offender must serve before being eligible for placement in home detention is to be reduced by the amount of good time credits earned by the prisoner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3036. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit the distribution of any check or other negotiable instrument as part of a solicitation by a creditor for an extension of credit, to limit the liability of consumers in conjunction with such solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3037. A bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3038. A bill to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 3040. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include teacher preparation for computer science in elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3041. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that medical professionals employed by the Veterans Health Administration are properly credentialed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3042. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe additional regulations to secure the safety of individuals and property on board certain small passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3043. A bill to modernize training programs at aviation maintenance technician schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3044. A bill to amend the American's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 to expand the Indian reservation drinking water program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3045. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect United States critical infrastructure by ensuring that the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has the legal tools it needs to notify private and public sector entities put at risk by cybersecurity vulnerabilities in the networks and systems that control critical assets of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3046. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish a program to provide grants and loan guarantees to improve the energy efficiency of publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3047. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a carbon technologies program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3048. A bill to authorize certain aliens seeking asylum to be employed in the United States while their applications are being adjudicated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 3049. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain amendments relating to reporting requirements with respect to clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 3050. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to provide designees of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Administrator of the Rural Housing Service of the Department of Agriculture with positions on the Appraisal Subcommittee of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3051. A bill to improve protections for wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN:

S.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S.J. Res. 62. A joint resolution disapproving the recommendation of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to realign Binghamton, NY (BGM) TRACON operations and Elmira, NY (ELM) TRACON operations to Wilkes-Barre/Scranton, PA (AVP) TRACON; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 453. A resolution honoring the Employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 454. A resolution calling for the immediate release of Cuban democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer and commending the efforts of Jose Daniel Ferrer to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 455. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the Case of Richard Arjun Kaul v. Senator Charles Schumer, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 299

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs that support interprofessional geriatric education and training to develop a geriatric-capable workforce, improving health outcomes for a growing and diverse aging American population and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic inter-

vention is required during the screening.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. BENNET, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, supra.

S. 903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 903, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to prohibit contracting with persons that have business operations with the Maduro regime, and for other purposes.

S. 1380

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1380, a bill to amend the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to remind prosecutors of their obligations under Supreme Court case law.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms.

ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1583

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1583, a bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes.

S. 1602

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1602, a bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1657

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1657, a bill to provide assistance to combat the escalating burden of Lyme disease and other tick and vector-borne diseases and disorders.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1820, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2024

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2024, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the

American History for Freedom grant program.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to require carbon monoxide alarms in certain federally assisted housing, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require licenses to acquire or receive firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2547

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China.

S. 2590

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to protect the dignity of fetal remains, and for other purposes.

S. 2615

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2615, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2627

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with civil claim awards.

S. 2661

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2661, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to designate 9-8-8

as the universal telephone number for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system operating through the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and through the Veterans Crisis Line, and for other purposes.

S. 2695

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2695, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the defense of United States agriculture and food through the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, and for other purposes.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2754

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2754, a bill to create jobs and drive innovation and economic growth in the United States by supporting and promoting the manufacture of next-generation technologies, including refrigerants, solvents, fire suppressants, foam blowing agents, aerosols, and propellants.

S. 2765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2765, a bill to improve Federal fiscal controls and the congressional budget process.

S. 2774

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2831

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2831, a bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to modify the national space grant college and fellowship program, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from

Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2941

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a consumer recycling education and outreach grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2942

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2942, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain contributions by government entities are treated as contributions to capital.

S. 2949

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2949, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 2976

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2976, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election to advance future child tax credits in the year of birth or adoption.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3001

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3001, a bill to provide for certain extensions with respect to the Medicare and Medicaid programs under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3016

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3016, a bill to amend the Fed-

eral Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that consumers can make informed decisions in choosing between meat products such as beef and imitation meat products, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name and the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 371

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 371, a resolution reaffirming the support of the United States for the people of the Republic of South Sudan and calling on all parties to uphold their commitments to peace and dialogue as outlined in the 2018 revitalized peace agreement.

S. RES. 385

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 385, a resolution celebrating the 30th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of both Germany and Europe, and the spread of democracy around the world.

S. RES. 447

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 447, a resolution expressing serious concern about widespread irregularities in Bolivia's October 20, 2019, general elections and supporting the convening of new elections in Bolivia at the earliest possible date.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3035. A bill to provide that the amount of time that an elderly offender must serve before being eligible for placement in home detention is to be reduced by the amount of good time credits earned by the prisoner, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3035

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 "Elderly Home Detention Pilot Program Technical Corrections Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. CREDITS FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS.

Section 231(g)(5)(A)(ii) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60541(g)(5)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking "to which the offender was sentenced" and inserting "reduced by any credit toward the service of the prisoner's sentence awarded under section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code".

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3042. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe additional regulations to secure the safety of individuals and property on board certain small passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Small Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 2019".

This bill would prevent future tragedies like the one that happened onboard the *Conception* passenger vessel off the coast of Santa Cruz Island, California. This was the worst maritime disaster in modern California history, and my thoughts continue to be with the victims and their loved ones.

On September 2, 2019, thirty-four people were tragically killed onboard the vessel when a fire started while passengers were sleeping below deck after a nighttime swim. The victims of the boat fire—thirty-three passengers and one crewmember—were athletes, immigrants, CEO's, and students. All were united by love of the water, marine life, and their adventurous spirit.

The *Conception* boat fire was a tragedy that must never be allowed to happen again. Reports indicate the fire consumed the boat, including the salon, galley compartment, and the aft deck, and causes include overloading of the electric system, possibly from rechargeable devices with lithium ion batteries. The lack of an interconnected fire alarm system throughout the vessel meant passengers and crew were not made aware of the fire until key areas of escape were already engulfed. Critical time—time that could have saved lives—was lost. This bill addresses these issues and potential causes.

While investigations by the National Transportation Safety Board and the Coast Guard are still ongoing, it is

clear regulatory changes are needed to ensure small passenger vessels have the right safety measures in place to limit the possibility of fire and help evacuate the vessel of passengers in the event a fire does start.

The *Conception* is one of about 325 small passenger vessels built before 1996 and exempt from stricter safety standards imposed on newer vessels.

This bill offers a number of common-sense provisions that will improve passenger vessel safety. These include: requiring these types of vessels to have no less than two avenues of escape from all areas accessible to passengers; mandating safety standards for the handling, storage and operation of lithium ion batteries; and, establishing standards for interconnected fire alarm systems.

I appreciate the hard work of the National Transportation Safety Board and the U.S. Coast Guard Inspections and Compliance Directorate. I especially appreciate the Commandant's Marine Safety Information Bulletin issued on September 10 reminding owners, operators and masters of passenger vessels to adhere to the regulations related to firefighting, lifesaving, emergency preparation and means of escape. And, more specifically, I appreciate the attention to the issue of unsupervised charging of lithium-ion batteries and the extensive use of power strips and extension cords.

Given the horrific nature of this tragedy, it is imperative that we establish stricter safety standards onboard these boats where so many children and families have such enjoyment. I believe this bill is a pragmatic, common-sense solution to improve safety on these older vessels, and I urge it to be included in the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3048. A bill to authorize certain aliens seeking asylum to be employed in the United States while their applications are being adjudicated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Asylum Seeker Work Authorization Act of 2019, which is similar to a bill introduced by Representative PINGREE in the House. My bill would allow asylum seekers to seek employment 30 days after applying for asylum, provided their applications are not frivolous, their identities have been verified, and their names run through the Federal government's terrorist watch lists. This change would allow asylum applicants to work and contribute to society without being dependent on assistance from local governments while their claims are being adjudicated.

Under current law, asylum seekers must wait 180 days after filing their applications before they are allowed to work. The 180-day requirement was

adopted by the Clinton Administration in 1994 out of concern that some asylum seekers might apply for asylum primarily as a means of getting a work authorization. Clearly, this change has only transferred the burden of care for these asylum seekers onto communities across the Nation.

One such community is Portland, Maine. Earlier this year, over the span of several weeks, a surge of asylum seekers from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Angola arrived in Portland after crossing our southern border. These asylum seekers could have given a much-needed boost to Maine's very tight labor market—our unemployment rate is just 2.8 percent—but the lengthy work-authorization process prevents these asylum seekers from getting jobs even to support themselves.

Thankfully, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act of 2019 made funds available to assist local communities dealing with a sudden influx of asylum seekers. The City of Portland and private organizations in southern Maine received \$892,586 from that Act. While I am pleased that these funds have been provided to Portland and other communities around our country, it would be a better solution if those seeking asylum were able to join the workforce and achieve self-sufficiency as quickly as possible while awaiting the outcome of their cases.

It is my hope that the change proposed by my bill will lessen the burden on the budgets of communities hosting asylum seekers while allowing these individuals and their families to support themselves as they want to do, bringing needed skills to the cities and towns in which they settle. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. MORAN:

S.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the following letter from U.S. Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Robert L. Wilkie, for the RECORD.

So Ordered.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC 20510.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: In accordance with the requirements of section 1703E(f)(2) of title 38, United States Code, enclosed is the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) report on a request for a waiver to allow VA to pilot community partnered collaborations to expand dental care for Veterans. We request that copies of this waiver be provided to the Chair and Ranking Member of applicable standing committees with jurisdiction to report a bill to amend the provision or provisions of law that would be waived by VA, consistent with section 1703E(f)(3).

