

robotics and programming. It is unclear where precisely this stereotype originates from, but implicit biases can have a negative impact on a girl's academic achievement in math and science and on their future decisions to enroll in advanced courses in these subjects.

The Code Like a Girl Act addresses this issue by creating NSF grants to increase understanding of the factors that contribute to the participation of young girls 10 and younger in STEM and computer science activities. This bill also creates a grant program to develop and evaluate interventions in pre-K and elementary school classrooms with the goal of increasing participation of young girls in computer science.

Some of these activities may include teacher training and professional development, classroom programs on gender-inclusive teaching practices, and providing mentors for girls to support their computer science aspirations. We know that young girls are interested in science, math, and computing, but we need to make sure that, as they grow older, they stay involved and engaged.

We also know that knowledge of computer science and use of technology is becoming increasingly essential for all individuals, not just those planning to work in the technology sector. STEM education cultivates students' curiosity, their creativity. It teaches them to work as a team and fosters critical thinking skills that are fundamental for success in any field.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help invest in our students. It will help them rise to meet the challenges of a changing economy that increasingly relies on highly skilled labor and technology. I am proud to stand for our students before this Chamber because, together, we are making smart investments that will help our children succeed, smart investments so that we can help our communities build more effective workforces and a stronger, competitive economy.

For these reasons, I am proud that my Building Blocks of STEM Act, including the text of my Code Like a Girl Act, is being considered today. With the passage of these bills, we are one step closer to bridging the current gaps in STEM education and workforce training.

Building the blocks for careers in STEM will prepare Nevadans and all Americans for better jobs and help us meet the demands of our 21st century economy. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, investing and encouraging early education in STEM are needs that we know are here now and even more in the future. I want to thank Ms. ROSEN for her leadership in

this role. It is absolutely something that is bipartisan. It is something that Congress is behind.

I can tell you, just on a personal note, Lancaster High School came out with their robotics team more than a decade ago, 100 percent boys. Just a short period after that, about 4 or 5 years, they were 50 percent girls, 50 percent boys, and they were winning awards all over the country. That was because we had great teachers there who pushed and made sure that girls knew that they could be on the robotics team and pulled them in. That is exactly what we are talking about: investing and encouraging.

I urge passage of this good bill. This is bipartisan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3397, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES PROGRAM

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4979) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences and to make technical changes to the competitive need limitations provision of the program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4979

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2017, that was made—

(i) after December 31, 2017, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A)

with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

(C) ANNUAL REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through December 31, 2020, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on efforts to ensure that countries designated as beneficiary developing countries under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) are meeting the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502(c) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(c)).

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL MODIFICATION TO PROCEDURES FOR COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVERS.

Section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in the matter following subparagraph (A)(i)(II), by striking “July 1” and inserting “November 1”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “on January 1, 1995” and inserting “in any of the preceding three calendar years”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “July 1” each place it appears and inserting “November 1”.

SEC. 3. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “February 24, 2027” and inserting “August 1, 2027”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4979, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of H.R. 4979, a bill to

extend the Generalized System of Preferences and to make technical changes to the competitive need limitations provision of the program. This bipartisan bill helps keep U.S. companies globally competitive by eliminating tariffs on certain imports from developing countries in a manner that does not hurt U.S. producers.

GSP saved U.S. companies more than \$865 million in import duties in 2017, providing benefits to thousands of companies and their employees as well as their customers. GSP also provides an important enforcement tool to require all 121 beneficiary developing countries to continue to make progress on eligibility criteria set by Congress. These include critical issues like intellectual property protection, market access for U.S. exporters, and elimination of the worst forms of child labor.

In my home State of Washington, GSP saved companies about \$11 million in import duties in 2017, and that is up 30 percent from 2016. As just one example, TRInternational, a small but quickly growing, veteran-owned chemical distributor in Seattle, relies on GSP to obtain certain chemical raw materials at globally competitive prices. Our last renewal of GSP in 2015 allowed TRI to hire more employees and invest in more equipment. Many of TRI's customers are U.S. manufacturers, and TRI's use of GSP to obtain raw materials at lower prices also makes these manufacturers more competitive.

For TRI and other Washington companies like Rain City Music that use the GSP program, their employees, and American consumers, GSP provides significant benefits.