As required by section 1703E(f)(2), the enclosed report describes in detail the specific

authorities to be waived under the pilot program; the standard or standards to be used in the pilot program in lieu of the waived authorities; the reasons for such waiver or waivers; a description of the metric or metrics VA will use to determine the effect of the waiver or waivers upon the access to and quality, timeliness, or patient satisfaction of care and services furnished through the pilot program; the anticipated cost savings, if any, of the pilot program; the schedule for interim reports on the pilot program describing the results of the pilot program so far and the feasibility and advisability of continuing the pilot program; the schedule for the termination of the pilot program and the submission of a final report on the pilot program describing the result of the pilot program and the feasibility and advisability of making the pilot program permanent; and the estimated budget of the pilot program.

Consistent with section 17.450 of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, this report also includes the geographic locations for each pilot program, the rationale for those selections, and how VA believes the selected locations will address deficits in care for a defined population; any applicable provision of existing regulations implementing any laws to be waived; and any more specific definitions of terms included in section 17.450(b), as necessitated by the specific provisions of the proposed pilot program.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this waiver proposal to Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Thank you for your continuing support of our mission. A similar letter has been sent to other leaders of the Congress and the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. WILKIE.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 453—HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 453

Whereas more than 81,000 people serve as employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, including locally employed staff, protecting and advancing national security, freedom, democracy, development, and free markets, for the benefit of the people of the United States and the international community;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development together represent the United States in maintaining diplomatic relations in over 250 posts in 180 countries around the world, including in many inhospitable and dangerous regions;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development promote American values and interests at home and abroad

through their work and actions, promoting the safety and freedom of all Americans;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development are a central component of our defense against international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development work to preserve peace and freedom and promote economic prosperity and mutual understanding around the world;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development daily work to reduce poverty, end hunger and malnutrition, fight disease, combat international crime and illegal drugs, and address environmental degradation;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development daily work to promote economic development, commercial enterprises, economic prosperity, and United States job and trade promotion;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development daily work to promote American ideals and values, human rights, freedom, gender equality, and democracy;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development daily work to provide emergency and humanitarian assistance aid to respond to crises around the globe;

Whereas there are almost 50,000 local employees at posts that aid and support the work of the United States and the Department of State around the world;

Whereas at least 250 United States citizen employees, as well as family members, and many more locally employed staff, of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of their Nation;

Whereas employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development personify the virtues of patriotism, sacrifice, service, and duty;

Whereas the families of employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development make important and significant sacrifices for the United States;

Whereas multiple career Foreign Service and civil service employees of the Department of State upheld their oaths to defend the Constitution, uphold the law, and provide testimony in response to lawful subpoenas from congressional oversight hearings, risking their careers and personal safety for service to their nation;

Whereas these courageous employees of the Department of State, individuals who have served the Nation with distinction and represent our Nation's finest, include Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch, a distinguished career public servant who dedicated 33 years of her life as a Foreign Service Officer; Ambassador William Taylor, a diplomat who started his 50-year public service as a West Point cadet and served in every Administration since 1985; George Kent a career foreign service officer with multiple postings throughout the Department since 1992; Jennifer Williams, a 13-year veteran of the Foreign Service who has served overseas in Beirut and Jamaica, managed the United States Government's humanitarian assistance program for Syrian refugees from 2011 to 2014, and, most recently, has served as the Vice President's assistant on European and Russian affairs

since April 2019; Ambassador David Hale, who has served around the world for more than three decades with the Department, including as Ambassador to Pakistan, Lebanon and Jordan, and in his current role as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; David Holmes, who joined the foreign service in 2002 and was awarded the William Rivkin award for Constructive Dissent in 2014; Peter Michael McKinley, whose career in the foreign service spanned more than 35 years and included service as ambassador to Peru, Colombia, Afghanistan and Brazil, and Senior Adviser to Secretary Mike Pompeo; Philip Reeker, a 27-year veteran of the foreign service, including as acting assistant secretary of the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs; Catherine M. Croft, who has served as a special advisor for Ukraine in the State Department and on the National Security Council staff; and Christopher Anderson, a foreign service officer since 2005, who served at the United States Embassy in Kyiv from 2014 to 2017 and as the special adviser for Ukraine negotiations from August 2017 to July 2019; and

Whereas the Department of State has represented to Congress that "no employee has faced any adverse action by the Department for testimony before Congress" and committed that "the Department will not discipline any Department employee for appearing before Congress in response to a subpoena": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service and sacrifice of employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, wherever they serve, past, present, and future;

(3) thanks the local employees for their aid and support in the mission of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development;

(4) expresses the deep appreciation of a grateful Nation to the employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development who each and every day courageously and publicly stand up for their country and defend the Constitution, including those who have provided testimony to Congress in response to lawful subpoenas;

(5) urges the Department to fully and faithfully implement all its stated commitment to assist employees called to testify before Congress with the cost of legal fees; and

(6) calls on the Department to ensure that no personnel will face any retaliatory action, adverse personnel action, or other negative consequence for testifying or providing requested information to Congress, and emphasizes that any reprisal for testifying before Congress would be a violation of law.

SENATE RESOLUTION 454—CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF CUBAN DEMOCRACY ACTIVIST JOSE DANIEL FERRER AND COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF JOSE DANIEL FERRER TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN CUBA

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KAINNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 454

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer García is a Cuban democracy and human rights activist who has dedicated his life to promoting greater political pluralism and respect for fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas Mr. Ferrer was born in Cuba on July 29, 1970, in the province of Santiago de Cuba;

Whereas, in the late 1990s, Mr. Ferrer joined the Christian Liberation Movement (MCL), a peaceful political movement led by late Cuban activist Oswaldo Paya;

Whereas, through coordination with the MCL, Mr. Ferrer helped lead the Varela Project, an initiative to collect the signatures of citizens to petition the Government of Cuba for democratic reforms and protections for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly;

Whereas, in March 2003, as part of a series of sweeping arrests of 75 democracy activists, Mr. Ferrer was arrested by Cuban authorities for his work on the Varela Project and sentenced to 25 years in prison;

Whereas, in March 2004, Amnesty International declared the group of 75 democracy activists, including Mr. Ferrer, to be prisoners of conscience and called for their immediate and unconditional release;

Whereas, in 2009, Mr. Ferrer was honored with the Democracy Award given annually by the National Endowment for Democracy;

Whereas, in March 2011, as part of an agreement brokered by the Catholic Church, Mr. Ferrer refused to abandon his homeland and was released from prison to remain in Cuba;

Whereas, in August 2011, Mr. Ferrer founded the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU), a nonviolent political movement dedicated to promoting human rights, democratic principles, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas, on June 7, 2012, Mr. Ferrer testified via digital video conference at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas, since he was released from jail in March 2011, Mr. Ferrer has been frequently harassed, regularly surveilled, and repeatedly jailed by Cuban authorities for his role in UNPACU;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Mr. Ferrer was imprisoned arbitrarily by Cuban authorities for his leadership of UNPACU and outspoken advocacy for human rights and democratic principles in Cuba;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Cuban authorities detained 3 other members of UNPACU, Fernando González Vailant, José Pupo Chaveco, and Roilan Zarraga Ferrer;

Whereas a letter from Mr. Ferrer was smuggled out of prison stating that he had been tortured, mistreated, and denied proper medical attention, and that his life was put in danger while in detention;

Whereas the family of Mr. Ferrer has been permitted to visit him only twice since he was imprisoned arbitrarily on October 1, 2019, and the wife of Mr. Ferrer reported that she saw evidence that he had been physically abused and mistreated; and

Whereas, on November 28, 2019, the European Parliament approved a resolution condemning the arbitrary detention of Mr. Ferrer and calling for his immediate release: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the arbitrary imprisonment of leading Cuban democracy and human rights activist José Daniel Ferrer and calls for his immediate and unconditional release;

(2) urges Cuban authorities to grant Mr. Ferrer immediate access to medical care and independent legal counsel;

(3) calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all members of the Patriotic

Union of Cuba (UNPACU) that have been arbitrarily imprisoned;

(4) commends Mr. Ferrer for his unwavering commitment to advance democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba; and

(5) recognizes the important contributions of UNPACU and all of its members for their efforts to promote greater respect for democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba.

SENATE RESOLUTION 455—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF RICHARD ARJUN KAUL V. SENATOR CHARLES SCHUMER, ET AL

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 455

Whereas, Senator Charles Schumer has been named as a defendant in the case of *Richard Arjun Kaul v. Senator Charles Schumer, et al.*, Case No. 19-CV-13477-BRM-JAD, currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Schumer in the case of *Richard Arjun Kaul v. Senator Charles Schumer, et al.*

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this resolution concerns a civil action pending in New Jersey Federal court against Senator Schumer and various private entities. The plaintiff previously brought a lawsuit arising out of the revocation of his medical license by the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners, and that lawsuit was dismissed. In this lawsuit, plaintiff asserts a conspiracy among Senator Schumer and two large insurance companies, a bank, a law firm, and a media company, to obstruct and undermine plaintiff's previous lawsuit by having the Senator use his influence over the presiding judge to dismiss the case. Plaintiff's claims against Senator Schumer are subject to dismissal for failure to State a claim and on jurisdictional grounds. This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator Schumer in order to seek dismissal of the claims against him.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30—RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO IMPROVE PHYSICAL ACCESS TO MANY FEDERALLY FUNDED FACILITIES FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, PARTICULARLY INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr.

MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

(1) prevents Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, prohibiting the free exercise of religion, or abridging the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the right to peaceably assemble, or the right to petition for a governmental redress of grievances; and

(2) was ratified on December 15, 1791, as 1 of the 10 amendments that constitute the Bill of Rights;

Whereas the Bill of Rights, specifically the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, calls for the right of all individuals to peaceably assemble, meaning that all individuals, regardless of their physical ability, shall be offered equal opportunity to access all amenities that are federally funded, in whole or part, with the exception of certain sites of historical importance approved by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (referred to in this preamble as the "United States Access Board") or a nonpartisan commission convened by the United States Access Board;

Whereas, in the 29 years since the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), there have been advances in technologies that benefit individuals with disabilities, such as automatic doors;

Whereas, in 2018, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that—

(1) 61,000,000 individuals in the United States have a disability that impacts major life activities;

(2) 1 of every 7 adults experience a mobility impairment, which is the most common form of disability; and

(3) as people age, disability becomes increasingly common, affecting an estimated 2 of every 5 older adults;

Whereas, as significant advances in medical treatment result in improved health outcomes, the incidence of disability has increased over time;

Whereas, in 2016, an estimated 25.1 percent of veterans in the United States, or more than 2,000,000 individuals, reported having a service-connected disability;

Whereas the Act entitled "An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped", approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) (commonly known as the "Architectural Barriers Act of 1968"), was enacted to ensure that certain federally funded facilities are designed and constructed to be accessible to individuals with disabilities;

Whereas title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791 et seq.)—

(1) prohibits discrimination against a person with a disability in programs and activities funded by the Federal Government;

(2) requires the elimination of architectural barriers for Federal employees and applicants with disabilities; and

(3) established the United States Access Board;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)—

(1) prohibits discrimination against a person with a disability by a State or local government, including any department, agency,

special purpose district, or other instrumentality of a State or local government, in programs and activities, transportation, communications, and the built environment;

(2) prohibits discrimination against a person with a disability in the activities of a place of public accommodation, which is an entity that is—

(A) generally open to the public; and

(B) within a category described in that Act, such as a restaurant, movie theater, school, day care facility, or doctor's office; and

(3) requires a newly constructed or altered place of public accommodation or commercial facility (such as a factory, warehouse, or office building) to comply with the Standards for Accessible Design;

Whereas the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.)—

(1) prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in multifamily housing, including military family housing; and

(2) requires the elimination of architectural barriers in common areas;

Whereas the United States Access Board has developed new guidelines for public rights-of-way that address various issues, including access for blind pedestrians at street crossings, wheelchair access to on-street parking, and various constraints posed by space limitations, roadway design practices, slope, and terrain;

Whereas the new guidelines developed by the United States Access Board cover pedestrian access to sidewalks and streets, including crosswalks, curb ramps, street furnishings, pedestrian signals, parking, and other components of public rights-of-way;

Whereas the aim of the United States Access Board in developing the new guidelines includes ensuring that—

(1) access for individuals with disabilities is provided wherever a pedestrian way is newly built or altered; and

(2) the same degree of convenience, connection, and safety afforded the public generally is available to pedestrians with disabilities;

Whereas, on the date on which the Attorney General adopts the new guidelines, the guidelines will become enforceable standards under title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.); and

Whereas the United States was founded on the principles of equality and freedom, and such principles require that all individuals, including individuals with disabilities, are able to engage as equal members of society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the importance of equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities in the United States;

(2) recognizes that too many facilities of Federal, State, and local governments remain inaccessible to individuals with disabilities due to architectural and other barriers;

(3) reaffirms its support of and requires full compliance with—

(A) the Act entitled "An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped", approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) (commonly known as the "Architectural Barriers Act of 1968");

(B) title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791 et seq.);

(C) the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); and

(D) the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.); and

(4) pledges to make universal and inclusive design a guiding principle for all infrastructure bills and projects and will continue working to identify and remove the barriers that prevent all people of the United States,

including individuals with disabilities, from having equal access to the services provided by the Federal Government.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1256. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CRAMER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1256. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CRAMER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater; as follows:

Between the seventh and eighth whereas clauses in the preamble, insert the following:

Whereas, the heroic defense of Bastogne by the 101st Airborne Division became personified by General Anthony McAuliffe's reply to the German request to surrender with one word: "Nuts!";

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10.30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing nomination of Crosby Kemper III, of Missouri, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and

Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101-595, and further amended by Public Law 113-281, appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF RICHARD ARJUN KAUL V. SENATOR CHARLES SCHUMER, ET AL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 455, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 455) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Richard Arjun Kaul v. Senator Charles Schumer, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 455) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE FOUGHT DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 326, S. Con. Res. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge was the last major German offensive in Western Europe during World War II, designed to split the Allied Forces, regain the initiative in the West, and pressure the Allies to seek a negotiated peace;

Whereas, in the Ardennes region of Belgium and Luxembourg, more than 650,000 troops from the United States, Great Britain, Belgium, Canada, and other Allied Forces defeated Germany in the Battle of the Bulge, which began December 16, 1944, and ended January 25, 1945;

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge resulted in over 89,000 United States casualties, including 19,000 soldiers killed, 47,500 wounded, and more than 23,000 captured or missing-in-action;

Whereas the Allied Forces overcame formidable obstacles that included being greatly outnumbered by the German Army, harsh weather conditions, and the treacherous and unknown terrain of the Ardennes Forest region of Belgium and Luxembourg;

Whereas, on December 17, 1944, during one of the worst atrocities of the war in Europe, the Malmedy Massacre, 84 unarmed American prisoners of war were shot by troops of the 1st SS Panzer Division;

Whereas 11 African American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion were massacred by SS troops near Wereth, Belgium, and were identified as James Stewart of West Virginia, Due Turner of Arkansas, Curtis Adams of South Carolina, Mager Bradley of Mississippi, George Davis, Jr. of Alabama, Thomas Forte of Mississippi, Robert Green of Georgia, James Leatherwood of Mississippi, Nathaniel Moss of Texas, George Moten of Texas, and William Pritchett of Alabama;

Whereas the impressive leadership of Lieutenant General George S. Patton of the Third Army accelerated the success of the Allied Forces during the Battle of the Bulge;

Whereas, although Belgium lost more than 74,000 civilians during the war, in addition to many more having suffered through other atrocities that come with war, the people of Belgium persevered through the difficult period of time and rebuilt their lives the best they could after the war ended;

Whereas the success of the Allied Forces in beating back the German attack in the Battle of the Bulge made possible the final defeat and surrender of Nazi Germany in May 1945;

Whereas the citizens of Belgium and Luxembourg have generously hosted thousands of United States veterans and kept the memory of the Battle of the Bulge alive through numerous memorials and museums, including the Henri-Chapelle American Cemetery and Memorial, the Ardennes American Cemetery and Memorial, the Luxembourg American Cemetery, the Battle of the Ardennes Museum, the Bastogne War Museum, and the Bastogne December Historic Walk; and

Whereas, after the Battle of the Bulge ended, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said, "This is undoubtedly the greatest American battle of the war and will, I believe, be regarded as an ever-famous American victory."; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate—

(1) commemorates, on December 16, 2019, the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge in World War II;

(2) recognizes the valiant efforts of the various Allied Forces; and

(3) remembers the individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice, which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to; that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the Cramer amendment at the desk to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1256) to the preamble was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To add language to the preamble)

Between the seventh and eighth whereas clauses in the preamble, insert the following:

Whereas, the heroic defense of Bastogne by the 101st Airborne Division became personified by General Anthony McAuliffe's reply to the German request to surrender with one word: "Nuts!";

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution with its preamble, as amended, read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge was the last major German offensive in Western Europe during World War II, designed to split the Allied Forces, regain the initiative in the West, and pressure the Allies to seek a negotiated peace;

Whereas, in the Ardennes region of Belgium and Luxembourg, more than 650,000 troops from the United States, Great Britain, Belgium, Canada, and other Allied Forces defeated Germany in the Battle of the Bulge, which began December 16, 1944, and ended January 25, 1945;

Whereas the Battle of the Bulge resulted in over 89,000 United States casualties, including 19,000 soldiers killed, 47,500 wounded, and more than 23,000 captured or missing-in-action;

Whereas the Allied Forces overcame formidable obstacles that included being greatly outnumbered by the German Army, harsh weather conditions, and the treacherous and unknown terrain of the Ardennes Forest region of Belgium and Luxembourg;

Whereas, on December 17, 1944, during one of the worst atrocities of the war in Europe, the Malmedy Massacre, 84 unarmed American prisoners of war were shot by troops of the 1st SS Panzer Division;

Whereas 11 African American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion were mas-

sacred by SS troops near Wereth, Belgium, and were identified as James Stewart of West Virginia, Due Turner of Arkansas, Curtis Adams of South Carolina, Mager Bradley of Mississippi, George Davis, Jr. of Alabama, Thomas Forte of Mississippi, Robert Green of Georgia, James Leatherwood of Mississippi, Nathaniel Moss of Texas, George Moten of Texas, and William Pritchett of Alabama;