And of course, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill, and I am pleased to be working with my good friend BILL PASCRELL, who joins us here tonight.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand here with my chairman from the great State of Washington, (Mr. REICHERT). This is a bipartisan bill.

The Generalized System of Preferences expired December 31, 2017. I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the legislation that would renew what I consider a very important program.

This is a longstanding trade program, Mr. Speaker, that has enjoyed broad bipartisan support since 1974. Since the GSP already expired, it is imperative that we extend the program now.

While this bill makes slight technical corrections, no real substantive changes were made in the existing program. I am open to having a debate on modifications that would enhance GSP in the future. I would have liked to have had it before this debate, had the time that we are debating right now and not have let the program expire, but, unfortunately, I am not in control

of the calendar. I am pleased, however, that we agreed to work to renew this program in its current form on a bipartisan, bicameral basis.

Established by the Trade Act of 1974, GSP promotes economic development by eliminating duties on thousands of products when imported from one of approximately 120 designated beneficiary countries and territories. This program not only supports American competitiveness and economic opportunity, but it also encourages developing countries in the program to adopt high labor standards, intellectual property rights, and the rule of law.

So, as part of the current program, the committee known as the GSP Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee conducts an annual review of the articles, an annual review of all the countries that are involved, that are eligible for duty-free treatment under this program. This committee is chaired by the United States Trade Representative and comprised of representatives of other executive branch agencies.

The law requires that the President take into account several factors when designating a country as eligible for GSP. These factors include whether a country has taken or is taking steps to afford workers internationally recognized worker rights—that is what the law says—and the extent to which a country is providing adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights.

Last year, the administration began a review of Bolivia's compliance, as an example, with the labor eligibility criterion due to concerns regarding the use of child labor and other labor abuses in Bolivia.

□ 1745

The legislation we are considering today includes a new reporting requirement that will improve the effectiveness of congressional oversight of the administration's enforcement of these eligibility criteria and the progress made under effective investigations. Article I, section 8 is very clear of what the legislators in this House have as a responsibility. It is my hope that Congress can further strengthen the enforcement mechanisms of the GSP in the future.

The program also boosts the competitiveness of United States companies and workers by reducing the cost of imports used to manufacture goods in the United States. In 2016, products valued at \$18.9 billion entered the United States duty-free under the program. Since the expiration of the program, small- and medium-sized enterprises have borne the burden of higher costs of products imported under the GSP.

Consider Primetac, which is located in Little Ferry, New Jersey, in my district. It is a family-owned business from my district that uses the GSP-eligible goods to support their industrial

packaging business. When GSP last expired, Primetac was forced to raise prices to compensate for the new import taxes. This was no small increase. The company estimates it paid about \$1.5 million in new tariffs during the program's lapse.

This legislation would provide benefits retroactively to GSP-eligible imports so that small- and medium-sized American companies like Primetac can take full advantage of the benefits of GSP and boost their business' productivity.

It is critical that we act quickly. I also want to mention that the GSP is also intended to prevent domestic companies from being harmed. Under the current process, the competitive need limitation provision within the law imposes ceilings on GSP benefits for each product and for each beneficiary country. The GSP statute provides that a beneficiary developing country loses GSP eligibility with respect to a product if the competitive need limitations are exceeded and then no waiver is granted.

In closing, I look forward to considering this legislation. With the successful passage of GSP, I hope that we will be able to issue a joint, bipartisan statement and continue working together to show the strong support for this program.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan bill to renew the Generalized System of Preferences program for 3 years.

I thank Congressman REICHERT for his leadership of the Trade Subcommittee and the good work that Mr. PASCRELL has done as well.

This program, known as GSP, is incredibly important for the competitiveness of our local businesses and our local workers. It helps our families and our communities by reducing tariffs, which are essentially taxes, on products that many of us use every day. Through GSP, we secure tax-free access to thousands of products from around the world.

Last year, this saved American businesses more than \$865 million. In Texas alone, our local job creators saved more than \$76 million. Of course, this is money that our businesses can instead use to hire more workers, to expand, and innovate.

But, really, think about what it means for families. Think about that single mom in the grocery store carefully reading every price tag so she can stretch every dollar to the max. For her, GSP makes everyday essentials more affordable, as well as the occasional treat that saves money. It provides her with real peace of mind.

GSP delivers all these benefits in an accountable way that doesn't hurt American workers or businesses.