Whereas the impressive leadership of Lieutenant General George S. Patton of the Third Army accelerated the success of the Allied Forces during the Battle of the Bulge;

Whereas, the heroic defense of Bastogne by the 101st Airborne Division became personified by General Anthony McAuliffe's reply to the German request to surrender with one word: "Nuts!";

Whereas, although Belgium lost more than 74,000 civilians during the war, in addition to many more having suffered through other atrocities that come with war, the people of Belgium persevered through the difficult period of time and rebuilt their lives the best they could after the war ended;

Whereas the success of the Allied Forces in beating back the German attack in the Battle of the Bulge made possible the final defeat and surrender of Nazi Germany in May 1945;

Whereas the citizens of Belgium and Luxembourg have generously hosted thousands of United States veterans and kept the memory of the Battle of the Bulge alive through numerous memorials and museums, including the Henri-Chapelle American Cemetery and Memorial, the Ardennes American Cemetery and Memorial, the Luxembourg American Cemetery, the Battle of the Ardennes Museum, the Bastogne War Museum, and the Bastogne December Historic Walk; and

Whereas, after the Battle of the Bulge ended, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said, "This is undoubtedly the greatest American battle of the war and will, I believe, be regarded as an ever-famous American victory.": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate—

(1) commemorates, on December 16, 2019, the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge in World War II;

(2) recognizes the valiant efforts of the various Allied Forces; and

(3) remembers the individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice, which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2019, AND MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, December 13, at 11:45 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, December 13, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, December 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1790; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motion filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:45 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5 p.m., adjourned until Friday, December 13, 2019, at 11:45 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

AURELIA SKIPWITH, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN JOSEPH SULLIVAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

STEPHEN HAHN, OF TEXAS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF FOOD AND DRUGS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE LATE PETE
FRATES

HON. LORI TRAHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the late Pete Frates, a global icon and champion for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) research and awareness.

A lifelong resident of Massachusetts and former Boston College baseball player, Pete Frates passed away on December 9, 2019 after a hard-fought battle with ALS.

Diagnosed with the disease in 2012, Pete spent his numbered days raising funds and awareness for ALS research through his social media phenomenon, the “ALS Ice Bucket Challenge,” sparking a global movement that ignited 17 million people into action in order to raise \$115 million for the cause.

Pete lived his life selflessly, leaving behind a strong legacy and lessons we can all learn from—be kind to one another and when faced with adversity, face it bravely and help others like you.

Eight years ago, Pete received a terrible diagnosis and a hopeless prognosis. Instead of falling into a cycle of self-pity and remorse, Pete saw this as an opportunity to help others suffering with ALS. At the time, Pete looked at the one life he had and saw its incredible worth. He then took this one step further, springing into action to improve the lives of others.

My heart goes out to Pete’s mother and father, wife, child, and friends. I know they will carry on his legacy and continue his courageous work to bring the world one step closer to the eradication of ALS.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a man whose life is an inspiration to us all. Pete Frates did not die in vain.

HONORING MICHAEL A.
HOULEMARD, JR.

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael A. Houlemard, Jr. for more than twenty years of leadership as the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Executive Officer and congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Houlemard was born in New Orleans, Louisiana and grew up in Pasadena, California. He studied at University of California, Santa Barbara and graduated with a degree in Political Science before completing a Master of Arts degree in Urban Studies at Occidental College. Following his studies, Mr. Houlemard participated in the prestigious CORO Foundation fellowship program.

Mr. Houlemard’s early career included a gubernatorial appointment as a Deputy in the

California Department of Housing and Community Development, time as a Project Manager for the Pasadena Redevelopment Agency, and leadership roles as Executive Director of the Southern California Urban Coalition, Deputy Director of the Pasadena Urban Coalition, and Assistant Dean/Director in the University of California at Santa Barbara Office of Veterans’ Affairs.

As Executive Officer of FORA, Mr. Houlemard oversees the broadly representative agency located on the Monterey Bay, which is responsible for former Fort Ord’s conversion to civilian reuse program. Mr. Houlemard also oversees a \$100 million munitions and explosives cleanup of 3,400 former Fort Ord acres. In this role, Mr. Houlemard’s decisive leadership and expertise resulted in FORA being designated a military base reuse national model by the Department of Defense. Mr. Houlemard’s work has also been lauded by the Association of Defense Communities, earning him their Local Reuse Authority Executive of the Year Award, and the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, earning him their Ruth Vreeland Public Official of the Year Award.

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr. has served the central coast of California with adept leadership and tireless dedication over the past two decades, making FORA a model agency for the potential of a civilian reuse program. I hope that Mr. Houlemard enjoys his well-earned retirement spending time with his beloved wife, Christina Valentino, watching his favorite pastime, baseball, and visiting his cherished hometown of New Orleans. Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing his years of service and encouraging him to let the good times roll (*laissez les bon temps rouler*).

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ODESSA
FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Missouri Class 3 State Championship won by the Odessa High School football team. Such an achievement is the result of strong leadership and continued dedication by both players and coaches alike. It is truly an honor to recognize this exemplary group of athletes from Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District.

For the first time in a quarter of a century and only the second time in school history, Odessa High School earned the state championship title in a 49–28 win over Cassville High School at the University of Missouri’s Faurot Field on Saturday, December 7, 2019. This victory was the culmination of their unwavering perseverance and excellence on and off the field.

Building upon their undefeated record and averaging 55 points per game, the Bulldogs

entered the championship game eager and focused. The Bulldogs took the lead, 6–0, in the first twelve seconds after Senior Bryley Ray’s 93-yard kickoff return. Capitalizing on their early advantage, Odessa covered 80-yards in six plays on its third drive of the game. Not giving into Odessa’s pressure, Cassville brought the score at the end of the first quarter to 14–7. In the second quarter, quarterback, Josey Meirerend and Ray led Odessa to a 21–7 lead before Ethan Uhrlaub’s 1-yard score made it 28–7. Leaving nothing to chance, junior Brett Duncan’s 27-yard post pattern completed a five-play, 52-yard drive, sending the Bulldogs into halftime with a 35–14 advantage. But the Bulldogs never became complacent and continued to push themselves.

Going into the second half of the game, Odessa remained singularly focused on their goal of becoming state champs. Carter Westerhold caught an 18-yard pass for a score to complete their first drive of the half while Luke Malizzi led the way on the second to provide the final margin of victory. In a true display of unity and willpower, the Odessa Bulldogs defeated the Cassville Wildcats 49–28.

This momentous accomplishment was achieved not by individuals, but as a united group of young men with guidance from a devoted group of coaches: Mark Thomas, head coach; Barry Blank, assistant head coach; Jeremy Helton, defensive coordinator; Chuck Clemens, special teams coordinator; Kiefer Kratz, JV head coach; and Miles Hoshard, JV offensive coordinator. The accolades of Odessa’s football team and coaching staff are a testament to what they have built through their hard work and collaboration.

It is my honor to congratulate each member of the team that have helped Odessa High School to claim this prestigious title. I encourage each player to continue challenging themselves to always give their best on and off the field.

Madam Speaker, please join with Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District in celebrating the Missouri Class 3 State Championship victory of the Odessa Bulldogs, and I encourage all of us to unite together under the same spirit of perseverance, collaboration, and hard work that led this remarkable team to their first state championship win in over twenty-five years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, yesterday I missed a roll call vote, and I wish to state how I would have voted had I been present: Roll Call No. 671—Yes.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1790,
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA-
TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). I would like to start by thanking Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, and the House Armed Services Committee staff who have worked tirelessly throughout this past year to get us to this point. It's a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support the conference report.

As the Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I worked closely with members on and off the committee to ensure the bill addressed three priority areas affecting our military.

First, the bill includes a number of bipartisan provisions aimed at addressing problems associated with the management and oversight of military family housing. The bill does the following:

Requires the military services to establish a tenants' bill of rights for residents of privatized military family housing;

Requires the Department to establish a standardized assessment tool to be used in evaluating military housing for certain risks, including lead and mold;

Prohibits the use of non-disclosure agreements as a condition of moving out of military housing;

Authorizes additional funding to ensure installation housing offices are properly staffed; and

Provides for a temporary direct hiring authority for government housing personnel to increase oversight of private contractors.

Second, the bill authorizes additional funding and includes bipartisan provisions to mitigate contaminated drinking water for households and agriculture resulting from fluorinated compounds around military installations:

Bans DOD use of fire fighting agents containing PFAS by 2024;

Requires DOD to ensure that when disposing of AFFF and supplies used to remediate PFAS contamination, it does so in a manner that is safe and does not create further pollution;

Bans the use of PFAS chemicals in the packaging of the meals (MREs) our service members eat when deployed in combat areas and for training;

Closes a loophole in the DOD Environmental clean-up accounts that was keeping the National Guard from being able to access these funds to address PFOS and PFOA contamination;

Authorizes DOD to provide alternative water to farmers effected by PFAS contaminated agricultural water;

Bans the use fire fighting agents containing PFAS for training;

Bans the uncontrolled release of fire fighting agents containing PFAS for any purpose other than putting out fires;

Addresses DOD's refusal to acknowledge State-promulgated drinking water standards by requiring their use when they are more stringent than federal standards; and

Requires the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey to establish a performance standard for detecting PFAS and then conduct nationwide sampling to determine the extent of PFAS contamination and then report to Congress the results.

Third, the bill contains a number of provisions to increase military installation resiliency efforts to ensure better planning to assess vulnerabilities and facility codes to mitigate the risk future natural and man-made disasters:

Requires DoD develop installation master plans that assess current climate vulnerabilities and plan for mitigating the risks to installations from extreme weather events, mean sea level fluctuation, wildfires, flooding, and other changes in environmental conditions using projections from recognized governmental and scientific entities.

Limits DoD's ability to spend planning and design funds until it initiates the process of amending the building standards for military construction (Unified Facility Criteria) to ensure that building practices and standards promote energy, climate, and cyber resilience at military installations.

Requires all proposals for military construction projects to consider potential long-term changes in environmental conditions, and increasingly frequent extreme weather events, as well as, industry best-practices to withstand extreme weather events.

Requires DoD to report on the feasibility of transitioning installation planning from 100-year floodplain data to a forward-looking predictive model that takes into account the impacts of sea-level rise.

Establishes a pilot authority for the Department of Defense to carry out military construction projects, with prior congressional notification, that enhance military installation resilience, mission assurance, support mission critical functions, and address known vulnerabilities.

Authorizes an additional \$133 million for military construction projects under the Department's Energy Resiliency and Conservation Investment Program.

Directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a black start exercise at three major military installations to ensure installation resiliency in the case of a total power outage.

I'm proud of the funding authorized by, and legislative provisions included within the Readiness Subcommittee's jurisdiction. The bill authorizes \$261.6 billion in operation & maintenance funding to support training, maintenance, and military operations; \$11.8 billion for MILCON, family housing, and BRAC; and \$4.1 billion in emergency authorization for MILCON for recovery of military installations damaged by natural disasters. The conference report also provides twelve weeks of paid parental leave for all federal employees.

I'm also pleased this NDAA includes a 3.1 percent pay raise for our troops and includes key provisions of my bill, H.R. 2617, the Occupational and Environmental Transparency Health Act, which will require DoD to input any Occupational Environmental Health hazards exposure into servicemembers' records while deployed, so it is tracked throughout their career and into veteran status.

Additionally, this year's NDAA funds important priorities at Travis and Beale Air Force Bases in my district. The military construction projects authorized in this bill will support the new KC-46 mission at Travis Air Force Base

and will improve resilience and power supply at Beale Air Force Base, enabling it to continue to support intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) and multi-domain operations.

While there are many positive outcomes, I am disappointed that the prohibition of funding for the deployment of new, low-yield nuclear warheads for submarines did not survive the conference process, and am also disappointed in the omission of critical provisions that were in the House-passed bill to reform border deployment and ensure funding for our military is spent wisely and as Congress intended, and not on an unnecessary border wall, such as the following:

Preventing the President from diverting Defense funding to pay for an unnecessary border wall;

Prohibiting funding for the construction of a wall, barrier, or fence along the southern land border;

Amending the emergency construction authority (10 USC 2808) to limit the total cost of military construction projects undertaken during a national emergency to \$500 million, with a further limit of \$100 million for construction projects within the United States; and

Prohibiting reprogramming of funds into the counter drug account, which has been used by the Administration to do construction along the southern land border.

Overall, I am proud of the Readiness Subcommittee's contribution to this year's bill and would like to thank the Readiness staff, Brian Garrett, Jeanine Womble, Melanie Harris, Brian Greer, John Muller, Dave Sienicki, Megan Handle, and Sean Falvey, and my personal staff, Betsy Thompson and Dan Naske, for their tireless work. Dan will be departing the Hill after next week, and I would like to personally thank him for his hard work and sharing his expertise with us this past year. He has been an invaluable member of my staff and we will miss him dearly.

This bill helps advance our military's near-term readiness goals and drives the Department to plan for and take action against long-term threats, and with that, I urge my colleagues to support the FY20 NDAA.

HONORING MICHAEL DAVID
SPADARO'S 25 YEARS OF SERV-
ICE TO THE NEW YORK STATE
POLICE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Ms. STEFANK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael David Spadaro's 25 years of dedicated service to the New York State Police.

Michael David Spadaro joined the State Police in 1994 and since then has served the State of New York with honor and distinction. Throughout our community, professionals in law enforcement, like Trooper Spadaro, dedicate their careers and risk their lives each day to keep us safe. Whether it be patrolling the highways connecting our towns, supporting local law enforcement, preventing terrorism, or responding to natural disasters, the New York State Police get it done. That is in no small part due to the dedication of Troopers like Michael David Spadaro. On behalf of New York's

21st Congressional District, I would like to thank him for his dedicated and unwavering commitment to public service. As Trooper Spadaro closes this chapter of his life, I have the utmost confidence that he will continue to admirably serve the community and I wish him the very best in all future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS E.
TAYLOR, P.E.

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas E. Taylor as he retires after 30 years as Executive Director for the Upper Trinity Regional Water District (UTRWD). Over the course of his career, he planned, directed, advanced and ultimately delivered UTRWD as a critical regional water supply system for the majority of the UTRWD member cities and other customers across Denton County.

Mr. Taylor graduated with honors from the University of Arkansas with a degree in civil engineering. After graduation, he joined the City of Dallas as an entry-level engineer and rose through the ranks to become the youngest department head at the city, serving as head of three different departments. As Director of Dallas Water Utilities from 1980 to 1986, he managed retail services for Dallas, plus wholesale water and wastewater services for 25 other cities. He was also responsible for adding two new water supply reservoirs to the system.

Subsequently, Mr. Taylor helmed the Steering Committee to create a Master Plan for the future regional water supply needs of communities in the Denton County area. The plan included securing legislative approval for a new county-wide wholesale utility special district. Supported by many entities, the Upper Trinity Regional Water District was approved by the Texas Legislature June 16, 1989.

Over the past 30 years as Executive Director, Taylor has effectively led the development and growth of UTRWD in meeting the needs of more than 25 participating communities. He recruited and developed a top-notch staff to accomplish UTRWD's mission to acquire raw water supplies, implement strategies for treatment, delivery, reclamation and reuse of water resources. Under his leadership, the organization navigated the necessary permitting challenges to initiate permitting and construction of Lake Ralph Hall reservoir that will provide one of the first new water supply lakes necessary to continue support for the fast-growing communities composing the North Texas region.

Taylor has been honored as one of the "Top Ten Public Works Leaders in North America" by the American Works Association. Also, for his concerted efforts and expertise to improve the profession of utilities, he was recognized by the American Water Works Association with the William T. "Doc" Ballard Award.

Much of the economic growth and quality of life enjoyed by the communities in Denton County and North Texas would have been impossible without Tom Taylor's ambition, vision and work ethic. It is my honor to recognize Mr. Thomas E. Taylor's commitment as a public

servant and the legacy he leaves in the form of UTRWD's important role in Texas' incredible economic growth and prosperity.

HONORING BARNEGAT VFW POST
10092

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Barnegat, New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 10092, which recently received a National Outstanding Community Service Award for their efforts supporting the veterans' community in Ocean County.

Over the last several years, the Barnegat VFW Post 10092 has dedicated itself to being an active leader in supporting the veterans, families and students of Barnegat, and Ocean County community as a whole. Post 10092 offers two scholarships for Barnegat High School students, and coordinates two essay contests, the Patriots Pen and the Voice of Democracy, directed towards high school students from the area. In 2017, the Post began to offer a police, fire and EMS recognition awards program for Barnegat, a Junior ROTC recognition awards program for the local high school, as well as a Christmas in Camouflage program with the elementary schools. These programs have succeeded in honoring those who serve and have engaged the community with the important work the VFW does every day.

Recently, the Barnegat VFW Post found that their neighbors lacked a VFW chapter and so could not engage in the same VFW programs that Barnegat residents had. Just this past year, Post 10092 expanded their programs to include Stafford Township schools and Southern Regional High School. Through this expansion, the Barnegat Post has lived up to the VFW's legacy of service to communities across our nation.

I'd like to thank the Barnegat VFW Post 10092 for their years of service to the veterans and their families, and to our schools in Ocean County. I am proud to fight in Congress for the needs of our veterans and servicemembers, and am proud to work alongside distinguished colleagues like the men and women of the VFW Post in Barnegat.

HONORING SPECIAL AGENT TONY
ANGELI ON HIS RETIREMENT
FROM THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT
ADMINISTRATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Special Agent Anthony "Tony" E. Angeli on his retirement from the Drug Enforcement Administration.

This past year, Tony served on my Judiciary Committee staff as a detailee from the DEA. In total, Tony has served as a detailee for nine years in this body and in the U.S. Senate.

Both my staff and I have found Tony to be a diligent and knowledgeable asset to the

Committee. In his capacity as a detailee, Tony has played an integral role in shaping public policy concerning illegal narcotics. This includes his important role in combatting the opioid crisis currently gripping our nation.