I thank all the Members who worked on this important pro-growth, pro-family bill; in particular, our Ways and Means Committee members: Congressman NEAL, my ranking member; Congressmen REICHERT and PASCRELL, our Trade Subcommittee chairman and ranking member; and Congresswoman JACKIE WALORSKI, who has been an outstanding leader in this effort.

Now, let's pass this bill, provide certainty for our job creators, and deliver the tax relief that American families deserve.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), one of the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4979, which extends the Generalized System of Preferences—or GSP—program through 2020.

GSP helps American manufacturers, both big and small, cut input costs, which, in turn, lowers prices for consumers. Companies saved \$865 million in import duties in 2017 alone.

I thank the chairman, in particular, for including my bipartisan bill, H.R. 4068, the Competitive Need Limitation Modernization Act, which I introduced with my friends, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

My bill makes two small but important technical fixes to the competitive need limitation—or CNL—process. CNLs are exemptions granted by the government on products that exceed the dollar or percentage thresholds for GSP eligibility. They can be granted for a number of reasons, including national security, no domestic production, or low import levels.

Manufacturers in my district reached out to my office when they were denied a CNL on a type of wood not found in the U.S. But because of a government spreadsheet that stated there was a domestic product that was like or directly competitive as of January 1, 1995, they were denied. There was no information beyond that, just that date and that spreadsheet. The manufacturers even had sworn affidavits from producers in the industry saying there was actually nothing like or directly competitive to this wood in the U.S., but it didn't matter.

This arbitrary and inflexible date forces manufacturers like the ones in my district to pay millions in unnecessary duties, hurting American workers and consumers. And it hurts domestic producers that have brought jobs back to the U.S. since 1995 because that date is all that matters in a CNL application.

My bill changes that date to the last three calendar years to better reflect current domestic production. It also better synchronizes CNL application dates and the date that full-year trade data is released to provide more certainty.

I am glad we are taking this step to reauthorize GSP and to ensure that it is working the way Congress intended. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), another member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman REICHERT and Ranking Member PASCRELL for their important work on this legislation.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 4979, to provide a 3-year renewal of the Generalized System of Preferences. The GSP program provides duty-free access to the U.S. market for selected goods from 121 developing countries.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have always been an advocate of policies that allow businesses and consumers to acquire products of their choice at the best possible price. The GSP program gives our businesses and consumers that choice by promoting economic growth in developing countries while creating jobs here at home.

In 2017, U.S. importers enjoyed nearly \$865 million in savings on import duties under the GSP program. During the same year, my home State of Florida had \$1.2 billion of imports covered by the program and a total savings of \$59 million on import duties. Mr. Speaker, that is about a 40 percent increase in savings from 2016.

I want to share the story of Mr. Bruce Price, a small-business owner in my district who would benefit from renewing the GSP program. He recently told my office he expects savings in the range of \$25,000 to \$45,000 per year if the program is renewed. For Mr. PRICE, those savings go a long way and make a major difference in determining his business decisions.

I commend the work the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade has done to reinforce our commitment to free and fair trade partnerships around the world. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4979 to help Mr. PRICE and other small-business owners hire more workers all across our country.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), who has been a leader on this issue.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman REICHERT for his work on this.

As Chairman BRADY said, this is very important. I have a lot of manufacturers in my district who really can't get parts in this country and they depend on other countries, and it is vital that they remain competitive. So I thank Chairman REICHERT for his work on this.

I rise today to support the reauthorization of the Generalized System of Preferences program, or GSP.

In 2016, job creators and producers in my State saved \$16 million on \$422 mil-

lion worth of imports. In 2017, producers in my State saved \$17 million on GSP imports through reduced tariffs. These savings translate directly to how much companies can reinvest in their businesses and their employees.

GSP also provides the executive branch with effective enforcement strategies to make sure the United States is not being taken advantage of in trade deals.

President John F. Kennedy once said: “A rising tide lifts all boats.”

This is the opportunity before us today. We can support American prosperity while helping lift others out of poverty.

I urge support of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

We have had expiration times in the last 5 or 6 years, but we always come together. We passed last week the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill in Trade. I think that is a good sign moving forward, working together in order to protect—not be protectionists, but protect American industries. I think that this is a very, very important move.

I also think that extending it to 2020 is a great idea. I think this is very, very important, so I won't be back here next year anyway. We have a little foresight here.