A former prosecutor, Tony previously prosecuted child abuse cases and juvenile crimes, and argued multiple appellate cases. He shifted from his career as a prosecutor by entering the DEA, eventually serving in multiple capacities in the Miami Field Division and at DEA Headquarters. In Miami, he investigated complex international drug conspiracy cases and followed up his experience as a line agent by entering management as a supervisory special agent overseeing large-scale drug investigations. Tony then moved into intelligence work, where he worked with U.S. and foreign intelligence agencies to further DEA's mission. He also became an experienced trainer by teaching law enforcement courses to the U.S. State Department at the International Law Enforcement Academies.

Tony's experience on Capitol Hill is something that sets him apart from nearly all federal law enforcement agents. He contributed to the development of our nation's drug policy by serving on both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, a rare professional combination for anyone. His law enforcement expertise made him a go-to expert for other staff and members of Congress. The country has been well-served by having a public servant like Tony offering his knowledge and skills for an such extended and valuable time in Congress.

I thank Tony for his service to our country, and I wish him all the best as he transitions into a new, well-deserved, and exciting phase of his life.

IN HONOR OF THE CITY OF
DARIEN, ILLINOIS' 50TH BIRTHDAY

HON. SEAN CASTEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th birthday of the city of Darien, Illinois.

On December 13th, 1969 the communities of Marion Hills, Brookhaven, Farmingdale and Hinsbrook united to incorporate as the city Darien. Today, Darien is known as "A Nice Place to Live," which perfectly describes this city.

The area was initially inhabited by the Potawatami and Ottawa Native Americans with the surrounding waterways serving as their trade routes. The farming communities of Cass and Lace were established along a stagecoach line in the early 1800s. An inn, tavern and post office served 15 stagecoaches that transited the area. Today, Darien continues to serve as a transportation center with easy access to the commuter train line, as well as Interstates 55, 355 and 294.

The six square mile town is home to approximately 6500 families. Darien is a vibrant, growing community dedicated to its citizens. The Indian Prairie Public Library has grown from a volunteer-operated bookmobile to a state-of-the-art facility that is a center for learning and community activities. The Park District Sportsplex includes three National Hockey League sized ice rinks as well as an

indoor soccer field, enabling children and adults from surrounding areas to hone their athletic skills. Civic pride and a commitment to others is demonstrated by organizations such as the Darien Woman's Club, Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, Good Work Sunny Patch Project, VFW, and the Darien Lions Club, which is one of the largest in the state. These groups serve others through food pantries, holiday giving, clothing drives, art and writing events, and scholarships.

It is an honor and privilege to congratulate Darien on its 50 years of growth and accomplishments. I congratulate Mayor Joseph Marchese, the City of Darien's Birthday Committee, and each of its citizens on this wonderful milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on December 10th, I missed roll call vote 660. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE.

HONORING THE WILLINGBORO HIGH SCHOOL CHIMERAS FOR WINNING THE NJSIAA REGIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Willingboro High School Chimeras football team, who last week won the NJSIAA Group 1 South Regional Championship.

Led by head coach Steve Everette and a strong roster from starters to reserves, the Chimeras showed outstanding teamwork and perseverance all season. From a dominant offensive line to their lockdown defense, the team's balance and focus helped them bring home the Group 1 South Regional title.

In the final, Willingboro's strong defense, rushing attack and ability to stretch the field helped propel them to a 50-14 victory over Penns Grove. The Chimeras played through pressure in the final to finish the season on a 12-game winning streak, ending the year 12-1.

I'm proud to be able to celebrate the success of some of the talented student-athletes from my district in New Jersey. I want to congratulate Coach Everette and the Willingboro team on their tremendous season, and for bringing the title back to Burlington County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, on December 11, 2019, I was unable to be present to cast

my vote on the Motion to Table the Motion to Reconsider H.R. 729, because I was unaware that an additional vote had been called. Had I been present for roll call No. 671, I would have voted "AYE."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GUADALUPE CENTERS CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL BOYS SOCCER TEAM

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the victory of the Guadalupe Centers Charter High School Boys soccer team. This victory establishes the team as Missouri's Class 2 Champions—the first championship title in school and program history. The achievement of such a title undoubtedly required strong leadership matched with unparalleled levels of passion and dedication. I am proud to represent the exemplary work of athletes like these in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District.

Not only did they finish this season with a winning 22-2 record, the team—comprised of first or second-generation Americans—demonstrates a uniquely American story of hard work, diversity, sacrifice, and perseverance. Embracing both their differences and their similarities, this united identity gave the team a unique sense of purpose and comradery that eventually led them down the path to victory. For many, the struggles along the path to this achievement were symbolic of the sacrifices many of their parents and loved ones made for them to have this opportunity.

Under the direction of head coach, Ricky Olivares, the Guadalupe Center Aztecs made their first tournament appearance in school history. They eventually reached the state final by beating Southern Boone High School 2-0 with sophomore Luckyboy Tarley scoring both goals in the shutout. On November 23, 2019, Guadalupe Centers High School went head-to-head with St. Louis Priory School. In a tense game, senior leader David Portillo scored three of the four goals, Tarley scoring the other. With the support of freshman goalkeeper Henry Godinez and the rest of the team, the Aztecs pulled off a 4-3 win over the four-time state champions, Priory.

It is my pleasure to congratulate each of the vitally important team members that helped Guadalupe Centers Charter High School claim this title, and I encourage each player to continue challenging themselves to pursue all that they do with the same passion and tenacity displayed in this historic season.

Madam Speaker, please join with Missouri's Fifth Congressional District in celebrating the victories of the Guadalupe Centers Aztecs, and I encourage my fellow citizens and constituents to unite together under the same spirit of perseverance, collaboration, and hard work that led this remarkable team to their monumental victory.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON ESTES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 675 on Motion to table the motion to reconsider H.R. 5038. If present, I would have voted "nay."

MR. HENRY COLE'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, December 19, 2019, Mr. Henry Cole of Washington, D.C. will celebrate his centennial birthday.

Mr. Cole and his nine siblings were born and raised right here in the nation's capital, where he developed a love for his family, his hometown, and his nation. During World War II, Mr. Cole honorably served in the United States Navy and was stationed at Pearl Harbor in Honolulu, Hawaii.

After the war, he returned home to Washington, D.C., where he continued his pursuit of the American Dream. Mr. Cole worked as a machinist at the Washington Navy Yard, opened a family-owned restaurant with his sister, and eventually retired from the United States Postal Service in 1980 after a long, distinguished career in public service.

I believe one of the most moving and inspirational aspects of Mr. Cole's legacy and life is the love affair he shared with Gloria, his beloved wife of 68 years. Together, they raised seven children—Theodore, Shelia, Sylvia, Linda, Rex, Alice and Don. Those seeds planted with love continue to flourish in their 25 grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, there is an African proverb that says, "What you help a child to love can be more important than what you help him to learn." Mr. Cole adored his family, his country, and his community; however, he never restricted his devotion and wisdom to his immediate family and maintained an open door and served as a father figure and role model to countless others.

As we strive towards realizing the dream of a nation at peace with itself and her neighbors, Mr. Cole witnessed and was an agent of change. On the behalf of a grateful nation, I thank this beloved patriarch for embodying courage, character, compassion for the last century.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, I am proud to join the family and all who know and love Mr. Henry Cole in honoring him on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING JAMES W. OXFORD,
NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE
AMERICAN LEGION, FOR HIS
DECADES OF SERVICE

HON. HARLEY ROUDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize James W. "Bill" Oxford, the National Commander of the American Legion, for his service to our nation and his dedication to the American Legion.

Mr. Oxford served in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam War, was discharged as a sergeant in 1970, and later joined the North Carolina National Guard. He ultimately retired from the U.S. Army Reserve as a colonel after more than 34 years of military service.

Mr. Oxford, a Legionnaire since 1986, was elected National Commander of the American Legion on August 29, 2019, during the American Legion's 101st National Convention.

Orange County is thrilled to welcome Mr. Oxford as he visits our beloved American Legion Post 291, which has been a fixture in the Newport Beach community for nearly 100 years.

I urge all members to join me in recognizing Mr. Oxford for his work on behalf of American veterans and legionnaires across the United States.

HONORING BITTLE PORTERFIELD III

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Bittle Porterfield III, a Roanoke native, businessman, and champion of the area's education and arts, who died on November 29, 2019 at the age of 75. Mr. Porterfield was incredibly involved in the Roanoke community, and his goal was to make the Roanoke Valley and Virginia a better place to live.

Bittle Porterfield III was born on March 9, 1944. He attended Roanoke College for his undergraduate degree. After graduating, Mr. Porterfield served in the United States Army for two years. He then earned a master's in business administration at Virginia Tech. Mr. Porterfield worked in the beverage industry for most of his career, leading two family-run businesses.

In addition to business, Mr. Porterfield had a passion for education. He was the president of the Western Virginia Foundation for the Arts and Sciences, where he oversaw maintenance for three museums, three performing arts centers, and the region's arts council. Mr. Porterfield was also the President of the Taubman Museum of Art.

Mr. Porterfield took any opportunity he saw to benefit the Roanoke Valley. This is evident in his service as Chairman for the Roanoke Valley Resource Authority, the Foundation for the Roanoke Valley, and the Roanoke Valley Business Council. Mr. Porterfield was also the President of the Roanoke Valley Chamber of Commerce.

The effort that Mr. Porterfield poured into education was noticed, and he was appointed

to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Additionally, he served on the Radford University Board of Visitors.

Mr. Porterfield also used his passion for aviation at the Virginia Aviation Board, where he was a member. He also served as the Chairman of the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission.

The Roanoke Valley and the Commonwealth of Virginia were fortunate to have such a strong proponent and leader of education and business in their community.

Mr. Porterfield's survivors include Charlotte Kelley Porterfield; his sons Bittle Wilson Porterfield IV and wife, Holly, and Forrest Kelley Porterfield and wife, Katie; and grandchildren Bittle Wilson Porterfield V, Jackson Watkins Porterfield, Forrest Shepperson Porterfield, and William Hines Porterfield. I offer my condolences to the Porterfield family on their loss.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEPHEN L. SANETTI'S DECADES OF SERVICE

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Stephen L. Sanetti for his decades of dedicated service upon his retirement as Chief Executive Officer of the National Shooting Sports Foundation.

Steve is a fierce defender and ardent supporter of our constitutional right to keep and bear arms, but is first and foremost an American patriot. A member of Virginia Military Institute's Class of 1971, Steve graduated with honors before earning his Juris Doctor at Washington and Lee University School of Law. While attending VMI, Steve was a member of the Executive Committee, Battalion Operations, president of the Rifle and Pistol Club, and four-year member of the Rifle Team. I venture to say that Steve is a pretty great shot. From 1975 to 1978, Steve proudly wore the uniform of the United States Army in the First Cavalry Division Staff Judge Advocate at Ft. Hood, Texas, attaining the rank of Captain. Steve continues to live by the Army core values of Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage to this day and holds true his oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

Following a two-year stint as Litigation Counsel at Marsh, Day & Calhoun in Connecticut, Steve was hired by Bill Ruger in 1980 as the first general counsel for one of the nation's leading firearm manufacturing companies. For nearly three decades, Steve rose through the ranks to President and has devoted his life to Sturm, Ruger & Company, Inc. Without question, this prepared him well for taking over the helm as President and CEO of the National Shooting Sports Foundation—the trade association for America's firearms and ammunition industry—and the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute. In his nearly 12 years at NSSF, Steve has guided the foundation through times of both turbulence and growth. Under Steve's leadership, NSSF's firearms safety and education program, Project ChildSafe®, has seen tremendous success and new partnerships have been established with the American

Foundation for Suicide Prevention and Department of Veterans Affairs to address suicide and with ATF to prevent firearms from landing in the wrong hands. Because of Steve's unwavering commitment to both developing genuine solutions that make for safer communities and respecting the rights of law-abiding citizens, NSSF continues to be a leading voice in the national conversation to promote firearm safety and responsibility. Steve can certainly take pride in his work at NSSF and in helping to ensure that future generations have opportunities to enjoy the great pastimes of hunting and the shooting sports.

I thank Steve for his service and love of country. As Steve begins the next chapter of his life, spending more time with family—in particular his grandchildren—and growing the next generation of sportsmen, I congratulate him and wish him, his wife Carole, their children and grandchildren all the best.

CONGRATULATING MR. AND MRS. DONALD COLE

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I want to express my sincere congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Donald Cole on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary on December 14, 2019.

Donald Dwight Cole and Edna Earl Mize married on December 14, 1969 at Millport Church of Christ. Their story began when they met in study hall as juniors in high school, where they were the only students in the class. Don grew up Millport, AL, while Edna grew up all over the country as the daughter of a U.S. Air Force veteran until the military brought her to Millport in 1965. It is the classic love story. Don, the football player, and Edna, soon to become Homecoming Queen, fell in love as high school sweethearts and soon found themselves at the University of Alabama.

After college graduation Don was commissioned in the U.S. Air Force and Edna began teaching English. Over the next few decades the Air Force would station them in Aurora, CO; Goldsboro, NC; Washington, DC; Uijeongbu, South Korea; Colorado Springs, CO; Nashville, TN; back to Colorado Springs, CO, and then to their last tour back in Bowie, MD.

In their retirement years they continue to serve in their church, Columbus Church of Christ, run the consignment store Cole's Collections, serve on the South Lamar Rescue Squad, Millport Chamber of Commerce and the C3 Northwest Alabama Economic Alliance.

They learned their strong faith, work and personal ethics from parents, which they've also taught by example to their two children, Eric Lee Cole (Kensington, MD) and Emily Cole Monahan (Columbus, MS). They have always stayed close to their roots and family in Lamar County, and remain avid Alabama football fans. Celebrated now by their 2 children (Eric and Emily), 2 grandchildren Thomas Cole Monahan (Columbus, MS) and Ryan Lee Cole (Kensington, MD) . . . theirs is truly a love story of obedience to God, loyalty and perseverance.

Fifty years later their love story, and the Air Force, have taken them all over the world and

included countless adventures and friends, but they will tell you that their faith and their family has been their greatest blessing. Back on November 24, 2019, their children hosted a 50th Wedding Anniversary reception from 2:00 to 4:00 at Columbus Church of Christ in Columbus, Mississippi.

As the Cole's representative to Congress, I send them my best wishes and my prayers that they will have many more happy years together.

IN RECOGNITION OF CATHY
COOMER

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Cathy Coomer, who will retire on December 31, 2019 after thirty years of dedicated service with the Buncombe County Government.

Ms. Coomer's dedication to serving North Carolina began on January 12, 1990. As Safety Officer, Ms. Coomer is responsible for the safety and well-being of a workforce of 1,500 employees. She has been an integral part of the Buncombe County Emergency Services Operation and earned her certificate as a North Carolina Executive Level Emergency Manager.

Throughout her career, Ms. Coomer has held leadership positions on numerous state and local committees. She served as President for the Western North Carolina Safety and Health School and the Western North Carolina Safety Council. She served as President for the North Carolina Association of Local Government Employee Safety Officials. She was also on the Conference Program Committee with the North Carolina Emergency Management Association.

Ms. Coomer's leadership and dedication to the people in North Carolina was on clear display during her efforts in response to numerous emergency and disaster situations, including the Blizzard of 1993, Hurricane Frances, Hurricane Ivan, Hurricane Irene, and several other various non-declared events.

It is my great pleasure to celebrate Ms. Cathy Coomer before the United States House of Representatives and thank her for diligent

service to her community, the great State of North Carolina, and this country.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL
OF THE SEBASTIAN INLET DISTRICT

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, this year marks the centennial anniversary of the Sebastian Inlet District, which not only serves as a premier recreational destination for families to enjoy but plays an important role in our local economy.

Created in May of 1919 by a special act of the Florida State Legislature, the Sebastian Inlet District was originally chartered to maintain the navigational channel between the Atlantic Ocean and our Indian River Lagoon. In the mid 1800's, the first settlers in the town which would become Sebastian, saw the opportunity to create an opening on the barrier island.

By 1905 there had been six attempts to make the official "cut" but it wasn't until Roy O. Couch, now a very prominent name in the district, formed the Sebastian Inlet Association and persevered to get the necessary permits. His efforts came to fruition in 1919 when the official charter was granted and in 1924, when the Sebastian Inlet was officially opened for business.

Today, the Sebastian Inlet continues to attract visitors and locals alike, having become a popular spot for fishing, boating and surfing, all within the scenic backdrop of Florida's scenic East Coast. Water sports enthusiasts and naturalists have enjoyed Sebastian State Inlet Park, now one of the most visited parks in Florida, for its wildlife and natural beauty.

Since its establishment, the Sebastian Inlet has played an important role in promoting economic prosperity for the area, having an annual economic impact of 200 million dollars for the region. The inlet is also responsible for protecting our natural treasures such as our Indian River Lagoon, home to some of the most biodiverse marine life in the country. Some of the vital work the inlet does in partnership with Florida's Department of Environmental Protection includes bypassing sand to

downdrift beaches, erosion control and ensuring public safety.

In celebration of the inlet's centennial, the Sebastian Inlet District has begun to hold a series of educational lectures by marine biologists and environmental scientists. This will give local residents the chance to learn about what their community is doing to preserve our waterways, particularly the inlet and the Indian River Lagoon.

The role that the Sebastian Inlet District employees and volunteers play in preserving this park is vital to our community, and I salute them for their hard work and contributions.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the centennial of the Sebastian Inlet District.

HONORING THE SHAWNEE HIGH
SCHOOL RENEGADES FOR WIN-
NING THE SOUTH-CENTRAL JER-
SEY GROUP 4 REGIONAL CHAM-
PIONSHIP

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Shawnee High School Renegades football team, who last week won the South-Central Jersey Group 4 Regional Championship.

Led by head coach Tim Gushue and a strong roster from starters to reserves, the Renegades showed outstanding teamwork and perseverance all season. From a stellar offensive line to their lockdown defense, the team's balance and focus helped them bring home the South Central Group 4 Regional title.

In the final, Shawnee's strong passing game and dominant defense helped stand up the opposing rushing attack and propel them to a shutout 34-0 victory over Hammonton. The Renegades played through pressure in the final to finish the season as South Jersey champs, ending the year at 10-3.