So I thank Mr. REICHERT for bringing this to the floor. We worked hard to get this here. We hope we will get help from the other side of the building.

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

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

I thank my friend from New Jersey because we have worked on a lot of issues together over the past almost 14 years now, and I do agree with him. There are few moments where we have a chance to sort of have a kumbaya moment. MTB, a week or two ago, was one of those.

Tonight, on GSP, is another one that doesn't sound—you know, GSP, people ask: What is that? And we tried to explain it tonight.

It is a complicated issue, but the bottom line is that this is good for American businesses. It creates jobs, energizes the economy. Coupled with tax reform and fair trade agreements that we are also working together on, I think we can look forward to a bright, bright future here in the United States for our working men and women and our families.

So our last renewal of GSP in 2015 allowed TRI to hire more employees, as I said. So we are looking forward to, you know, more jobs being created. And TRI, I know, is going to be very pleased by the fact that this is going to be voted on tonight.

It is clear that H.R. 4979 has strong bipartisan support, and for good reason. Renewing GSP will benefit U.S. companies, workers, and consumers. Any additional delay in renewing this important program has real costs in

my home State, as I mentioned, and throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4979, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1800

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 12, 2018, at 3:28 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President on his framework for rebuilding infrastructure in America.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

FRAMEWORK FOR REBUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE IN AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-95)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Education and the Workforce; Committee on Energy and Commerce; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Natural Resources; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have enclosed with this message my Administration's framework for rebuilding infrastructure in America. Our Nation's infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which

damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans the working, modern infrastructure they deserve.

To help build a better future for all Americans, I ask the Congress to act soon on an infrastructure bill that will: stimulate at least \$1.5 trillion in new investment over the next 10 years, shorten the process for approving projects to 2 years or less, address unmet rural infrastructure needs, empower State and local authorities, and train the American workforce of the future.

To develop the infrastructure framework I am transmitting today, my Administration engaged with Governors, mayors, Federal agencies, State and local agencies, Members of Congress, industry, and most importantly, the American people who depend on upgraded infrastructure. The product of these efforts is a roadmap for the Congress to draft and pass the most comprehensive infrastructure bill in our Nation's history. My Administration's plan addresses more than traditional infrastructure—like roads, bridges, and airports—but addresses other needs like drinking and wastewater systems, waterways, water resources, energy, rural infrastructure, public lands, veterans' hospitals, and Brownfield and Superfund sites. The reforms set forth in my plan will strengthen the economy, make our country more competitive, reduce the costs of goods and services for American families, and enable Americans to build their lives on top of the best infrastructure in the world.

My Administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact a law that will enable America's builders to construct new, modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 2018.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4533, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 4979, by the yeas and nays.

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

LEXINGTON VA HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4533) to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—402

Abraham	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Adams	Cheney	Dunn
Aderholt	Chu, Judy	Ellison
Aguilar	Cicilline	Emmer
Allen	Clark (MA)	Engel
Amash	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Amodei	Clay	Espallat
Arrington	Cleaver	Estes (KS)
Babin	Clyburn	Esty (CT)
Bacon	Coffman	Evans
Banks (IN)	Cohen	Farenthold
Barletta	Cole	Faso
Barr	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Barragán	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Comer	Fleischmann
Beatty	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bera	Conaway	Foster
Bergman	Connolly	Fox
Beyer	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Biggs	Cooper	Fudge
Bilirakis	Correa	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Gallagher
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Gallego
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Garamendi
Blackburn	Crawford	Garrett
Blum	Crist	Gianforte
Bonamici	Crowley	Gibbs
Bost	Cuellar	Gohmert
Boyle, Brendan	Culberson	Gomez
F.	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	Curtis	Gosar
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Gottheimer
Brat	Davis (CA)	Gowdy
Bridenstine	Davis, Danny	Granger
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Graves (LA)
Brown (MD)	DeGette	Graves (MO)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Green, Al
Buck	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Bucshon	DelBene	Griffith
Budd	Demings	Grijalva
Burgess	Dent	Grothman
Bustos	DeSantis	Guthrie
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Hanabusa
Calvert	DesJarlais	Handel
Capuano	Deuth	Harper
Carbajal	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Cárdenas	Dingell	Hartzler
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hastings
Carter (GA)	Donovan	Heck
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Hensarling
Castor (FL)	F.	Herrera Beutler
Castro (TX)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.