I'm proud to be able to celebrate the success of some of the talented student-athletes from my district in New Jersey. I want to congratulate Coach Gushue and the Shawnee team on their tremendous season, and for bringing the title back to Burlington County.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6999–S7034

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3029–3051, S.J. Res. 61–62, S. Res. 453–455, and S. Con. Res. 30. **Pages S7026–27**

Measures Reported:

S. 877, to prohibit the sale of shark fins. (S. Rept. No. 116–173)

S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–174)

S. 2641, to promote United States national security and prevent the resurgence of ISIS, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. Con. Res. 23, honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied victory in the European Theater, and with an amended preamble. **Page S7026**

Measures Passed:

Armenian Genocide: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 150, expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian Genocide through official recognition and remembrance, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S7010**

Legal Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 455, to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the Case of *Richard Arjun Kaul v. Senator Charles Schumer, et al.* **Page S7033**

Battle of the Bulge: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, honoring the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge fought during World War II, recognizing the valiant efforts of the Allied Forces in December 1944, and remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice, all of which contributed to the Allied

victory in the European Theater, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S7033–34

McConnell (for Cramer) Amendment No. 1256, to add language to the preamble. **Page S7034**

Conference Reports:

National Defense Authorization Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Pages S7019–23**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the conference report to accompany the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, December 12, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, December 16, 2019. **Page S7019**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3:00 p.m., on Monday, December 16, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motion to invoke cloture filed during the session of Thursday, December 12, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, December 16, 2019. **Page S7034**

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, appointed the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Senator Wicker. **Page S7033**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 52 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 395), Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Pages S6999–S7009

By 70 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. EX. 396), John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation. **Pages S7009–10**

By 72 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. EX. 397), Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services. **Pages S7010–15**

Messages from the House: **Page S7026**

Measures Referred: **Page S7026**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7026**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7027–29**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S7029–33

Additional Statements: **Pages S7024–26**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S7033**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7033**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—397) **Pages S7009–10, S7015**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5 p.m., until 11:45 a.m. on Friday, December 13, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7034.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on national security issues in the Middle East from John C. Rood, Under Secretary for Policy, Major General Jeffrey B. Taliaferro, USAF, Vice Director for Operations, Joint Staff, and Christopher J. Almont, Defense Intelligence Officer for the Middle East, Defense Intelligence Agency, all of the Department of Defense.

COAST GUARD ARCTIC STRATEGIC OUTLOOK

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Security concluded a hearing to examine expanding opportunities, challenges, and threats in the Arctic, focusing on the Coast Guard Arctic Strategic Outlook, after receiving testimony from Admiral Charles W. Ray, Vice Commandant, Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and Heather A. Conley, Center for Strategic and International Studies, and Sherri Goodman, and Mike Sfraga, both of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 225, to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 258, to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the National Forest System land in the Ruby Mountains Ranger District located in the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Elko and White Pine Counties, Nevada, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 298, to establish the Springfield Race Riot National Historic Monument in the State of Illinois, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 327, to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 389, to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in Presidential Park in the District of Columbia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 430, to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 434, to provide for a report on the maintenance of Federal land holdings under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 490, to designate a mountain ridge in the State of Montana as "B-47 Ridge", with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 526, to withdraw certain Bureau of Land Management land from mineral development, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 641, to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Yucca House National Monument, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 774, to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, with an amendment;

S. 1152, to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain parcels of Federal land in Arlington, Virginia, with an amendment;

S. 1262, to designate certain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest

Service in the State of Oregon as wilderness and national recreation areas, to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, with an amendment;

S. 1890, to provide for grants for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy improvements at public school facilities;

S. 2108, to amend section 6903 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for additional population tiers;

S. 2393, to promote a 21st century energy workforce, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2399, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve State loan eligibility for projects for innovative technology, with an amendment;

S. 2660, to establish a grant program for wind energy research, development, and demonstration, with an amendment; and

H.R. 617, to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2971, to amend and reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2997, to revise and extend health workforce programs under title VII of the Public Health Service Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2683, to establish a task force to assist States in implementing hiring requirements for child care staff members to improve child safety, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2927, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that the authority of the Director of the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities to make certain research endowments applies with respect to both current and former centers of excellence; and

The nomination of Crosby Kemper III, of Missouri, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

NOMINATION

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of J. Brett Blanton, of Virginia, to be Architect of the Capitol, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 5406–5427; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 79–80; and H. Res. 762–763 were introduced. **Pages H10257–58**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H10259**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1620, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program (H. Rept. 116–338);

H.R. 2548, to modify eligibility requirements for certain hazard mitigation assistance programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–339, Part 1);

H.R. 4719, to amend the Federal share of the fishing safety standards grants, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–340);

H.R. 3256, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize and improve the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–341, Part 1);

H.R. 4704, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–342);

H.R. 5065, to amend the Small Business Act to provide re-entry entrepreneurship counseling and

training services for formerly incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–343); and

H.R. 5078, to amend the Small Business Act to provide re-entry entrepreneurship counseling and training services for incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–344). **Pages H10256–57**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, December 13th. **Page H10127**

Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act: The House passed H.R. 3, to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, by a ye-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 682. Consideration began yesterday, December 11th. **Pages H10129–H10225**

Rejected the Upton motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a ye-and-nay vote of 196 yeas to 226 nays, Roll No. 681.

Pages H10223–24

Agreed to:

Tonko amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that requires CMS to create and implement a measure in the Star Ratings program evaluating Medicare Advantage and Part D plans on how well they provide access to biosimilar drugs;

Pages H10202–04

Peters amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that amends the Public Health Service Act to authorize a pilot program to develop, expand, and enhance the commercialization of biomedical products, and for other purposes;

Pages H10204–05

Kennedy amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that requires another Senate confirmed officer with HHS to carry out the negotiation duties should the Secretary of HHS have a conflict of interest; the General Counsel of HHS would be responsible for identifying these conflicts;

Pages H10205–06

Kennedy amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that expresses the Sense of Congress regarding the impact of the high cost of prescription drugs on communities of color and persons living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the United States;

Pages H10208–10

Axne amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that establishes a grant program for states to reduce the burdens associated with health care administrative work and reduces HHS administrative costs by 50% over 10 years; **Pages H10211–14**

Finkenauer amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that requires drug companies to disclose truthful and non-misleading pricing information about prescription drugs and biological products when they advertise these products directly to consumers; **Pages H10214–15**

Houlahan amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that increases funding for clinical trials at NIH and ban the use of spread pricing by PBMs as it relates to Medicaid;

Pages H10217–19

O'Halleran amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that creates a grant program within HHS for hospitals located in rural and medically underserved areas, including Critical Access Hospitals, to cover the start-up costs for establishing a Graduate Medical Education (GME) program or a partnership with a hospital that has an existing program; would include a reporting requirement for GAO to analyze whether residents continue to practice in a rural or medically underserved area after completing their training (by a recorded vote of 351 yeas to 73 noes, Roll No. 677);

Pages H10206–08, H10220

Gottheimer amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that requires an HHS study to identify conditions without an FDA-approved treatment where the development of a treatment would fill an unmet medical need for a serious or life-threatening condition or rare disease; requires HHS to identify appropriate incentives that would lead to the development of such treatments (by a recorded vote of 380 yeas to 45 noes, Roll No. 678);

Pages H10210–11, H10221

Luria amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that makes clear that federal employee health plans are covered by the price reduction provisions of the bill (by a recorded vote of 231 yeas to 192 noes, Roll No. 679); and

Pages H10215–16, H10221–22

Cunningham amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that allows the Veteran's Administration to benefit from Maximum Fair Pricing guidelines (by a recorded vote of 234 yeas to 192 noes, Roll No. 680). **Pages H10216–17, H10222**

Rejected:

Walden amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–334) that sought to include provisions in the bill related to Medicare Parts B&D, drug price transparency, Medicare Part D benefit redesign, MedPAC, Medicaid, FDA, and revenue provisions (by a recorded vote of 201 yeas to 223 noes, Roll No. 676). **Pages H10167–H10202, H10219–20**

H. Res. 758, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3) and (H.R. 5038) and the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1790) was agreed to yesterday, December 11th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H10234.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H10219–20, H10220, H10221, H10221–22, H10222, H10224, and H10225. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12 noon.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT'S IMPLEMENTATION OF BORROWER DEFENSE

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the Education Department’s Implementation of Borrower Defense”. Testimony was heard from Betsy DeVos, Secretary, Department of Education.

MEMBER DAY HEARING

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day Hearing”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Case, Garamendi, Green of Texas, Hill of Arkansas, Meng, Roy, and Steil.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee continued a markup on H. Res. 755, the “Articles of Impeachment Against President Donald J. Trump”.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, continue markup on H. Res. 755, the “Articles of Impeachment Against President Donald J. Trump”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11:45 a.m., Friday, December 13

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Friday, December 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1585
 Bishop, Rob, Utah., E1585
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1583
 Casten, Sean, Ill., E1583
 Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E1581, E1584
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E1583

Crow, Jason, Col., E1584
 Estes, Ron, Kans., E1584
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E1582
 Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1585
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E1583, E1584, E1586
 Lewis, John, Ga., E1584
 Meadows, Mark, N.C., E1586
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1584

Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1581
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E1581
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E1586
 Rouda, Harley, Calif. E1585
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1582
 Trahan, Lori, Mass., E1581



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.